Chapter 3

Initial Study Environmental Checklist

1. Project Title:	Riverside Park Outdoor Development
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks 221 N. Figueroa Street Suite 100 Los Angeles, CA 90012
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:	Paul Davis, Environmental Specialist (213) 202-2667
4. Project Location:	Located at 1800 W. Riverside Drive in Los Angeles, the park is near the intersection of Riverside Drive and Stadium Way and near the junction of the I-5 Glendale Freeways (SR-2).
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks 221 N. Figueroa Street Suite 100 Los Angeles, CA 90012
6. General Plan Designation:	Open Space
7. Zoning:	OS-1XL
8. Description of Project:	See Chapter 2, Project Description.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	See Chapter 2, Project Description.
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:	Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

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

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

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 to 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 an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Paul J. Davis — Signature

9/10/2009 — Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following.

   (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.

   (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

   (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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 along a 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 that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. **Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not affect a scenic vista. The project site comprises 18 acres of vacant land characterized by ruderal vegetation and shrubs, with gentle to steep topography. The site is visible from properties in the immediate vicinity of the site, which include commercial uses along Riverside Drive, surrounding hillside residential neighbors, and motorists on the I-5 Freeway. The site provides some scenic qualities from these receptors, but does not represent a scenic vista as the site is limited in size and visibility from off-site areas. The majority of the site that is visible from off-site areas includes the steep hillside areas, which will remain undeveloped and be left in a natural condition with opportunities for landscape enhancements. The lower levels of the park that are proposed for active recreation would be largely unnoticeable in the context of existing development along Riverside Drive.

The project site is located at the eastern edge of the base of the Santa Monica Mountain Range, which provides scenic views from many parts of the city of Los Angeles. The range extends from the site to the north/northwest and would provide views from the lower levels of the project site. Park users who choose to visit the upper level outlook area of the proposed project would be afforded views of the Santa Monica Mountains, Hollywood sign, and other regional landmarks. The upper level would be unobtrusive and would include two parking spaces, benches, and landscaping, which would not affect existing views of the project site.

Project implementation would not obstruct any scenic views. As stated above, the upper levels would provide opportunities for park users to view scenic vistas. The facilities proposed as part of the park would not block existing views of scenic vistas. The lower levels of the park do not provide scenic vistas, nor would the proposed parking development block any existing views from off-site areas.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site does not consist of any rock outcroppings that are of significant visual quality, and construction of the project would not displace any such resources. The

park does have mature trees, but none of these would be damaged or removed during construction or implementation of the proposed project. There are no historic buildings on-site or within the project area that would be affected by the proposed project.

Riverside Drive, located adjacent to the northeast side of the project site, is designated as a scenic highway in the City of Los Angeles General Plan. Additionally, Los Feliz Boulevard, approximately ¼ mile northwest of the site, and Silver Lake Boulevard, approximately 2 miles east of the proposed project, are both designated as scenic highways (City of Los Angeles 1998a). The Caltrans Scenic Highway System does not identify any highways that are in the vicinity of the project as scenic highways (California Department of Transportation 2007).

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not affect Los Feliz Boulevard or Silver Lake Boulevard as these roads are not within the viewshed of the project site. Construction and implementation of the proposed project would not require any changes to Riverside Drive. The proposed project would enhance the visual quality of the natural environment along Riverside Drive by providing natural vegetation and park amenities such as multipurpose playing fields and sports courts.

There are no significant rock outcroppings or historic buildings on-site, no view from a scenic highway would be diminished, and no existing trees would be damaged or removed; therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. The site and surroundings would be visually altered during the construction of Phase I and Phase II of the proposed project. Impacts on visual quality would be short-term as Phase I construction would be completed in approximately a year and Phase II construction would follow. Therefore, construction impacts would be less than significant.

Construction and operation of Phase I and Phase II would result in a neutral to positive change to the visual character of the site. The existing environment surrounding the project area is characterized by a hillside neighborhood landscape with a mix of residential and commercial uses. The project site is currently vacant open space. The proposed courts and community building would be accompanied by additional visually pleasing amenities, such as trails, picnic areas, and landscaping, which would act to increase the aesthetic value of the park and the mix of neighborhood uses. Therefore, the project would not constitute a significant degradation of the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

d. No Impact. The major sources of light and glare in the vicinity of the site are surrounding residences, street lighting, and headlights from vehicles traveling along Riverside Drive and the I-5 Freeway at night. The proposed project would not be operational after dusk and would not have lights. Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce any new light sources to the surrounding area; no impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	**AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts on 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 Department of Conservation. 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 conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. No Impact. The California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the project site and the surrounding land as "area not mapped"; thus, the project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance (California Department of Conservation 2006). Furthermore, the project site is located in an existing developed urban setting with no agricultural uses on or surrounding the site. Therefore, the project would not convert any farmland to a non-agricultural use.

b. No Impact. The project site is zoned for Open Space under the Los Angeles Municipal Zoning Code and is not zoned for agricultural use. The Williamson Act applies to parcels consisting of least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of farmland not designated as Prime Farmland. The project site is not located within a Prime Farmland designation, nor does it consist of more than 40 acres of farmland. Therefore, the site is not eligible to be placed under a Williamson Act Contract and no impacts would occur.

c. No Impact. The proposed project would not disrupt or damage the operation or productivity of any areas designated as farmland. The proposed project is located near low-density urban residential uses, commercial and manufacturing uses, and roads. The project site is not located near or adjacent to any areas that are actively farmed; therefore, no farmland could be affected by land use changes on the project site. No impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	**AIR QUALITY.** When 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 a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. No Impact. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is required, pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment (i.e., ozone [O_3], and particulate matter equal to or less than 10 and less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM10 and PM2.5, respectively]). As such, the project would be subject to the SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. These strategies are developed, in part, based on regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

SCAG is the regional planning agency for Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties and addresses regional issues relating to transportation, economy, community development, and environment. With regard to air quality planning, SCAG has prepared the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which includes Growth Management and Regional Mobility chapters that form the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. These documents are used in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analysis included in

the AQMP. Both the RCP and AQMP are based, in part, on projections originating with Los Angeles County and City General Plans.

The proposed project would involve the development of a park for both active and passive recreational uses. The physical changes to the environment proposed by the project would involve minor site grading and the development of park facilities. It would not result in an increase in either population or the number of new permanent employees in the area. The project is consistent with both the City of Los Angeles General Plan land use designation and zoning.

Because the project is consistent with the local general plan and the Regional Growth Management Plan, pursuant to SCAQMD guidelines, the proposed project is considered consistent with the region's AQMP. As such, proposed project–related emissions are accounted for in the AQMP, which is crafted to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Response IIIa, the project site is located within the Basin. State and federal air quality standards are often exceeded in many parts of the Basin. A discussion of the project's potential short-term construction-period and long-term operational-period air quality impacts is provided below.

Regional Construction Impacts

The SCAQMD has established methods to quantify air emissions associated with construction activities such as air pollutant emissions generated by operation of on-site construction equipment; fugitive dust emissions related to grading and site work activities; and mobile (tailpipe) emissions from construction worker vehicles and haul/delivery truck trips. Emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of construction activity occurring, and, for fugitive dust, prevailing weather conditions.

With respect to the proposed project, construction activities are expected to extend over a period of approximately 24 months. Construction activities during this period would be completed in two main phases. The first phase would consist of constructing the active recreational facilities such as the basketball courts. The second phase would consist of the construction of a 2,500 square-foot community building and nature trail improvements.

A mass emissions inventory for the construction period was compiled based on an estimate of construction equipment as well as scheduling and phasing assumptions. More specifically, the mass emissions analysis takes into account:

- combustion emissions from operating on-site construction equipment,
- fugitive dust emissions from moving soil on-site, and
- mobile-source combustion emissions from worker commute travel.

For the purpose of estimating emissions associated with the construction activities, a project time frame of November 1, 2009, through December 30, 2010, for Phase I and February 1, 2011, through January 31, 2012, for Phase II was applied to the analysis. Emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS2007 emissions inventory model. The quantity, duration, and the intensity of construction activity have a effect upon the amount of construction emissions, and related pollutant concentrations, occurring at any one time. As such, the emission forecasts provided herein reflect a specific set of

conservative assumptions based on the expected construction scenario wherein a relatively large amount of construction is occurring in a relatively intensive manner. Because of this conservative assumption, actual emissions could be less than those forecasted. If construction is delayed or occurs over a longer time period, emissions could be reduced because of (1) a more modern and cleaner burning construction equipment fleet mix, and/or (2) a less intensive buildout schedule (i.e., fewer daily emissions occurring over a longer time interval). A conservative estimate of the project's regional mass emissions during construction is presented in Table 3-1. As shown therein, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain below their respective thresholds. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3-1. Forecast of Regional Construction Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
Construction Phase	**ROG**	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Phase I						
Demolition (1-month duration)	1.29	8.56	6.04	<0.01	0.88	0.65
Grading/Excavation (3-month duration)	3.22	26.52	14.10	<0.01	21.81	5.51
Construction (5-month duration)	2.11	8.81	15.77	0.01	0.78	0.68
Paving (1-month duration)	2.04	12.12	8.86	<0.01	1.05	0.96
Irrigation (2-month duration)	2.09	17.75	9.26	<0.01	0.89	0.81
Landscaping and Post Construction (3-month duration)	1.05	8.40	3.93	<0.01	0.47	0.43
Phase II						
Grading/Trails (4-month duration)	1.48	12.56	7.21	<0.01	16.23	3.81
Construction (6-month duration)	1.95	8.32	14.98	0.01	0.73	0.64
Site Work (1-month duration)	1.98	16.48	9.05	<0.01	0.83	0.76
Landscaping (1-month duration)	0.92	7.13	3.71	<0.01	0.39	0.36
Maximum Regional Project Emissions [a]	**4**	**27**	**25**	**<1**	**22**	**6**
SCAQMD Regional Emissions Threshold (lbs/day)	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[a] Maximum concurrent regional project emissions for ROG, CO, and SO_X occur during the 1-month period when Phase I construction and paving overlap. All other maximums occur during Phase I grading/excavation.
ROG = reactive organic gas.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
CO = carbon monoxide.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter.

URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in Appendix A.

Localized Construction Impacts

When quantifying mass emissions for localized analysis, only emissions that occur on-site are considered. Consistent with the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology guidelines, emissions related to off-site delivery/haul truck activity and employee trips are not considered in the evaluation of localized impacts. As shown in Table 3-2, localized emissions for all criteria pollutants would remain below their respective SCAQMD LST significance thresholds. As such, localized impacts that may result from air pollutant emissions during the construction phases would be less than significant.

