EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) to evaluate potential environmental effects that would result from development of the proposed Los Angeles State Historic Park (LASHP) Master Development Plan Phase I Implementation (proposed project). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq., 2010). CDPR is identified as the lead agency for the proposed project under CEQA.

The project site occupies a critical nexus within the geographical and cultural history of the City of Los Angeles (City). LASHP is located at the foot of the Elysian Hills on the former site of the historic Southern Pacific Railroad Company's River Station railroad yard. CDPR acquired the project site in December 2001, which is currently operated as part of the Angeles District of the CDPR parks system. In 1971, 30 years prior to CDPR purchase, the City of Los Angeles recognized the local significance of the site and dedicated the site as Historic-Cultural Monument No. 82, for its role as the Southern Pacific Railroad Company's River Station railroad yard.[1] However, the cultural significance of the property and adjacent areas dates back much further in time than just to the site's use as a railroad yard, and forward to its establishment as a public park.

Previous environmental and planning documents prepared for the LASHP include the Cornfield Interim Public Use Plan Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, which was prepared by CDPR in July 2003, and the LASHP General Plan/EIR, which was approved by the CDPR Commission on June 10, 2005. These previous documents have allowed for development of interim park uses, which have provided for immediate public use of LASHP as permanent planning and a long-term vision for the project site are developed. Additionally, the Draft Cornfield Arroyo Seco Specific Plan (CASP), which includes the project site, and the CASP Draft EIR were circulated for public review in November 2010 and September 2011, respectively. The proposed project synthesizes the LASHP General Plan/EIR goals and guidelines into design concepts that will be implemented in phases as funding becomes available.

ES.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The 32-acre project site is located at 1245 North Spring Street in the eastern portion of the City of Los Angeles, approximately 1.5 miles north of the downtown Los Angeles financial district and directly east of the Chinatown district. The project site is generally bound by the Metro Gold Line right-of-way and Broadway to the north, the channelized Los Angeles River to the east, Spring Street and commercial/industrial uses to the south, and the Metro Gold Line right-of-way and commercial/industrial

[1] City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, Cultural Heritage Commission, Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) Report for Central City North Community Planning Area, Last Updated April 6, 2011, available at: http://www.preservation.lacity.org/designated-sites, accessed: November 1, 2011.

uses to the west. The project site comprises an elongated, grass-covered area that is currently primarily used for picnicking, jogging, running, informal play, and other activities requiring large open areas. The southwestern 13 acres of the project site are currently developed with an interim public use (IPU) park consisting of curvilinear walkways, trees, and open grass play areas. Existing park amenities include a drinking fountain, benches, picnic tables, and temporary restroom facilities. Existing structures on the project site include a small lunch stand, an information kiosk, a park administration building, and a maintenance trailer. The park also contains a maintenance and operations yard on the southwestern corner of the project site.

Regional access to the project site is provided by State Route 110 (SR-110, Pasadena Freeway) located approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the project site; Interstate 5 (I-5, Golden State Freeway) located approximately 0.45 miles east of the project site; U.S. Highway 101 (US-101, Hollywood Freeway) located approximately 0.80 miles southwest of the project site; and Interstate 10 (I-10, San Bernardino Freeway) located approximately one mile southeast of the project site. Additionally, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro) Gold Line light rail line runs adjacent to the northern boundary of the project site. The nearest Gold Line station is the elevated Chinatown Station, located south of the project site at the intersection of Spring Street and College Street.

The area surrounding the project site is a developed urban area of the City consisting of a mix of commercial, light industrial, institutional, public facilities, and multi-family residential uses. Land uses north of the project site include several one- and two-story single- and multi-family residences, several one- to three-story commercial uses, two churches, a Buddhist temple, and Cathedral High School. Additionally, Dodger Stadium is located approximately 1,500 feet northwest of the project site. The areas east and south of the project site are primarily developed with one- to three-story industrial uses. The channelized Los Angeles River is located approximately 400 feet east of the project site. West of the project site is the elevated Metro Gold Line Chinatown Station. Other land uses west of the project site include the historic Capitol Milling Company building, and several one- and two-story commercial uses.