Table 3-2. Forecast of Localized Construction Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
Construction Phase	**ROG**	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Phase I						
Demolition (1-month duration)	1.23	8.15	4.78	<0.01	0.85	0.63
Grading/Excavation (3-month duration)	3.18	26.46	12.98	<0.01	21.80	5.50
Construction (5-month duration)	1.80	8.21	5.99	<0.01	0.69	0.63
Paving (1-month duration)	1.98	11.89	6.98	<0.01	1.03	0.94
Irrigation (2-month duration)	2.06	17.69	8.22	<0.01	0.88	0.81
Landscaping and Post Construction (3-month duration)	1.04	8.37	3.40	<0.01	0.47	0.43
Phase II						
Grading/Trails (4-month duration)	1.45	12.52	6.48	<0.01	16.22	3.81
Construction (6-month duration)	1.67	7.77	5.88	<0.01	0.64	0.59
Site Work (1-month duration)	1.95	16.42	8.07	<0.01	0.82	0.76
Landscaping (1-month duration)	0.90	7.10	3.25	<0.01	0.39	0.36
Worst Case On-Site Total [a]	**4**	**26**	**13**	**<1**	**22**	**6**
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (lbs/day)[b]	--	131	2,194	--	50	11
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[a] Maximum concurrent regional project emissions for ROG, CO, and SO_X occur during the 1-month period when Phase I construction and paving overlap. All other maximums occur during Phase I grading/excavation.

[b] These localized thresholds were taken from tables provided in the SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology guidance document based on the following: 1) The project site is located in SCAQMD Source Receptor Area No. 1, 2) sensitive receptors located within 50 meters of construction activity, and 3) the maximum site area disturbed is 5 acres.

ROG = reactive organic gas.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
CO = carbon monoxide.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter.

URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in Appendix A.

Regional Operations Impacts

The SCAQMD also has established significance thresholds to evaluate the potential impacts associated with long-term project operations. Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would be generated by the consumption of electricity and natural gas and the operation of on-road vehicles. Pollutant emissions associated with energy demand (i.e., electricity generation and natural gas consumption) are classified by the SCAQMD as regional stationary-source emissions. Electricity is considered an area source because it is produced at various locations in and outside the Basin. Because it is not possible to isolate where electricity is produced, these emissions are conservatively considered to occur within the Basin and be regional in nature. Criteria pollutant emissions associated with the production and consumption of energy were calculated using emission factors from the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (appendix to Chapter 9).

Mobile-source emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS2007 emissions inventory model, which multiplies an estimate of daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by applicable EMFAC2002 emissions factors.[1] The URBEMIS2007 model output and worksheets for calculating regional operational daily emissions are provided in Appendix A. As shown in Table 3-3, the project's net regional emissions would not exceed regional SCAQMD thresholds for CO, NO_X, SO_X, ROC, PM_{10},

[1] Daily VMT estimate derived by applying URBEMIS2007 default trip generation and length estimates (per land use) to the proposed project land uses.

or $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, regional operations emissions would not result in a significant long-term regional air quality impact.

Table 3-3. Forecast of Regional Operational Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
Riverside Park	**ROG**	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Mobile[a]	0.6	0.8	7.3	<0.1	1.2	0.2
Area	0.3	0.1	3.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Stationary[b]	0.1	4.7	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.1
Total Operational Emissions	**1**	**6**	**11**	**<1**	**1**	**<1**
SCAQMD Regional Emissions Threshold (lbs/day)	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in Appendix A.

[a] Mobile emissions calculated using the URBEMIS2007 emissions model. Model output sheets are provided in the Air Quality Appendix.

[b] Emissions attributable to project-related electricity generation calculated based on guidance provided in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Worksheets are provided in the Air Quality Appendix.

ROG = reactive organic gas.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
CO = carbon monoxide.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter.

Local Operational Emissions

In an urban setting, vehicle exhaust is the primary source of CO. Consequently, the highest CO concentrations are generally found close to congested intersections. Under typical meteorological conditions, CO concentrations tend to decrease as the distance from the emissions source (e.g., congested intersection) increases. For purposes of providing a conservative worst-case impact analysis, CO concentrations typically are analyzed at congested intersection locations. If impacts are less than significant close to congested intersections, impacts also would be less than significant at more distant sensitive-receptor locations.

The SCAQMD recommends a hot spot evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when vehicle to capacity (V/C) ratios are increased by 2% or more at intersections with a Level of Service (LOS) C or worse. Project traffic during the operational phase of the project would not have the potential to create local area CO impacts, as discussed in Response XV(a) under Transportation/Traffic, and the proposed project would not significantly affect peak-hour traffic volumes. Thus, local intersections would not be affected by the proposed project, and there would be no impacts resulting from CO hot spots.

With respect to the project's on-site mass emissions, Table 3-4 shows that operations-period emissions would be below SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds. Impacts from emissions of these criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

Table 3-4. Forecast of Localized Operational Emissions

	Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
Riverside Park	**ROG**	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
On-Site Area Source Emissions[a]	0.3	0.1	3.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (lbs/day)[b]	--	131	2,194	--	12	3
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[a] Emissions attributable to project-related electricity generation, calculated based on guidance provided in the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook.* Worksheets are provided in the Air Quality Appendix.

[b] These localized thresholds were taken from tables provided in the SCAQMD *Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology* guidance document based on the following: 1) The project site is located in SCAQMD Source Receptor Area No. 1, 2) sensitive receptors are located within 50 meters of the project, and 3) the maximum site are disturbed is 5 acres.

ROG = reactive organic gas.
NO_X = oxides of nitrogen.
CO = carbon monoxide.
SO_X = sulfur oxides.
PM10 = particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.
PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter.

Source: ICF Jones & Stokes. URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in Appendix A.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Global climate change is a problem caused by combined worldwide greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), and mitigating global climate change will require worldwide solutions. GHGs play a critical role in the earth's radiation budget by trapping infrared radiation emitted from the earth's surface, which otherwise could have escaped to space. Prominent GHGs contributing to this process include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO_2), nitrous oxide (N_2O), methane (CH_4), O_3, and certain hydro- and fluorocarbons. This phenomenon, known as the *greenhouse effect* keeps the earth's atmosphere near the surface warmer than it would be otherwise and allows successful habitation by humans and other forms of life. Increases in these gases lead to more absorption of radiation and warm the lower atmosphere further, thereby increasing evaporation rates and temperatures near the surface. Emissions of GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are thought to be responsible for the enhancement of the greenhouse effect leading to what is termed *global warming*, a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's natural climate. Climate change is a global problem, and GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants (such as ozone precursors) and toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are pollutants of regional and local concern.

As shown in Table 3-5 below, the relative quantity of project-related GHG emissions during short-term construction are negligible compared to statewide and worldwide daily emissions. The proposed project's amount of emissions, without considering other cumulative global emissions, would be insufficient to cause substantial climate change directly. Thus, project emissions, in isolation, are considered less than significant. However, climate change is a global cumulative impact, and thus the proper context for analysis of this issue is not a project's emissions in isolation, but rather as a contribution to cumulative GHG emissions.

Table 3-5 presents an estimate of project-related GHG emissions of CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O in the form of CO_2e (carbon dioxide equivalent). Because quantitative GHG guidelines, including thresholds, have not been developed by the SCAQMD, these emissions are provided for information purposes only.

Table 3-5. Estimate of Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions (pounds per day)

	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
California Statewide Average Daily Emissions (year 2004)	**2,972,314,499**
Project Emissions	
Maximum Construction-Period Emissions	**3,168**
Operations-period Emissions	
Mobile Sources	791
Stationary Sources	3,825
Area Sources	26
Total Operations-Period Emissions	**4,642**
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	NA
Exceed Threshold?	**NA**

Source: ICF Jones & Stokes 2008. URBEMIS 2007 outputs are provided in Appendix A.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. SCAQMD's approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on the AQMP forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards in accordance with the requirements of the Federal and State Clean Air Acts. As discussed earlier in Response IIIa, the proposed project would be consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants.[2] In addition, the mass regional emissions calculated for the proposed project (Forecast of Regional Construction Emissions and Forecast of Regional Operational Emissions) are less than the applicable SCAQMD daily significance thresholds that are designed to assist the region in attaining the applicable state and national ambient air quality standards. As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

With regard to climate change and GHG emissions, the amounts of GHG emissions that would result from development and operations of the proposed project are negligible. The proposed project's amount of emissions, without considering other cumulative global emissions, would be insufficient to cause climate change. The proposed project would be consistent with the state's goals of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. As such, the proposed project's contribution to climate change/worldwide GHG emissions would be less than significant.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. As described in Response IIIb above, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any substantial localized or regional air pollution impacts and therefore would not expose any nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e. Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors and therefore would not produce objectionable odors.

[2] CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3) states "A lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem (e.g. water quality control plan, air quality plan, integrated waste management plan) within the geographic area in which the project is located. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources through a public review process to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the public agency."

Potential sources of odors during construction activities include asphalt paving and the use of architectural coatings and solvents. SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1113 limit the amount of volatile organic compounds from cutback asphalt and architectural coatings and solvents, respectively. Through mandatory compliance with SCAQMD rules, no construction activities or materials are proposed that would create a significant level of objectionable odors. As such, potential impacts during short-term construction would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

ICF Jones and Stokes biologists James Hickman and Mikael Romich conducted a habitat assessment of the project site on October 14, 2008. In addition, a California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (2008) query was completed for the project site and within a 5-mile radius. All species identified in the CNDDB were evaluated during the habitat assessment and are included as Appendix B (Species Table).

A plant community map is presented as Appendix C. The project site was dominated by chaparral and coast live oak/walnut woodland plant communities on the steep slopes. Some of the slopes have been subject to vegetation management (mowed), presumably for fire prevention. In these areas, the understory vegetation is extremely sparse. In addition, some of the slopes are heavily infested with a nonnative invasive plant species—blackwood acacia (*Acacia melanoxylon*). This species is considered a noxious weed by the California Department of Food and Agriculture.

The flatter portions of the project site were dominated by a nonnative grassland and ruderal vegetation that has been subject to past disturbances, such as disking and mowing. One small patch of southern willow scrub, dominated by arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), occurs at the base of one of the slopes. One small patch of mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) scrub occurs in a small depression.

a. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The impact area for the upper park currently is very short ruderal vegetation and bare ground. Several plant species were observed, including horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*) and telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), that are common to disturbed areas. Tree species included Peruvian pepper (*Schinus molle*) and gum (*Eucalyptus* species). This habitat would not support any special-status plant or animal species (see Appendix B), and no significant direct impacts would occur as a result of its removal.