ES.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the proposed project include the following:

- Express the interwoven histories and the multi-cultural significance of the LASHP site, while satisfying a broad range of year-round recreational opportunities.
- Establish a major public open space and destination for future generations to celebrate the past, present, and future of Los Angeles.
- Ensure that the pedestrian-friendly public realm of the park seamlessly extends to the park's boundaries and includes flexible spaces for special events, markets, and festivals.
- Position the LASHP within the 21st Century context and allow it to remain compatible with evolving technologies and to incorporate those future cultural histories as they develop.

- Provide for the health, inspiration, and education of the public by helping to preserve valued cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation while protecting and stabilizing significant cultural resources and recreated natural habitats within the park.

- Engage both nature and culture in creating a regional gathering space around the theme of a larger, more diverse Los Angeles history, which reconnects the City to the Los Angeles River.

- Provide visitor use facilities that offer the opportunity for diverse visitor experiences, maximizing visitor and staff use while minimizing negative effects on viewsheds, cultural or natural resources, or other conflicts.

ES.4 PROPOSED PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project represents the design footprint of the long-term vision of LASHP. The LASHP Development Plan would be implemented in at least three phases. The full development of all phases of the proposed project is anticipated to occur by 2035. Due to the long-term nature of the project, the components included within future phases of the project may change over time and would be subject to the availability of funding. At this time, the components of Phase I of the proposed project have been detailed and the implementation would be funded primarily by Proposition 84, a bond measure approved by voters in 2006. This EIR analyzes the potential impacts primarily related to the implementation of Phase I of the LASHP Master Development Plan. Only a limited number of components of future phases are conceptually known at this time. These are addressed in this EIR as appropriate. Subsequent CEQA review will be required for a majority of the future improvements implemented after Phase I.

PHASE I OF PROPOSED PROJECT

- Three event spaces would be installed with the following capacities: 1,000 to 1,500 people, 4,000 to 5,000 people, and 10,000 to 12,000 people. These event spaces would include turf areas that would not be a substantial change from existing conditions. This would include an amphitheatre for open air concerts that includes an “archaeological reveal space” showing some of the structures used when the site was a rail yard for interpretive purposes.

- One-story Welcome Station and operations buildings would be constructed, both with permanent public restrooms.

- A 14-foot-tall elevated walkway would be installed including the Roundhouse Observation Deck, which would rise above the exposed “archaeological reveal space.” The elevated walkway would close half the distance in vertical elevation to Broadway to the north for a possible future bridge connection. The Roundhouse Observation Deck would provide views of the exposed archaeological features on-site and the downtown Los Angeles skyline. In addition, views toward the Los Angeles River and hills beyond would be provided.

- Hardscaped walkways and/or plazas would be provided, including a series of pedestrian entry plazas along the Spring Street frontage. In between the series of entry plazas would be a series of tree-lined pedestrian promenades. The pedestrian plazas would help to connect the proposed project to potential future residential populations along Spring Street.

- Jogging and interpretive trail loops would run throughout and around the entire project site. In addition, interpretive areas would be included such as the Zanja Madre view node.

- A Children's Interpretive Play Area/Exploration Zone and a "Storytelling Circle" amphitheater, with a campfire ring, would be included once funding becomes available.

- Unstructured play and work-out areas, group gathering areas, and restrooms would be provided. In addition, various park furnishings would be provided, including benches (both permanent and movable), picnic tables, drinking fountains, bike racks and storage, trash and recycling receptacles, and bollards to control access.

- Up to two approximately 75-space surface parking areas would be provided, one potentially within the interior of the project site and the second potentially along Baker Street. The interior parking area would have a permeable surface.

- Pedestrian pathway, parking lot, and security lighting would be included throughout the park.

- Bioswales would be installed for stormwater retention, recharge, and reuse. Stormwater basins would be included that also function as constructed/demonstration wetlands and a habitat area. A habitat boardwalk would be located adjacent to this area.

- Approximately 550 new trees would be planted on the project site. Landscaping would be provided including turf, shrubs, and herbaceous plants. Approximately 236,000 square feet of irrigated reinforced turf would be installed for events and general use. In addition, approximately 555,000 square feet and 213,000 square feet of irrigated ornamental plantings and non-irrigated naturalized plantings (requiring temporary irrigation) would be included, respectively. Grasscrete paved or reinforced turf area(s) for event vehicle access and public programming such as farmer's markets.