The middle and lower park areas were dominated by nonnative grassland and ruderal vegetation. Dominant plant species included black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), slender oat (*Avena barbata*), and false jimson weed (*Datura wrightii*). Other species observed included castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) and tree-of-heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*). This habitat would not support special-status plant and animal species (see Appendix B) and no direct impacts would occur as a result of its removal.

The slopes present on the project site have a moderate potential to support one special-status plant species, Plummer's mariposa lily, and two special-status wildlife species, hoary bat and western yellow bat. In addition, Cooper's hawk was observed during the habitat assessment and could nest on the project site. A minimal amount of chaparral habitat may be removed, and if Plummer's mariposa lily is present, it would not be removed in substantial numbers. As such, the project is expected to have less-than-significant impacts on Plummer's mariposa lily.

A minimal amount of southern walnut woodland and coast live oak woodland may be removed for the project, and potential direct impacts on both bat species would be less than significant, as they could relocate to other portions of the project site where the oaks and walnut woodland would be preserved. Direct impacts on nesting Cooper's hawk, and other bird species, could be potentially significant under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is provided to minimize the potential for direct impacts on Cooper's hawk and other nesting birds.

Potential indirect impacts on hoary bat, western yellow bat, and Copper's hawk, as well as more common wildlife, could occur during park construction (short term) and park use (long term). The short-term impacts could include movement, noise, dust, and other associated effects that occur with construction vehicles and personnel. Potential short-term indirect impacts on hoary bat and western yellow bat are considered less than significant as they are a mobile species and temporarily could move away from construction activities if necessary. In addition, they are not federally or state-listed and are not considered a sensitive species by California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Indirect impacts on Cooper's hawk and other bird species could be potentially significant under the

Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is provided to minimize the potential for indirect impacts on Cooper's hawk and other nesting birds.

The long-term indirect impacts could include noise from active recreational activities. Because of the current existing noise regime from the nearby roadways and freeways, operation of the proposed project is expected to add a less-than-significant amount to the total noise and is considered less than significant. Because the proposed project would operate only from dawn to dusk and does not incorporate any nighttime lighting, indirect impacts of night lighting on biological resources would not occur.

Mitigation Measure

MM BIO-1. The Department will not schedule clearing and grubbing during the avian nesting season (approximately February 1–August 31) to ensure project conformance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. If clearing and grubbing occur between February 1 and August 31, a preconstruction survey for nesting birds will be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 7 days prior to the start of construction.

If nesting birds occur within the disturbance limits, a buffer around the nest will be determined by a qualified biologist. All construction activities will occur outside the buffer area until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is complete and that no new nesting activity has occurred within the buffer area.

Any potential direct impacts on nesting birds would be mitigated to a level below significance with incorporation of the above mitigation measure.

b. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site supports several plant communities that are considered rare by the CDFG. These include California walnut woodland and coast live oak woodland (5.87 acres total) and southern willow scrub (0.16 acre total). See Appendix C for identification of plant communities on-site and impacts on vegetation. Direct impacts on California walnut woodland and coast live oak woodland may include removal of approximately 0.82 acre, which is considered a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2 through BIO-4 would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Any project in the city of Los Angeles that requires the removal of protected trees or affects protected trees in a manner that may cause protected tree death or failure requires submission of a Protected Tree Report. All removals of protected trees require the approval of the Board of Public Works and a protected tree removal permit issued by the Urban Forestry Division (UFD). The proposed project may also affect approximately 0.02 acre of southern willow scrub. These impacts may be avoided by carefully delineating the limits of disturbance in the area of the southern willow scrub patch to avoid removing it. However, in the event this habitat cannot be avoided, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would be required.

There are potential long-term indirect impacts that could affect the long-term persistence of oak and walnut woodlands, most notably the potential impacts of irrigation of the turf and the release of exotic plant species from ornamental landscaping. Native California oaks and walnuts have evolved in a Mediterranean-type climate where there is little rainfall between late spring and early autumn. As such, they generally do not require irrigation during this dry period and, in fact, trees may be adversely affected by supplemental watering during this period because warm, moist conditions can favor harmful diseases. However, the proposed project would incorporate a "Smart Irrigation Controller smart irrigation controller," which uses weather-based satellite data to incorporate

sufficient watering times in order to reduce use of excess amounts of water on turf. The smart irrigation system would allow appropriate watering of only turf and reduce any potential impacts on native California oaks and walnuts. Furthermore, the bioswales incorporated into the proposed project would assist with the collection and containment of any irrigation runoff. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would minimize the introduction of invasive plant species.

A large portion of the woodland understory appears to be heavily managed (cleared), presumably for fire prevention. This can affect the overall health of these sensitive plant communities. If development of the park would increase the need for fire prevention and vegetation management, this would also be considered a potential adverse indirect impact. If fire management would decrease as a result of the Park, this could be considered beneficial for the sensitive plant communities. Another current threat to the sensitive plant communities is the extent of infestation of Acacia that was noted during the habitat assessment. The development of the Park could facilitate the spread of Acacia by introducing additional irrigated water and newly disturbed soil. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would compensate for the potential introduction or enhancement of the spread of invasive plant species. It would also act to compensate for increased vegetation management for fire, if required.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-2. Plant species to be used for the project's landscaping will not include invasive species pursuant to the California Invasive Plant Council. These species would include all plants that have a limited, moderate, or high potential for negative ecological impact in California.

MM BIO-3. An invasive species management plan will be developed for Acacia, which is the species of greatest threat to the natural plant communities that occur on the project site slopes. The management plan will include documenting the extent of Acacia on the project site, researching the best methods of eradicating it, and developing a plan to implement eradication methods without disturbing other sensitive habitats. The plan will also include follow-up monitoring in areas where Acacia has been removed to determine whether eradication is successful and to document what plant species are colonizing areas where *Acacia* previously occurred. The invasive species management plan will continue until *Acacia* is eradicated from the project site.

MM BIO-4. Prior to construction, the Department will prepare or have prepared a Protected Tree Report to address the treatment of any protected trees proposed to be removed as part of the project. The tree report will include an evaluation of the size and overall health of the tree and determine whether it can be relocated, or if replacement will be required. The tree report will be submitted to the UFD, which will issue a tree removal permit should the Board of Public Works approve the removal. No trees will be removed prior to approval and determination of protection and/or replacement requirements.

The Department also will consult the UFD prior to grading within 5 feet of an oak or walnut tree dripline (the root protection zone) to identify protection measures to avoid or minimize impacts on oak trees. If oak and walnut trees are to be removed, on-site replacement will be required. Any recommendations by UFD after the consultation also will be implemented.

MM BIO-5. The grading plan will be modified to avoid the southern willow scrub patch. Should this patch not be avoidable, the Department will compensate for the loss of this habitat by restoring the habitat in like kind at a 3:1 ratio on-site. Follow-up monitoring will occur to determine whether restoration efforts are successful.

Any potential direct impacts on the rare plant communities on-site would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with incorporation of the above mitigation measures.

c. No Impact. The project site does not have any federal wetlands present. Furthermore, the project site is completely lacking any jurisdictional waters.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is connected to other undeveloped lands in Elysian Park, but outside of that area occurs as an isolated fragment surrounded by urban development. Therefore, the project site would not be considered to be a part of a regional wildlife corridor that would facilitate movement of wildlife species from one area to another. It does support daily movement of some species from breeding, roosting, and nesting sites and provides some stopover habitat for migratory bird species.

e. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project may potentially result in the removal of oak and walnut trees that are protected by Los Angeles Municipal Code. The ordinance covers oak and walnut trees 4 inches or more in diameter at 4.5 feet above ground (DBH). In addition, construction may occur within the drip line of several oak and walnut trees. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4 as described above would mitigate potential impacts on oaks to less-than-significant levels.

f. No Impact. The site is not part of any habitat conservation plan or Natural Communities Conservation Plan area.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a. Less-than-Significant Impact. A qualified archaeologist conducted a literature search at the South Central Coastal Information Center, located at California State University, Fullerton, and a field survey (Appendix D). The records search included a review of all available cultural resource survey and excavation reports and site records for an area within a ½-mile radius of the project site (the project area for cultural resources). The results of this literature and records search indicate that one previous archaeological study has been conducted within the project area, by White and Van Horn in 1989. This 1989 survey described the project area as "…subjected to cut and fill earth moving operations at some time in the past." (White and Van Horn 1989). In addition, five surveys had been conducted previously. No cultural resources have been recorded. A Phase-1 cultural resources survey of the proposed project site was conducted on October 14, 2008. No visible historic structures are located on-site. No new prehistoric or historic archaeological resources were identified during the field survey. Furthermore, the project site has been disturbed by extensive grading and filling and essentially is an undeveloped vacant property. Given the extent of the ground disturbance and the results of the literature and records search, the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on historical resources, and impacts are considered less than significant.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. As described above, the literature and records search identified no archeological resources within the project site or within ½-mile of the project site. Additionally, the field survey did not identify any archaeological resources. With regard to contemporary Native American concerns, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on October 27, 2008, and requested that they consult their sacred lands files. The NAHC responded, stating that a search of their sacred lands database did not yield any sacred lands or traditional cultural properties within the boundaries of the project site . The NAHC provided a list of five Native American contacts in Los Angeles County. Letters describing the project site and indicating the project location were sent to these Native American representatives on October 28, 2008. Two responses were

received. The Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation responded by e-mail on 28 October 2008, indicating concern about sites in the project area. Further inquiries did not elicit specific information about cultural resources, but a concern about excavations associated with park construction. The Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians responded by telephone on 7 November 2008. Mr. Anthony Morales, representing the Band, stated that the area, along with Griffith Park and Elysian Park, was an area of concern. He did not provide any further details. ICF Jones & Stokes archaeologist stated that since the area had been graded, no cultural resources monitoring was recommended. Mr. Morales indicated that since the park site had been graded, this was also OK with his group. Therefore, given the extent of the ground disturbance, the results of the literature and records search, and the results of the Native American Consultation, the proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on archeological resources, and impacts are considered less than significant.

c. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is located in the Elysian Hills on the southeastern flank of the Santa Monica Mountains near the historic Los Angeles River Channel. It is located in the northern limb of the Elysian Park Anticline with bedrock in the area striking approximately east-west. The site is underlain by bedrock of the Puente/Monterey formation. This formation consists of Miocene-age sedimentary bedrock of marine origin (City of Los Angeles 2008a).

The field survey of the project site determined that at some point in the past, sediments, presumably derived from the construction of Riverside Drive and adjacent leveled lots, were deposited in a steep-sided gulch. These spoils were leveled to form the larger, lower flat surface within the project site adjacent to Riverside Drive. The sides of the gulch were graded and contoured, and cement-lined drainage channels were installed to protect the slopes and lower areas from erosion. A second, smaller flat area was formed during this process, also adjacent to Riverside Drive, to contain part of the drainage structure.

The geology and history of the project site leads to the possibility that buried paleontological resources may exist site that do not possess surface indicators, despite previous ground disturbance at the project site. Although it is remote, the possibility exists that paleontological resources could be unearthed during project excavation activities. It would be a potentially significant impact should paleontological resources be unearthed during construction of the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 below would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure

> **MM CR-1.** If paleontological materials (e.g., fossils, bone, shell) are discovered below surface during the construction of the project, work will be halted. A qualified paleontologist will be contacted to determine the significance of the find prior to any construction work resuming and measures to mitigate potential impacts on fossil resources.

d. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The literature and records search did not identify known cemeteries in the project area or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the likelihood of burials occurring on the project site is considered extremely low, based on results of the cultural resources assessment. Although disturbance of human remains, including those of Native Americans, is unlikely, it is possible that construction activity could unearth human remains. This would be considered a potentially significant impact should Native American human remains be disturbed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2, identified below, would ensure that human remains are treated with dignity and as specified by law and would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measures

MM CR-2. As specified by State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are found in the project area during archaeological work or during construction, no further disturbance will occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. If such a discovery occurs, excavation or construction will halt in the area of the discovery, the area will be protected, and consultation and treatment will occur as prescribed by law. A temporary construction exclusion zone will be established surrounding the site to allow further examination and treatment of the find. The Lead Archaeological Monitor or City representative will immediately notify the Los Angeles County Coroner's office by telephone. By law, the Coroner will determine within 2 working days of being notified whether the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she will contact the NAHC, who will appoint the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Additionally, if the bones are determined to be Native American, a plan will be developed regarding the treatment of human remains and associated burial objects, and the plan will be implemented under the direction of the MLD.

If Native American human remains are discovered during project construction, it will be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials that are under the jurisdiction of the NAHC (Pub. Res. Code Section 5097). For remains of Native American origin, code 5097.98 states that no further excavation or disturbance will take place until:

The MLD of the deceased Native American(s) has made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work regarding means of treating or disposing of the human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as provided in the Pub. Res. Code Section 5097.98; or the NAHC is unable to identify an MLD or the descendent fails to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the Commission. In consultation with the MLD, the project archaeologist and the City representative will determine a course of action regarding preservation or excavation of Native American human remains, and this recommendation will be implemented expeditiously. If an MLD cannot be located or does not make a recommendation, the project archaeologist and the City representative will determine a course of action regarding preservation or excavation of Native American human remains, which will be submitted to the NAHC for review prior to implementation.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	1. 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐
	3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐
	4. 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 an on-site 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 wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a1. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving surface rupture. Ground surface rupturing along fault lines is an important seismic consideration for properties in southern California. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting by preventing the construction of buildings used for human occupancy over an area with known faults. The site is not

located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone Area (City of Los Angeles 2008a). Thus, the potential for ground surface rupture affecting the site is considered low, and impacts would be less than significant.

a2. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project potentially would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving seismic ground shaking. Based on the current understanding of the geologic framework of the area, the seismic hazards that are expected to have the highest probability of affecting the site are ground shaking and landslides resulting from an earthquake occurring along any of several major active and potentially active faults in southern California. Therefore, when the project site is occupied, it could expose people and/or structures to potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking. The ground motion characteristics of any future earthquakes in the region would depend on the characteristics of the generating fault, the distance from the epicenter, the magnitude of the earthquake, and the site-specific geologic conditions (City of Los Angeles 1996). Major faults in the region could be a source of a strong seismic-related movement at the project site. Known regional faults that could produce significant ground shaking at the site include the Upper Elysian Park Blind Thrust, Puente Hills Blind Thrust, Hollywood, Raymond, and Verdugo faults, among others. The closest of these are the Upper Elysian Park Blind Thrust, Puente Hills Blind Thrust, and Hollywood faults with potential rupture areas located at distances of less than 1.5 miles from the site (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

Phase I of the proposed project would not include any structures that would be habitable by people. Although strong ground shaking at the project site is possible, as the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Zone and no structures will be present, it is expected that any ground shaking would not create an adverse risk to persons using any of the park amenities or services (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

However, Phase II of the proposed project would include the development of the 2,500 square-foot community building on the lower portion of the site and a trail system throughout the site. To ensure that no adverse impacts from ground shaking would occur to any persons using the community building or cause damage to the trail system, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 below would be implemented. Furthermore, the community building will be built to meet all current building codes and standards for seismic hazards. Thus, any impact from ground shaking would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

> **MM GEO-1:** Prior to plan approval for Phase II (community building and trail system), geotechnical studies will be performed to include further investigation of soil stability, liquefaction potential, landslide potential, and seismic hazards. These geotechnical studies will provide design measures and requirements where needed to minimize hazards for the community building and trail system. The approved final plans for the community building and trail system will incorporate specifically the conclusions and recommendations contained within the geotechnical studies, and any design measures, requirements, and specifications identified by the geotechnical studies to reduce any risk associated with soil instability, liquefaction, landslides, and seismic events. The community building and trail system will be built to incorporate all design measures, requirements, and specifications identified by the geotechnical studies.

a3. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project potentially would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving liquefaction. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which a saturated, non-cohesive soil causes a temporary transformation of the soil to a fluid mass, resulting in a loss of structural support. Liquefaction typically occurs when near-surface (usually upper 50 feet), saturated, clean, fine-grained loose sands are subject to intense ground shaking (City

of Los Angeles 2008b). The ground surface for much of the project site is soft and loose; as such, potential for liquefaction is present (City of Los Angeles 2008b). The northeastern portion of the site is shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones map as being within an area that has potential for liquefaction (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

Phase I of the proposed project would not include any habitable structures. Additionally, liquefaction prevention measures have been implemented at the site. The east-facing slope on the western side of the property has been terraced with horizontal concrete swales spaced at regular intervals on the slopes. Furthermore, there are two to four terrace drains on the slopes adjacent to the site with one major down drain. With these existing drainage improvements in place at the site, and the lack of built structures in Phase I of project development, it is not expected that there would be any adverse impacts from liquefaction.

However, Phase II of the proposed project would include the development of the 2,500 square-foot community building on the lower portion of the project site. The liquefaction zone includes only the northeastern edge of the project site along Riverside Drive (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Therefore, implementation of **MM GEO-1** identified above would reduce any impact from liquefaction to a level less than significant.

a4. Less-than-significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project potentially would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving landslides. The project site extends westward from Riverside Drive across gently sloping terrain and includes a steep graded slope on the west side of the project site (City of Los Angeles 2008b). The area currently is unimproved, with a rough graded access road from Riverside Drive into the central portion of the lower level of the site (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Subsequent to the existing grading, the site was terraced and concrete-lined drainage benches and swales were constructed (City of Los Angeles 2008c). The majority of the lower level and upper level of the site has a slope of approximately 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) or 1:1 (h:v). However, there currently exists a slope of approximately 3:1 (h:v) that parallels Riverside Drive (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Some portions of this slope are locally steeper (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

The ground surface for much of the project site is soft and loose with evidence of extensive near-surface animal burrows and recent topsoil tilling (City of Los Angeles 2008b). There are likely large quantities of fill that were placed within the limits of the proposed improvements and on the adjacent slopes (City of Los Angeles 2008b). These fill materials are relatively dense where tested; however, as there is no record of previous grading or compaction activities, the fill is considered uncertified (City of Los Angeles 2008b). All proposed engineered fill slopes within the project limits are 2:1 (h:v) or flatter (City of Los Angeles 2008c). Fill materials found on-site consist of moist and dense silty, clayey fine sand and are similar in composition native soils found at the site.

The project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone (City of Los Angeles 2008a). However, in the area surrounding the project site, the hills to the south and west are included in landslide areas designated by the State of California Seismic Hazard Mapping Program (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Surficial failures have been observed on the slopes to the south and northwest outside the limits of the project site (City of Los Angeles 2008b). All of the failures have occurred laterally 100 feet or more away from the project site and appear to involve the upper few feet of the surficial soils (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Surficial failures also were observed on the steep east-facing slope on the west side of the project site (City of Los Angeles 2008b). The upper slopes of the project site are considered surficially unstable and potentially grossly unstable. However, there does not appear to be any recorded evidence or site geology evidence of a deep-seated slope failure near the proposed site

improvements (i.e. multipurpose game and sports courts, outdoor classroom, picnic and play areas), probably because the slopes were graded more than 40 years ago (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Additionally, review of the slope geometry and nature of the bedrock indicates that the rate of potential gross failure of the slopes would be relatively slow, and any failure would occur on the order of days or weeks (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

Although Phase I of the proposed project would not include any habitable structures, it would include the development of multipurpose sports fields and courts. Surficial failures on the western slopes have been observed previously, and any future surficial failures along these slopes may affect the proposed Phase I elements. Any slope failures are likely to involve surficial soil movement with low danger to life or health but may require the removal of soil materials from the multipurpose sport field (City of Los Angeles 2008b). The geology of the unstable upper slopes above Phase I would result in a relatively slow-moving gross failure, should one occur during project operation (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Therefore, the failure would be on the order of days or weeks, giving ample time for park closure and site assessment (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

Furthermore, in efforts to reduce the risk of surficial soil movement impacts on park patrons using Phase I improvements, maintenance provisions during construction and operation have been included as part of the proposed project. These provisions include: maintenance of the concrete drainage swales and vegetation on the steep slopes in the western portion of the site; allowance of sufficient nonstructural area (including play fields) placed near the base of these slopes to allow for the spread and settling of mud and earth flows; and the inclusion of a 2-foot-high earth berm placed around the spreading area to help contain the potential debris flows. Additionally, a geotechnical monitor will be on-site during construction to supervise earthwork and construction of foundations. The geotechnical monitor will be available to provide supplemental recommendations if needed during construction, and also will review the preliminary foundation and earthwork plans and specifications. Therefore, the proposed site grades under Phase I would be stable against potential slope failure and/or landslides (City of Los Angeles 2008b).

Phase II of the proposed project would involve the development of the community building on the lower portion of the project site and a trail system throughout the park. To ensure that no adverse impacts from landslide would occur on any persons using the community building, Mitigation Measure **GEO-1** above will be implemented. With this mitigation measure in place, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on slope failures.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. The site does not contain substantial amounts of topsoil. The project is located on an 18-acre vacant site that is characterized by some trees and unimproved vacant land. Small amounts of exposed on-site soils would be prone to soil erosion during the construction phase of the proposed project. However, the project would implement standard erosion control measures and construction BMPs as required by the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) that would minimize potential impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site extends westward from Riverside Drive across gently sloping terrain and has a steep graded slope on the west side (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Large quantities of fill materials are currently on-site, and all proposed engineered fill slopes within the project limits are 2:1 (h:v) or flatter (City of Los Angeles 2008c). Fill materials found on-site consist of moist and dense silty, clayey fine sand similar in composition to native soils found at the site. As discussed in Section a3 above, the northeastern portion of the site is an area with potential for liquefaction. Furthermore, as discussed in a4 above, surficial failures

have been observed on the slopes around the project site and along the east-facing slope on the west side of the property.