- Fire access and services road(s) along the northern border of the project site.

- Automated irrigation systems utilizing the latest technologies in controls and materials for maximum efficiency including, but not limited to smart controls, and rain and moisture sensors. The new irrigation systems would be able to receive reclaimed water and/or river water.

- Re-use as feasible, infrastructure from the existing IPU facilities such as gabion walls with lights, concrete or steel stripes added to the existing parking area, historic cobblestone paving, concrete paving, decomposed granite pathways, and wooden boardwalk elements.

Upon the completion of Phase I, average daily usage, as well as annual attendance is expected to increase and potentially include daytime student field trips and tourist trips to the project site. Most daily park activities are assumed to occur between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Friday night and weekend park usage and attendance are expected to increase from the existing condition of approximately 1,500 visitors (excluding special events). The proposed project would include as many as four daytime/evening/nighttime special events per year with a total attendance of up to 25,000 people each, as well as smaller events of 500 to 5,000 people expected to occur monthly at the project site. Overall attendance figures are expected to exceed 180,000 annually upon opening. Special events and concerts held at the project site may include fireworks displays and the use of public address systems.

FUTURE PHASES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The future phases (i.e., Phases II and III) of the LASHP Master Development Plan would be determined by the availability of funding, as well as by the extent of development accomplished in Phase I. Future phases of the proposed project may include a bridge from the park north to Broadway, a Los Angeles River connection, and enhanced interpretive facilities and elements of the park. These particular components are not analyzed in this EIR. In addition, future phases would include additional tree plantings. The full development of all phases of the proposed project is anticipated to occur by 2035. Annual park attendance would be expected to increase from approximately 125,000 people to 300,000 people at the time of full buildout. As previously mentioned, additional CEQA environmental review will be necessary for the implementation of a majority of the project components following Phase I.

ES.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

A public scoping meeting was held near the project site at the Los Angeles Conservation Clean & Green Headquarters on November 20, 2008. The purpose of this meeting was to seek input from public agencies and the general public regarding the environmental issues and concerns that may potentially result from the proposed project to be addressed in the EIR. Approximately 60 people attended the public information meeting. The following list summarizes the public comments and questions received at the public information meeting related to environmental issues:

- **Cultural Resources.** Create more of a historic design and feel to match the previous use of the site as a railroad yard. Ensure that the history of the area is interpreted as part of the design of the park. (see Chapter 3.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources)

- **Transportation and Traffic.** Concern with increase in traffic to nearby streets if Spring Street were to be declassified to a lower capacity. The park should be accessible for large equipment trucks for large events. Ensure that there is sufficient accessibility to the park. (see Chapter 3.12, Transportation and Traffic)

In accordance with CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) distributed in November 2008. Six comment letters were received from various agencies, organizations, and individuals. Copies of the comment letters are provided in Appendix A to this Draft EIR. The primary

areas of controversy identified by the public and agencies included the following potential environmental issues:

- Potential impacts related to community connectivity, connection to the Los Angeles River, and sustainable design should be evaluated.
- Should the proposed project include any grade separation structure over Metro's rail lines, a formal application would be required to be submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission for approval.
- The traffic analysis should include: an evaluation of impacts on SR-110 and I-5 as well as affected on- and off-ramps, streets, crossroads, and intersections; analysis of existing and future conditions; traffic volume counts for anticipated AM and PM peak-hour volumes; level of service before and after development; a discussion on traffic circulation at the project site; and a discussion of any mitigation measures.
- The proposed project should reflect the cultural and historical diversity of the project site.
- Community accessibility to park resources should be evaluated.
- Hazardous conditions associated with possible oil wells and methane gas should be evaluated.
- Mineral resources should be evaluated.
- Biological resources impacts related to the movement of wildlife should be evaluated.
- Impacts related to hydrology and water quality, including floodplain management, should be evaluated.
- The cultural resources analysis should evaluate potential impacts related to Native American artifacts and human remains.