As concluded in Sections a3 and a4 above, liquefaction and landslides would not affect Phase I of the proposed project. Furthermore, the slope stability analysis of the geological report concluded that the proposed site grades would be stable against potential surrounding slope failure (City of Los Angeles 2008b). Over-excavation is not required for cut slopes or fill slopes with both a final grade flatter than 3:1 (h:v) and less than 24 inches of fill placement. However, these fill slopes would be cleared of vegetation and loose topsoil. To provide long-term protection to on-site slopes, the slopes would be landscaped, and site drainage would be directed away from slopes to the nearby storm drainage system. As such, construction and operation of Phase I of the proposed project would not increase the potential for on-site or off-site landslides; lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse to occur.

As concluded in Sections a3 and a4 above, Phase II of the proposed project could be subject to liquefaction and landslides. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will be implemented to reduce the impact associated with liquefaction, landslides, and other unstable geology. With this mitigation measures in place, the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. Expansive soil generally consists of certain clay materials that occur naturally and generally is found in areas that historically were floodplain or lake areas. Expansive soil is subject to shrinking and swelling; the amount of shrink and swell varies in proportion to the amount of moisture present in the soil. These types of soil characteristics can pose a threat to overlying structures. According to the 2008 ZIMAS Parcel Profile Report, the project site is not located within a flood zone (City of Los Angeles 2008a). Additionally, the project site is underlain by bedrock of the Puente/Monterey formations (City of Los Angeles 2008b). This type of bedrock is unlikely to have expansive soils present. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would be underlain by soils characterized by fine-grained clay associated within floodplains and lake areas, and impacts from expansive soils would be less than significant.

e. No Impact. The project would tie into existing sewers, avoiding the need to use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	**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 involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Be located on a site that 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.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. No Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not create any significant hazards to the public through the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous substances. The project involves development of an 18-acre park for community use. Typically, park uses do not generate, store, dispose of, or transport quantities of hazardous substances. Recreational activities associated with the proposed project would not expose park users or the surrounding communities to any health hazards. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. Operation of the project as a recreational resource would not result in the reasonably foreseeable upset or release of any hazardous materials. Construction equipment that would be used to build the proposed project has the potential to release oils, greases, solvents, and other finishing materials through accidental spills. Spill or upset of these materials would have the potential to affect surrounding land uses, but federal, state, and local controls have been enacted to reduce the effects of potential hazardous materials spills. The Los Angeles Fire Department enforces city, state, and federal hazardous materials regulations for Los Angeles. City regulations include spill mitigation and containment and securing of hazardous materials containers to prevent spills. Compliance with these requirements is mandatory as standard permitting conditions and would minimize the potential for the accidental release or upset of hazardous materials, helping to ensure public safety. The operation of parks and associated structures, such as the community building, generally are not associated with the use or storage of large amounts of hazardous substances, and the proposed project would not use or store large amounts of hazardous substances. Therefore, an upset of those types of materials would not be reasonably foreseeable. The construction and operation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to the creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project is located within 0.41 mile of Ivanhoe Elementary School, which is located south of the project site. However, the proposed project is a park and during construction and operation would not use, emit, or handle acutely hazardous materials. The proposed project would require the use of some materials such as oils, greases, and fuels for the generation and maintenance of equipment during construction. Additionally, the operation of the new park may require some solvents, cleaners, and fertilizers to maintain landscaping. However, none of the materials would be used in quantities that would pose a threat to human health and safety and all would be used and stored in accordance with regulations of the Los Angeles Fire Department. Furthermore, none of these materials would be considered acutely hazardous. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. A Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I and Land Use Report (Phase I) for the project site was done in 1998. The Phase I report evaluated various environmental databases, involved a site visit, and a review of historical documents pertaining to the site. The Phase I report concluded that there is no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the project site and recommended no further site assessment research or subsurface exploration. The Phase I report did identify several off-site locations that are listed in environmental databases, including the National Priorities List and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank list but concluded that the distance from the project site to those off-site locations precluded any impacts on soil or groundwater beneath the project site. (California Environmental 1998.)

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) conducted a search of available environmental records for the project site and surrounding areas in October 2008 to update any of the original Phase I findings (See Appendix E for EDR Executive Summary). EDR searched a variety of federal and state databases and other public sources of information for available environmental documentation and

evidence relating to hazardous materials, facilities, sites, and generators. EDR database searches include but are not limited to the following databases: the California Department of Transportation, National Priority List, the Leaking Underground Storage Tank List, RCRA—Large and Small Quantity Generators, and Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Findings. Additionally, tribal-related environmental documents were searched, such as the Indian Reservations, and Underground Storage Tanks Located on Indian Land (Environmental Database Resources, Inc (EDR) 2008).

The search for hazardous facilities was conducted for the project site and within a 1.5-mile radius of the project site. EDR determined the project site has not been listed in any of the hazardous databases or reports (EDR 2008).

There are sites listed in various environmental databases within general proximity of the project site EDR 2008). Many of these sites are the same sites identified in several different databases. For example, 11 sites were identified by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA under Superfund)—Small Quantity Generator database for generating small quantities of defined hazardous materials. One site (San Fernando Valley Area 4) was identified on the National Priority List and CERCLA list as a superfund site (EDR 2008). Nine sites were located on the Leaking Underground Storage Tank List (EDR 2008). Generally, these are the same sites identified in the 1998 Phase I document. These sites are located to the east of Interstate 5 and are the same distances identified in the 1998 Phase I document for the project site. Furthermore, there is no significant risk of groundwater contamination or other contaminated media from these sites as they are currently identified in environmental databases and are regulated by the existing hazardous materials storage, remediation, and recovery laws (Superfund). Finally, the project site was not listed in any of the environmental databases; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. **No Impact.** The nearest airport is Bob Hope Burbank Airport, located approximately 9 miles northwest of the project site. As this is considered an ample distance from the site, it is not expected that any impacts on the airport would occur by construction or operation of the project. Additionally The Los Angeles Department of City Planning Parcel Profile Report states that the project site is not located within an Airport Hazard Zone (City of Los Angeles 2008a). Therefore, there would be no impacts from local airports.

f. **No Impact**. As discussed above, the Bob Hope Burbank Airport, located in the city of Burbank, is located approximately 9 miles northwest of the project site. The project would not be affected by noise created by the airport, and it would not be affected by any safety restrictions. The project would not affect the safe operation of the airport. No impacts would occur.

g. **No Impact**. The proposed project would not impair or physically affect any adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The proposed project would not require the closure of any public or private streets or roadways and would not impede access of emergency vehicles to the project or any surrounding areas. Further, the project would provide all required emergency access in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department. Therefore, no impacts on emergency response would occur.

h. **Less-than-Significant**. The Los Angeles Department of City Planning Parcel Profile Report states that the project site is located within an area that is designated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City of Los Angeles 2008a). However, standard park maintenance includes provisions for brush clearing and irrigation methods to ensure that the susceptibility of the site to wildland fires would be kept at a minimal risk. With these maintenance provisions in place, the impact from wildland fires on people and structures would be considered less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	**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, resulting in 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 that 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site 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 that would result in flooding on site or off site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 that 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.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would be required to obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board in compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and implement associated project-specific SUSMP requirements that would detail best management practices (BMPs) during construction activities and post-construction operational activities. BMPs would be incorporated into the proposed project as part of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to prevent discharges of polluted stormwater from construction sites from entering the storm drains. Measures in the SWPPP would include those listed below.

- Equipment will be inspected regularly (daily) during construction, and any leaks found will be repaired immediately.
- Refueling of vehicles and equipment will be in a designated, contained area.
- Drip pans that are in use will be covered during rainfall to prevent washout of pollutants.
- Monitoring will verify that BMPs are implemented and all equipment/controls are kept in good working order.
- Sediment barriers, sedimentation basins, and site contouring will be used to minimize runoff of sediments.

Post-construction operations of the proposed project would include compliance with the SUSMP by the inclusion of vegetated bioswales that would reduce drainage flow rates and pollutant concentration impacts from stormwater and irrigation runoff. The bioswales would be designed to improve water quality and runoff impacts above existing conditions and to hold site runoff from typical storms. Therefore, standard storm water design measures would reduce water quality impacts to level less than significant.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) would provide water for the proposed project. DWP's water supply comes from local groundwater, reclaimed water, Owens Valley, the Colorado River, and the California Aqueduct, which conducts water southward from sources in northern California. Local groundwater, primarily from wells in the San Fernando Valley, provides approximately 15% of the total supply (City of Los Angeles 1998b). The demand for water created by the proposed project would be extremely negligible in comparison to the city's total water consumption and therefore would not contribute to the depletion of DWP groundwater supplies. Additionally, the proposed project incorporates the use of a "smart irrigation controller." This system uses weather-based satellite data to incorporate sufficient watering times and effectively reduces excess use of water for the turf on the multipurpose playing field (see discussion below under Section XVI(d)for approximate potable water demand). Furthermore, because of the minimal amount of impervious surfaces planned at the site—approximately 0.6 acre—the proposed project is not expected to have any significant impacts on groundwater recharge capabilities. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on groundwater supplies and recharge capacity.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not directly affect the flow of a river or stream. The project would include some minor grading to enable construction of the project. These activities would minimally alter the existing drainage pattern of the site by creating approximately 0.6 acre of impervious surfaces. The majority of post-construction runoff from the site would be

absorbed into the bioswales and other vegetated areas, with the remainder draining off-site into the storm water drainage system. Therefore, impacts from erosion, either on-site or off-site would be less than significant.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not directly affect the flow course of a river or stream. However, the project is located at the base of an east-facing steep slope; the runoff from the slope could affect the geological conditions at the site, increasing potential slope failure. The project would include BMPs required by the SUSMP. The measures of compliance that would be incorporated to reduce impacts from runoff include the placement of bioswales near the outdoor classroom area and along Riverside Drive at the lower level. The inclusion of the bioswales into the project design allows for catchment of runoff from the steep slope, filtration of the runoff, and delay and reduction of flow into the two storm drains located along Riverside Drive. As such, the project is expected to result in a small increase in runoff from the site, which would be detained in the bioswales on-site prior to discharge into the storm drainage system. Additionally, approximately 0.6 acre of the site would be impervious surfaces; therefore, the site's remaining 17.4 acres of pervious surfaces, along with the surrounding vegetated hillside areas, would absorb water from rain events. In accordance with the SUSMP, the project would be designed to minimize the effects on the existing drainage pattern of the site. Therefore, increased runoff would not be considered substantial and would not have the capacity to induce flooding or exceed the capacity of existing storm systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, the project would include BMPs required by the SUSMP and would comply with NPDES requirements. The proposed BMPs that would be incorporated to reduce impact on storm drains would include the placement of bioswales near the outdoor classroom area and along Riverside Drive at the lower level. Therefore, increased runoff would not exceed the capacity of existing storm drain systems. Furthermore, the project would be recreational in nature and would not contain any uses that would result in significant polluted runoff. Any potential contamination from chemicals used to maintain landscaped areas would be minimal in nature and would not result in significant amounts of polluted storm water runoff. Impacts to storm water, therefore, would be less than significant.

f. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality. The project includes elements for passive and active recreational uses and is not expected to use large amounts of water, other than for landscaping and restroom facilities. The amount of landscape to be irrigated on-site is less than 2.5 acres and would have negligible impacts on water quality. Additionally, as part of the project, the development would incorporate bioswales that would comply with SUSMP to ensure impacts on water quality would be minimal. Therefore, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

g. No Impact. The project site is not identified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan as an area within a 100- or 500-year floodplain (City of Los Angeles, Safety Element, Exhibit F, 1996). Impacts would not occur.

h. No Impact. The project site is not identified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan as an area within a 100- or 500-year floodplain (City of Los Angeles 1996). Impacts would not occur.

i. No Impact. The project site is not identified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan as an area within a flood control basin or a potential inundation area (City of Los Angeles 1996). Impacts would not occur.

j. No Impact. The project site is not identified in the City of Los Angeles General Plan as an area potentially affected by a tsunami (City of Los Angeles 1996). Impacts would not occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	**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, a 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. No Impact. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed project would be located in a vacant area that is designated Open Space by the General Plan. The surrounding land uses consist of low-density residential on the hillside above the project site and commercial/manufacturing northwest of the site along Riverside Drive. The project is expected to serve the local community and would represent a beneficial recreational resource that will unite the community rather than divide it. No impacts would occur.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is in an area that is designated by the Silver Lake–Echo Park–Elysian Valley Community Plan (City of Los Angeles 2004), which is part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, as Open Space. The site is zoned OS-1XL (Open Space) by the City of Los Angles Zoning Ordinance (City of Los Angeles 2008a).

The General Plan clarifies and articulates the City's intentions with respect to the rights and expectations of the public, property owners, prospective investors, and business interests. Implementation of the General Plan would serve to protect and preserve natural resources and natural features of the environment; to provide outdoor recreation opportunities and advance the public health and welfare; to enhance environmental quality; to encourage the management of public lands in a manner that protects environmental characteristics; and to encourage the maintenance of open space uses on all publicly owned park and recreation land, and open space public land that is essentially unimproved.

Through the Community Plan, the City informs these groups of its goals, policies, and development standards. The goals, objectives, policies, and programs are created to meet the existing and future needs and desires of the Silver Lake–Echo Park–Elysian Valley Community through the year 2010. The Open Space land use designation is broadly defined by the Community Plan as land that is essentially free of structures and buildings and/or is natural in character and functions in one or more of the following ways:

- recreational and educational opportunities;
- scenic, cultural, and historic values;
- public health and safety;
- preservation and creation of community identity;
- rights-of-way for utilities and transportation facilities;
- preservation of natural resources or ecologically important areas; or
- preservation of physical resources, including ridge protection.

Furthermore, the Community Plan identifies several goals and policies in association with the Open Space land use designations that are relevant to the proposed project. These include:

Goal 5: A community with sufficient open space in balance with new development to serve the recreational, environmental, and health needs of the community.

Objective 5-1: Preserve existing and develop new open space resources.

Objective 5-2: Provide/insure access to new recreational resources and open space developed throughout the Plan area, including trails and facilities along the Los Angeles River, and new parks.

The Municipal Code defines the purpose of the Open Space Zone (OS) as regulating:

> publicly owned land in order to implement the City's adopted General Plan, including the recreation, parks and open space designations in the City's adopted district and community plans, and other relevant elements, including the Open Space, Conservation and Public Recreation Elements. [3]

On land in an OS Zone, no building, structure, or land will be used and no building or structure will be erected except for the following uses:

- parks and recreational facilities, including bicycle trails, equestrian trails, walking trails, nature trails, park land/lawn areas, children's play areas, child care facilities, picnic facilities, and athletic fields (not to exceed 200 seats in park) used for park and recreation purposes. [4]

The proposed project would use a vacant area and provide additional recreational and education opportunities for the public and communities of Silver Lake, Echo Park, and Elysian Valley. Phase I of the proposed project would include recreational facilities such as game courts, multipurpose sports fields, and a playground. All of these facilities are consistent with the recreational opportunities as described under the Open Space land use designation in the Community Plan, and are consistent with the exceptions identified in the Open Space Zone of the Municipal Zoning Code. Additionally, the trail components, outdoor classroom, butterfly garden, and vista point that would also be developed under Phase I would provide educational opportunities that are consistent with the Community Plan and Municipal Zoning Code. Finally, in Phase II, the development of the community center would be consistent with the Open Space Zone and the goals and objectives of the Community Plan. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with the General Plan, the Silver Lake–Echo Park–Elysian Valley Community Plan, and the Municipal Zoning Ordinance, and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

[3] City of Los Angeles 2008a
[4] Ibid.

c. No Impact. Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) are administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and are intended to identify how impacts would be mitigated when a project would affect endangered species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2004). HCPs pertain to Incidental Take Permits for otherwise lawful activities that may harm listed species or their habitats. To obtain a permit, an applicant must submit an HCP outlining what would be done to "minimize and mitigate" the impact on the listed species under the permit. There are no HCPs affecting the general vicinity of the proposed project.

The Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) program, which began in 1991 under the state's Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, is administered by the CDFG. It is a cooperative effort between the resource agencies and developers and takes a broad-based ecosystem approach to planning for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity. The Palos Verdes Peninsula NCCP is currently the one example of an NCCP in Los Angeles County protecting and restoring coastal sage scrub habitat. The proposed project is not located within or near this NCCP.

The County of Los Angeles also has established 61 significant ecological areas (SEAs) (County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning 2001). Los Angeles County developed the concept of SEAs in the 1970s in conjunction with adopting the original General Plan for the County. SEAs are defined and delineated in conjunction with the Land Use and Open Space Elements of the County General Plan. Griffith Park and the Verdugo Mountains are currently the closest identified SEAs to the project site (County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning 2007). The project site is not identified as an SEA.

Because there are no HCPs, NCCPs, or SEAs within the general vicinity of the proposed project, the proposed project would not conflict with these measures to conserve natural areas. Therefore, there would be no impact.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	**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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. No Impact. According to the Division of Mines and Geology 1994 Mineral Land Classification Map, the project site and surrounding areas are located within a mineral resource zone classified as MRZ-3. The MRZ-3 zone is defined as "areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data" (California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology 1994). However, the project site is surrounded by land uses that are not compatible with pit mining (commercial, residential, and roads) all of which would preclude it from being developed as a mine, even if there is indeed an extractable mineral resource present. Therefore, no impacts associated with the loss of a mineral resource would occur.

b. No Impact. The site is not delineated in the City of Los Angeles General Plan or in the Silver Lake–Echo Park–Elysian Valley Community Plan as containing a locally important mineral resource (City of Los Angeles 2001, 2004). No impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	**NOISE.** Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

Existing Conditions at Project site

The proposed project is located along Riverside Drive in the city of Los Angeles. Noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include single-family residences immediately to the south and west of the project site. The existing noise environment in the project area is dominated by traffic on Riverside Drive and Interstate 5, which are located immediately to the east of the project site.

Regulatory Background: Noise Standards and Thresholds of Significance

The project is located in the city of Los Angeles and is subject to the Noise Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the noise ordinances incorporated therein.

The City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element establishes standards for exterior sound levels based on land use categories. The City of Los Angeles also has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-

sensitive land uses. The noise element states that the maximum acceptable outdoor noise exposure level for residential, hospital, and school zones is 65 dBA CNEL (decibels above reference noise, adjusted, community noise equivalent level), and that silencers and mufflers on intake and exhaust openings for all construction equipment are required (City of Los Angeles 1999).

The Noise Element also identifies the exterior day and night range of noise exposure levels for neighborhood parks. The Normally Acceptable to Normally Unacceptable range of noise for neighborhood parks is between 65 and 70 CNEL (City of Los Angeles 1999). This means that locating neighborhood parks which experience a range of noise levels from 65 to 70 CNEL is allowed by the Noise Element. Normally acceptable (A) is defined by the Noise Element of the Los Angeles General Plan as "specified land uses is satisfactory, based upon assumption buildings involved are conventional construction, without any special noise insulation." Normally unacceptable (N) is defined by the Noise Element of the Los Angeles General Plan as "new construction or development generally should be discouraged. A detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and noise insulation features included in the design of the project." Therefore, a level of 70 CNEL, while normally unacceptable, can be acceptable for a neighborhood park based on the design of the project.

Chapter IV, Article 1, Section 41.40 of the Municipal Code specifies hours allowed for construction activities (City of Los Angeles 2000a). Construction or other noise-generating activity may not disturb the occupied sleeping quarters of any dwelling, hotel, apartment, or other place of residence between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., nor may such activity occur on or within 500 feet of residential property between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturday or federal holiday, nor at any time on Sunday. Additionally, the operation, repair, or servicing of construction equipment and the delivering of construction materials to the job site are prohibited between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays and anytime on Sundays.

Chapter XI, Article 2, Section 112.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code specifies the maximum noise level of powered equipment or powered hand tools. Any powered equipment or powered hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery is prohibited. However, this noise limitation will not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. The code states, "technical infeasibility shall mean that said noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques during the operation of the equipment" (City of Los Angeles 2000b). Silencers and mufflers on intake and exhaust openings for all construction equipment are required.

a. **Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Although, sensitive receptors in the area would be exposed to temporary increases in noise from construction activities, City of Los Angeles noise standards would not be exceeded. The construction and operational noise impacts and required mitigation measures are discussed below.

Construction Noise

The proposed project would be constructed in two separate phases. Construction of Phase I and Phase II is anticipated to last approximately 24 months. Each phase would increase noise levels temporarily at noise-sensitive receptors near the project site. The magnitude of the increases would depend on the type of construction activity, the noise level generated by various pieces of construction equipment, site geometry (i.e., shielding from intervening terrain or other structures), and the distance between the noise source and receptor.

Construction noise activities during Phase I would include earthwork to excavate/grade the project site and re-compaction of existing fill, construction of recreational uses (picnic areas, sports field, outdoor classrooms) on the lower level, and earthwork and construction of a scenic viewing area on the upper level. Phase II would include construction of a trail system connecting the upper and lower portions of the project site and a community center. Construction activities are not anticipated to be in progress on more than one part of the project site at a given time.

Noise from construction activity is generated by the use of a broad array of powered mechanical equipment. This equipment ranges from handheld pneumatic tools to bulldozers, dump trucks, and front loaders. In order to assess the potential noise effects of construction, this noise analysis used data from an extensive field study of various types of recreation construction projects (Bolt, Beranek, and Newman 1971). Noise levels associated with various construction phases where all pertinent equipment is present and operating at a reference distance of 50 feet are shown in Table 3-6. Because of vehicle technology improvements and stricter noise regulations since the field study was published, this analysis uses the average noise levels shown in Table 3-6 for the loudest construction phase. This information indicates that the overall average noise level generated on a construction site could be 89 dBA at a distance of 50 feet during excavation and finishing phases. The noise levels presented are value ranges; the magnitude of construction noise emission typically varies over time because construction activity is intermittent and the power demands on construction equipment (and the resulting noise output) are cyclical.

Table 3-6. Typical Noise Levels from Construction Activities for Recreation Projects

Construction Activity	Average Sound Level at 50 feet (dBA L_{eq})[a]	Standard Deviation (dB)
Ground Clearing	84	7
Excavation	89	6
Foundations	78	3
Erection	85	6
Finishing	89	7

Source: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman. 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances. Prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

[a]Sound level with all pertinent equipment operating.

Noise levels generated by construction equipment (or by any point source) generally decrease at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source (Harris 1979). Therefore, if a particular construction activity generated average noise levels of 89 dBA at 50 feet, the level would be 83 dBA at 100 feet, 77 dBA at 200 feet, 71 dBA at 400 feet, and so on. This calculated reduction in noise level is based on the loss of energy resulting from the geometric spreading of the sound wave as it leaves the source and travels outward. Intervening structures that block the line of sight, such as buildings, would further decrease the resultant noise level by a minimum of 5 dBA. The effects of molecular air absorption and anomalous excess attenuation would reduce the noise level from construction activities at more distant locations at the rates of 0.7 dBA and 1.0 dBA per 1,000 feet, respectively.

The closest noise-sensitive receptors to the project are residential land uses to the west of the project site approximately 75 feet from the acoustical center[5] of the project site. A construction noise level of 89 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet would attenuate to approximately 86 dBA L_{eq} at 75 feet from the source. This noise level is likely to be substantially higher than the ambient daytime noise level at the closest sensitive receptor. Noise levels of this magnitude would be readily audible in the residential area during construction activities. The City's Municipal Code exempts construction from the noise restrictions discussed above as long as it does not occur between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. or between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturday or federal holiday, or at any time on Sunday. The City's Municipal Code also states that equipment or a powered hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from construction and industrial machinery will be prohibited unless compliance is technically infeasible. Therefore, noise control measures are recommended as Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-11 to reduce the noise levels to the extent practicable.

Mitigation Measures:

MM N-1. All noise-producing project equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines will be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) will be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.

MM N-2. All mobile and fixed noise-producing equipment used on the project that is regulated for noise output by a local, state, or federal agency will comply with such regulation while in the course of project activity.

MM N-3. Electrically powered equipment will be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion–powered equipment, where feasible.

MM N-4. Mobile noise-generating equipment and machinery will be shut off when not in use.

MM N-5. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas will be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.

MM N-6. Construction site and access road speed limits will be established and enforced during the construction period.

MM N-7. Construction operations will not occur between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. or between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturday or federal holiday, or at any time on Sunday. Noise-producing project activity will comply with local noise control regulations affecting construction activity or obtain exemptions therefrom.

MM N-8. The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, will be for safety warning purposes only.

[5] Acoustical center is the idealized point from which the acoustical energy from construction would be produced. It is determined by taking the square root of the distance from closest receiver to the nearest point where construction equipment could be times the distance to the farthest point.

MM N-9. No project-related public address or music system will be audible at any adjacent receptor.

MM N-10. The on-site construction supervisor will have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the project proponent will be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.

MM N-11. During construction activities for the upper level of the proposed project, temporary noise barriers, such as noise-attenuating blankets, will be erected along the north, northwest, and west construction fence lines, where sensitive receptor sites are within 150 feet of the line-of-site of construction activities.

With the mitigation provided, the construction of the facility would not expose adjacent noise-sensitive receptors to significant noise impacts.

Operational Noise

The proposed project would increase traffic volumes to some extent on the surrounding street networks. However, Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) does not anticipate that activities associated with the project (i.e., recreational activities) would substantially affect existing traffic volume (Carranza, 2008 pers. comm.). Recreational activities generally would take place during evenings and on weekends, and thereby, would not affect peak-hour traffic volumes. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to significantly increase noise levels due to traffic. Impacts from operations would be less than significant.

The proposed project would introduce new sensitive receptors to the area in the form of park users. Current noise sources in the area include Riverside Drive and Interstate 5 immediately to the east of the project site. These two noise sources likely would dominate the noise environment on the project site. The Los Angeles General Plan Guidelines for Noise Compatibility Land Use states that an exterior Day/Night Average noise level measured in CNEL that ranges between 65 and 70 is considered Normally Acceptable/Normally Unacceptable for Neighborhood Parks. For the purpose of this analysis, a noise level of 67 dBA CNEL was used to determine significance. The 67 dBA CNEL contour likely would extend into the project site but would not extend all the way through the site. Park patrons would be able to move away from areas that exceed 67 dBA CNEL, if the noise becomes a nuisance. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with grading and excavation may result in some minor amount of ground vibration. Vibration from construction activity is typically below human perception when the activity is more than about 50 feet from receiver. Additionally, vibration from these activities would be short-term and would end when construction is completed. Because construction activity would not involve high impact activities, such as pile driving, this impact is considered less than significant.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. Noise associated with recreational activities at the project site would primarily be generated by traffic. However, increases in traffic volumes associated with the proposed project would be relatively small and would not cause a significant increase in noise levels (Carranza, 2008 pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

As stated in Section a (above), the proposed project would introduce sensitive receptors to the area. The major sources of noise (Riverside Drive and Interstate 5) potentially could subject a portion of the proposed project site to noise levels in excess of 67 dBA CNEL. However, visitors to the park would be able to avoid these areas by moving to other areas of the park that do not exceed 67 dBA CNEL. Therefore, impacts would be less that significant.

d. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As stated above, the construction of the proposed project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels. These levels would be readily audible at the closest sensitive receptors but would not exceed City standards with the incorporation of mitigation measures N-1 through N-11. Therefore, impacts from construction would be less than significant.

e. No Impact. The proposed project is not located within a 2-mile radius of an airport. The closest airport is Bob Hope Burbank Airport located approximately 9 miles to the northwest. No noise impacts related to air traffic would occur.

f. No Impact. As stated above, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airstrip, private or public. No impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:				
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. No Impact. The project would not facilitate direct or indirect future growth in the area. The project site is a vacant parcel within a highly developed urban area, and involves the development of a park and associated recreational amenities. The project would not involve the development of new housing or extend roadways or infrastructure that might result in direct or indirect population growth to the area. The project is designed to accommodate the existing and projected recreational demands of the existing population. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on population growth.

b. No Impact. The proposed project would not displace any housing and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

c. No Impact. The proposed project does not contain any residences and would not displace any people. Therefore, no impact would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	**PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project:				
a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:				
1.	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
2.	Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
3.	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
5.	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a1. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts on fire protective services. The proposed project would result in the construction of an 18-acre park, including multi-purpose courts and fields, picnic areas, and a community building. The project would be used by the surrounding community as a gathering place for a variety of non-programmed activities. The proposed project is located in a high wildfire hazard area; however, the proposed project would be maintained to reduce the wildfire hazard and would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes set forth by the Los Angeles Fire Department. Prior to final plan approval, the Los Angeles Fire Department would verify that the proposed project has been designed to conform to code. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered a fire hazard and would not exceed the capacity of the Los Angeles Fire Department to serve the site or other areas with existing fire protection services and resources. Less-than-significant impacts would occur.

a2. Less-than-Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would occur within a vacant open space area that has been designed to provide park space. The proposed project would increase opportunities for social interaction among community members, thereby increasing community cohesion and involvement. These types of projects generally are not associated with increased criminal activity, and increased demand for police protection at the park is not expected. During site visits, it was observed that the project area has existing illicit uses, such as homeless encampments. The development and enhancement of this site is expected to increase community use and decrease criminal activity. Furthermore, the design of the park includes security gates that would open the

park at dawn and close and lock the park at dusk, preventing any late evening and potentially criminal activities within the area. As such, the project would not exceed the capacity of the Los Angeles Police Department to provide police protective services to the site or other areas; instead, the project would help to reduce criminal activity at the site, as well as within the surrounding community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

a3. No Impact. The proposed project would not increase the population or result in the construction of new housing. The proposed project would result in the construction of an 18-acre park on vacant land, and as such, would not increase demand on local schools or affect any school operations. The proposed project would create outdoor educational opportunities. No impacts would occur.

a4. No Impact. The proposed project involves developing a park on a vacant piece of land. As such, it would not affect any existing parks, but instead enhance community use of new park space. The proposed project would develop 5 acres for active and passive recreational use, including multi-purpose courts and field, trails, and the community building. The community building would increase opportunities for social interaction among community members. The building could be used as a gathering place for activities, including classes, games, and other social events. Therefore, the project would increase opportunities for passive and active recreational activities on a vacant undeveloped site. Therefore, the project would be considered a benefit in terms of providing recreational space for the local communities, and no impacts on parks would occur.