ES.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

An analysis of environmental impacts caused by the proposed project has been conducted and is contained in this EIR. Twelve issue areas are analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.0. Table ES-1 provides a summary of the potential environmental impacts that would result during construction and operation of the proposed project, mitigation measures that would lessen significant environmental impacts, and the level of significance of the environmental impacts that would remain after implementation of mitigation. The proposed project would create significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from fireworks displays during special events (Chapter 3.9). The EIR identifies potentially significant impacts requiring mitigation for biological resources (Chapter 3.3), cultural resources (Chapter 3.4), geology and soils (Chapter 3.5), and hazards and hazardous materials (Chapter 3.7). The EIR identified less than significant

impacts for aesthetics (Chapter 3.1), air quality (Chapter 3.2), paleontological resources (Chapter 3.4), greenhouse gas emissions (Chapter 3.6), hydrology and water quality (Chapter 3.8), population and housing (Chapter 3.10), public services and utilities (Chapter 3.11), and transportation and traffic (Chapter 3.12). As discussed in Chapter 4.0, the proposed project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. Table ES-1, presented at the end of this executive summary, provides a summary of the environmental impacts detailed in Chapter 3.0 of this EIR. For those impacts determined to be less than significant and requiring no mitigation measures, a "Not Applicable" determination is stated under the "Level of Significance After Mitigation" column within Table ES-1.

ES.7 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed project in an EIR. Several alternatives, including alternate sites, were considered but rejected from consideration in this EIR. Three alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, are reviewed in Chapter 5.0 of this document. This section summarizes alternatives to the proposed project that were developed, as well as the No Project Alternative, as required under CEQA.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed development of the 32-acre project site, including various event spaces, observation and interpretive areas, recreation areas and pathways, parking, constructed wetlands and habitat area, as well as park furnishings and infrastructure would not be completed on the project site. Because these improvements would not be implemented, the design goals and vision of the LASHP General Plan/EIR would not be realized. Under the No Project Alternative, the IPU park would continue to operate as under existing conditions. Future environmental conditions would be unchanged from those that currently exist, which are described in the environmental setting sections of Chapter 3.0. The No Project Alternative would not fully meet any of the project objectives.

HIGH INTENSITY MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVE

The High Intensity Master Plan Alternative, although similar to the proposed project, would result in the increased programming of the project site as compared to the proposed project. This alternative includes interpretive gardens, habitat areas, interpretive play area, a civic water feature, a "fountain" bridge spanning the project site and connecting to Broadway, multi-use lawn spaces, a 5,600-square-foot Welcome Station/cafe, a 14,000-square-foot ecology center including a restaurant, a performance stage, public parking, interpretive and recreational trails, and the excavation of the northern end of the project site to establish a direct physical connection with the Los Angeles River. In addition, large public and operations facilities would be included on-site. This alternative would create iconic attractions for the park. Due to the increased intensity of development, the construction phase of this alternative would be longer in duration as compared to the proposed project. The construction activities and processes required with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, except there would be an increase in the intensity of excavation and grading. This alternative would result in greater impacts in 10

environmental issue areas as compared to the proposed project. The High Intensity Master Plan Alternative would meet all of the project objectives.

RESOURCE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

The Resource Protection Alternative would be identical to the proposed project. However, this alternative would reduce the scope and size of the project and would further protect known archaeological resources by fully covering the project site with an additional layer of soil where it is currently shallow or exposed. Similar to the proposed project, the Welcome Station building, operations building, elevated walkway and Roundhouse Observation Deck would be included with this alternative. However, no archaeological features would be exposed during the operational phase. In addition, no constructed wetlands would be included with this alternative. The construction phase required with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project. This alternative would result in less cultural and paleontological resources impacts and greater hydrology and water quality impacts. The Resource Protection Alternative would meet all of the project objectives.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The "No Project" alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative primarily because no construction activities would occur on the project site. However, this alternative would not fully meet any of the project objectives or implement the vision of the LASHP General Plan/EIR. In accordance with Section 15126.6(e) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Table 5-1 provides a comparison of the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project. The Resource Protection Alternative would reduce cultural resources impacts as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would result in greater impacts in one environmental issue area, and less impacts in one environmental issue area. The High Intensity Master Plan Alternative would not reduce impacts in any environmental issue area as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would result in greater impacts in 10 environmental issue areas. Both the alternatives would result in greater impacts in at least one environmental issue area. As such, the proposed project would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
VIS-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
VIS-2: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
VIS-3: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
VIS-4: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than Significant	The proposed project would not exceed applicable significance thresholds and would not require mitigation measures. However, as mentioned in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, SCAQMD's Rule 403 for Best Available Control Measures and Rule 1113 would be implemented as part of the project. Compliance with these rules would ensure that the emissions of fugitive dust, including PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, as well as VOC, would be minimized.	Not Applicable
AQ-2: The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
AQ-3: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
AQ-4: The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
AQ-5: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
BIO-2: The proposed project would not 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 a native wildlife nursery site. Impacts to wildlife corridors would be less than significant, while mitigation measures are required to ensure less than significant impacts to migratory birds.	Significant	**BIO-A**: Construction activities associated with the proposed project (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures, and substrates) shall take place outside of the breeding bird season, which generally runs from March 1 through August 31 (as early as February 1 for raptors and as early as November 1 for great blue herons). **BIO-B**: Bird species protected by the MBTA, as well as nesting native birds, have the potential to nest/breed within the project site and vicinity in the breeding bird season. If construction activities cannot be avoided during the breeding bird season a qualified biologist shall perform a bird survey no sooner than three days prior to the start of construction activities. If nesting birds or an active nest is present on the project site, CDPR environmental scientists shall be notified prior to the start of any construction activity. Appropriate actions may include, but are not limited to, monitoring nest sites to ensure no impacts to nesting avian species, designation of the location as an environmentally sensitive area, and delaying or restricting construction activities until nesting is complete so that	Less than Significant

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		nesting activities are not interrupted. **BIO-C**: CDPR shall record the results of the described protective measures to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of migratory and native birds.	
BIO-3: The project site is not included in any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
CR-1: The proposed project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 without the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures are required to ensure less than significant impacts.	Potentially Significant	**CR-A**: The following shall apply to all building sites and other historic resources within the project site: • All building sites shall remain in-place; • All building sites and historic resources shall be well documented; • Historical research shall be continued to provide additional details concerning the architecture, design, and development history of Southern Pacific's railroad station, depot, and general shops buildings and the technological innovations that occurred during the time of the River Station; • Interpretation of all historic resources shall be undertaken; • Any interpretive program shall be feasible, given the constraints of conditions of the archaeological remains of the building sites, fragility of the 19th century	Less than Significant
CR-2: The proposed project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. Mitigation measures are required to ensure less than significant impacts.	Potentially Significant		Less than Significant

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		building materials, recommendations from conservators, staffing limitations, and other issues; • A protection plan shall be developed during the construction phase of the proposed project; • Long-term conservation of historic building sites shall be included in the final project design; • Avoidance of physical or indirect impacts to significant historic resources within the project site shall be considered the preferred project design alternative; • Sufficient fill soils and well-planned drainage systems shall be placed over all archaeological resources, including the 19th century building sites and other historic resources to provide protection from construction activities, project operations, and infiltration by irrigation of landscaping or plant roots; • Landscaping, in particular, trees, and landscape features shall be planned to avoid major historic building sites and known archaeological features to prevent the potential of water or root damage to structural and archaeological remains; and • Reports shall be prepared for all archaeological investigations	

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		undertaken at the project site. **CR-B**: The following shall be implemented in the event that a discovery is encountered: • When a discovery is encountered, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity shall cease. As soon as possible, all other ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the discovery shall also be redirected. • A discovery encountered by construction personnel shall be reported immediately to the archaeological monitor/project archaeologist. • All traffic through the construction area where a discovery has been made shall be redirected. Only traffic necessary to remove vehicles and equipment within the area shall be allowed to continue. In most cases laths with flagging, traffic cones, or temporary fencing shall be installed at the discovery location as markers to prevent accidental impact by construction equipment or other sources. • The archaeological monitor shall evaluate and verify the discovery. During verification and evaluation of the discovery, the archaeological monitor shall have the authority to probe and shovel, and otherwise investigate the find to the extent necessary to determine whether the remains qualify as a discovery. If	