a5. No Impact. Because of the nature and intent of the proposed project, no impacts on libraries, senior centers, or other public facilities are anticipated. The project is intended to benefit members of the community and could be used as a gathering place for non-programmed activities, including recreation, games, and other social events. Therefore, the project would not increase the demand placed on other public facilities, and no impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	**RECREATION.** Would the project:				
a.	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.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. No Impact. The increased demand for or use of existing parks generally is associated with the increase of housing or population in an area. The proposed project consists of public park and recreational amenities and would not include residential uses that could increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities. The proposed project would likely reduce or relieve the burden on existing community park and recreational facilities in the general vicinity by helping to satisfy recreational demand. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts on recreational facilities.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would directly increase the overall accessibility of recreational facilities available to members of the public. Potential adverse impacts associated with the site preparation and construction of the proposed park and recreational facilities, including but not limited to grading and/or trenching are analyzed and discussed in the pertinent resource sections of this checklist (e.g. cultural resources, air quality, noise, etc). Construction and operation impacts related to other resource areas were all found to be less than significant or could be mitigated to a level of less than significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment and impacts would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:				
a.	Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard 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 because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. Less-than-Significant Impact. The LADOT does not expect that activities facilitated by project implementation would substantially affect existing traffic volume (Carranza, 2008 pers. comm.). Activities generally would take place during evenings and on weekends and would not generally affect peak-hour traffic volumes, which are generally during the commuting hours of 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays. Additionally, activities associated with projects similar to the one proposed generally generate only small numbers of trips at a given time. A Major Highway Class II, such as Riverside Drive, can accommodate small increases in the number of vehicular trips. Furthermore, the local and collector street network leading to the upper level outlook could accommodate off-peak trips and weekend trips associated with travel to the outlook. Impacts on traffic volumes and flow would be less than significant.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. The area to the north of the project site is neighborhood commercial, and the remaining area surrounding the proposed project is residential. The primary access to the lower level the project site would be off Riverside Drive. Riverside Drive is identified as a Major Highway Class II, and Stadium Way is identified as a Secondary Street in the Generalized Circulation of the Silver Lake–Echo Park–Elysian Valley Community Plan (City of Los Angeles 2004). Secondary access to the upper level would be off of Landa Street. Landa Street is a local street, and the surrounding roads are either local roads or collector roads.

The designed capacity of Riverside Drive and Stadium Way is adequate to carry the traffic volumes that are generally present in the area, in addition to the small trip-number increase. The proposed project generally would result in additional trips in the area during the mid-weekday hours, on the weekday evenings, and on weekends and not during peak traffic hours; therefore, the local and collector streets would be able to absorb any trips to the upper level of the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. No Impact. The proposed project would not cause an increase in air traffic levels or create a physical impediment that would necessitate an alteration of flight patterns. No impact would occur.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not alter the shape of any of the adjacent roads. Although the project would require the development of an internal access road off of Riverside Drive, it would be designed in accordance with LADOT guidelines and LADOT would review and approve the access plan for the project to ensure the design and placement of driveways were appropriate (Carranza, 2008 pers. comm.). Impacts would be less than significant.

e. No Impact. The proposed project would not result in impacts on emergency access. Construction or operation of the project would not affect streets or otherwise affect emergency access routes. The project would be designed to incorporate all required Los Angeles Fire Department standards to ensure that its implementation would not result in hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access to the site or areas surrounding the site.

f. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would provide parking on-site at the lower level near the multi-use game courts and multi-use field and at the upper level near the lookout. There would be seven standard parking spaces, three ADA parking spaces, and one maintenance truck space at the lower level for a total of 11 spaces. In addition, on-street parking is available along Riverside Drive. Two ADA parking spaces would be located at the upper level, and there is street parking available at the upper level. The City of Los Angeles Parking Code does not have specific parking requirements for parks and open space areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The proposed project would provide adequate bicycle racks for park users, and bus transit is available through the Metropolitan Transportation Authority along Route 96 (with a stop at Riverside Drive and Los Feliz) and Route 201 (with a stop at Glendale and Riverside). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	**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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater 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 would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. No Impact. The project site is currently vacant and does not generate any wastewater. Implementation of Phase II of the proposed project would slightly increase the generation of domestic wastewater from day-to-day operations. Upon Phase II implementation, the wastewater facilities associated with the community center building would tie into existing wastewater/sewer lines and would adhere to all wastewater treatment requirements specified by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Bureau of Sanitation so that no impacts would occur.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. Phase I of the proposed project does not include restrooms and therefore would not result in the need for additional wastewater treatment capacity or facilities. Phase II of the project would include the construction and operation of the community building, which

would include restrooms and drinking fountains. This would be the only element of the proposed project that would generate wastewater at the site. At this point, it is unknown how many days a week the community building would be open to the public. Therefore, wastewater estimates are based on a conservative assumption that a 2,500 square-foot community building would be used by a maximum of approximately 100 park users per day. According to the Draft City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, the community building would be expected to generate approximately 4 gallons of wastewater per occupant. Assuming a conservative estimate of 100 people that could use the building per day, the community building is projected to generate approximately 400 gallons per day or 2,800 gallons per week. Wastewater from the project would be delivered via gravity through interceptor lines to the City of Los Angeles Hyperion Treatment Plant where it would be treated. An additional contribution of 400 gallons a day to the flow to the existing facilities would be considered negligible in relation to existing flows and overall remaining capacities. Therefore, the project contribution of wastewater would be less than significant.

c. Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in the construction of approximately 0.6 acre of impermeable surfaces, which includes the multi-purpose courts and community building, as well as some parts of the trails that would have steps and drainage areas. The majority of increased runoff from rain events would be absorbed into the surrounding grass areas, with the remainder flowing off-site. Off-site flow would be minimal and extremely negligible in terms of overall drainage facilities that serve the project site. The project would include design elements that reduce water runoff from the site, including bioswales to minimize flow rates. Therefore, the project would not contribute significant volumes of stormwater flows such that the capacity of existing drainage facilities would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site would increase the demand for potable water needed to serve the 2,500 square-foot community building, including restroom facilities. Additionally, approximately 2.4 acres of land would require irrigation. The 2.4 acres of land would be irrigated by sprinklers under a Smart Irrigation Controller, which determines watering times using weather-based satellite data, reducing use of water. Water services would be provided by DWP through its existing supply. Based on a conservative estimate that a 2,500 square-foot community building would be used by approximately 100 park users per day, it would generate a maximum of 400 gallons of wastewater per day. Using the general factor that potable water use is 111% of wastewater use, the 2,500 square-foot community building would demand 444 gallons of potable water per day or 162,060 gallons per year. Using data from station 133 in Glendale of the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS), and assuming 100% cool season turf with a crop coefficient of 0.6, the multipurpose field turf would demand approximately 6 gallons per day, or 13,400 gallons per year, for the proposed 2.4 acres (104,544 square feet). See Table 3-7 below identifying the CIMIS data and proposed project irrigation demand calculation.

Table 3-7. CIMIS Data and Proposed Project Irrigation Demand

Month	Precipitation (in)	Evapotranspiration (ETo)[1] (in)
January	3.02	2.20
February	4.81	2.45
March	1.89	3.64
April	1.37	4.74
May	0.89	5.31
June	0.31	6.06
July	0.11	6.75
August	0.14	6.66
September	0.24	5.01
October	0.70	3.95
November	0.81	2.73
December	2.64	2.31
Total Annual Inches	16.93	51.81
Net Precipitation	13.54	-
Net Irrigation Requirement (in)	-	51.81[2]
Cool Season Turf (Acre-Feet per Year/Acre)[3]		2.6[4]
Developed Park Land (Gallons per Day/Square Foot)		0.000059
Proposed Project Irrigation Demand (Gallons per Day/Square Feet)		6.1[5]

Source: CIMIS data were recorded from August 1996 to August 2008, City of Glendale, Station 133, CIMIS, www.cimis.ca.gov

[1]ETo = evapotranspiration, the loss of water from the soil both by evaporation and by transpiration from the plants growing thereon. Normal reference ETo is based on surface of grass.
[2]Total Annual ETo Inches less Net Irrigation Requirement or 51.81-0 = 51.81.
[3]Assuming 100% Cool Season Turf, with crop coefficient (Kc) = 0.6.
[4](0.6*51.81)/12 months = 2.6 AFY/A.
[5]0.000059 GPD/SF*104,544 SF = 6.1 GPD.

Together, the community building and multipurpose turf field would demand approximately 450 gallons per day, or 164,250 gallons per year of potable water. This slight increased demand for potable water would be negligible in regard to the overall existing supply. Additionally, the project would not require new or expanded water entitlements or that new water resources be found. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant increase in demand for potable water and impacts would be less than significant.

e. Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, the project would generate an approximate maximum of 400 gallons of wastewater, and the increased demand would be considered less than significant.

f. Less-than-Significant Impact. The site currently generates no solid waste since it is vacant. The proposed project would therefore result in a slight increase in domestic municipal solid waste generation. Approximately 0.6 acres of recreation uses including the multipurpose sports courts, playground, and community building would generate trash. An additional 2.4 acres of irrigated recreational land would generate grass cuttings. Therefore a total maximum of 3.0 acres of the project site would have the ability to generate solid waste. Using a solid waste generation factor of 0.372 tons per acre per year (or 2.5 pounds per day per acre) the project is anticipated to generate approximately one tone (2,000 pounds) of solid waste per year or 7.5 pounds per day of solid waste (Los Angeles Harbor Department 2005). The project would comply with AB 939, which requires cities to divert 50% of solid waste to recycling programs and away from landfills. The required 50% diversion would reduce the project generated solid waste going to landfills to 3.75 pounds per day or approximately 1,300 pounds per year. The project would be served by one of the many county landfills with remaining capacity. The project's contribution would be extremely negligible in terms of the remaining capacity of available landfills; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g. No Impact. The proposed project would comply with all regulations related to solid waste, such as the California Integrated Waste Management Act and city recycling programs; therefore, no impacts would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**				
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. An urban environment that is largely developed with a mixed use of residential and commercial surrounds the proposed project. The project site is currently vacant disturbed land with ruderal vegetation and trees. However, as discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, the site has biological resources that would be affected by the implementation of the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5 (identified previously) would minimize potential impacts on biological resources. The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in terms of fishery or sensitive terrestrial habitat, or substantially damage an area containing any sensitive animal or plant communities. The site does not contain any rare or endangered species and does not contain any habitat that would be used as a wildlife corridor.

The project site does contain elements of California's history and prehistory. No demolition or removal of any historic structures is proposed. However, given the historic and prehistoric context of the area, construction of the proposed project could potentially affect unknown buried resources in the park. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 (identified previously) would minimize potential impacts on cultural resources.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts. Through the analysis contained herein, it has been determined that the project would not result in any significant impacts. Additionally, taken in sum with other projects in the area, the scale of the project is so small that impacts on any environmental resource or issue areas would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. No Impact. The proposed project would provide a park with amenities and a 2,500 square-foot community building, which would add recreational benefit to residents in the surrounding community. The project would be a beneficial use for the area and would not consist of any use or any activities that would negatively affect any persons in the vicinity. Additionally, other issue areas associated with the project have been analyzed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines and found to pose either no impact or a less-than-significant impact. In other words, the project would not result in any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse environmental effects on human beings directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impacts would occur.