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		it is determined that the potential discovery is non-cultural, or not culturally significant, the archaeological monitor shall notify the State Representative that work can resume. • If the archaeological monitor determines that the find is cultural but does not qualify as a discovery (i.e., an isolated occurrence, materials less than 50 years old, displace cultural remains that are obviously out of primary context, or due to another specific reason), the archaeological monitor shall confer with the project archaeologist and document the find in the daily log, on project maps, collect any necessary samples, and acquire global positioning system date for the find. • If a discovery has been made, and the documentation of the discovery will entail continued investigation, then an area of at least 30 feet (10 meters) surrounding the discovery shall be fenced with safety fencing. The archaeological monitor shall immediately notify the on-site State Representative and the project archaeologist of the discovery. In the event of a discovery, an initial discovery report shall be completed by the archaeological monitor. The report	

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		shall document the location of the resource, the date and circumstances of the discovery, a description of the discovery, photographs, recommendations, and agencies involved. In the event that the discovery entails construction impacts to a previously known, flagged cultural resource within the Area of Potential Effects, or a known or unknown cultural resource beyond the Area of Potential Effects, the initial report shall identify whether the site is new or existing, how the damage was discovered, the date and time of the damage, the party responsible for the damage and his or her supervisor, witnesses to the damage, a detailed description of the damage, agencies notified of the damage, and actions taken as a result of the damage. • A comprehensive Discovery/ Damage Report incorporating all of the project discoveries and damage assessment situations shall be prepared and submitted to the responsible agencies following completion of construction activities and field documentation. This report shall include a narrative description of each discovery or damage assessment (including a justification for the evaluation), the context, USGS quadrangle map	

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		location, drafted site maps, feature plan maps, profiles, photographs, analytical results (e.g., artifacts recovered, samples analyzed), interpretation of the resources within the context of the project research design, and recommendations. • An updated site record form shall be completed and submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center and to park offices. • Any artifacts recovered during monitoring shall be curated with CDPR. The artifacts and faunal remains shall be cataloged under a CDPR accession number that is different from the accession numbers used during the previous evaluation and study phases.	
CR-3: The proposed project could potentially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. With adherence to applicable guidelines and procedures, impacts would be less than significant.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PR-4: The proposed project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
GEO-1: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, or liquefaction.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
GEO-2: The proposed project would not be located	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
on an unstable geologic unit.			
GEO-3: The proposed project would be located on potentially expansive soils.	Significant	**GEO-A**: As Medium expansion potential soils are limited to the upper two feet of the project site, these clayey materials shall be removed from the area within and extending five feet outside the building footprint and used in non-structural areas. Additionally, surficial clayey soils shall be removed in areas proposed for hardscape features. All backfill of clayey soil removed shall have an EI value of less than 20, and the building foundations, slabs, and hardscape shall be designed for Very Low expansion potential. If surficial clayey soils are left in place or recompacted and used as fills below structural elements, any foundations, slabs, or hardscape supported on these materials shall be designed for Medium expansion potential. If footings, slabs, and hardscape are designed for Low to Very Low expansion potential, then any clayey materials (typically the upper two feet) shall be removed, all backfill below these elements shall have an EI value of 20 or less. Unless all clayey topsoils are removed, foundations, slabs, and hardscape shall be designed for Medium expansion potential.	Less than Significant
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: The proposed project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
GHG-2: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: The proposed project would 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.	Significant	**HAZ-A**: Should previously unknown areas of metal and/or TPH contaminated soils be encountered during construction activities, the soil shall be stockpiled, sampled, and properly managed on the basis of sampling results. **HAZ-B**: Should previously unknown subsurface groundwater contamination, which could potentially expose enclosed spaces to VOCs, be encountered within the proposed building areas on-site during construction activities, a qualified abatement consultant shall abate the contaminate areas in compliance with applicable state regulations. **HAZ-C**: During construction, a methane mitigation system shall be implemented in all new structures in coordination with a methane consultant. This shall include a vapor barrier, granular soil layers, and other elements installed within the 12 inches of soil directly below any new building slab.	Less than Significant
HAZ-2: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HAZ-3: The proposed project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, may potentially create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	Significant	See mitigation measures HAZ-A and HAZ-B above.	Less than Significant
HAZ-4: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
evacuation plan.			
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYDRO-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-4: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in on- or off-site flooding.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-5: The proposed project would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, nor would the proposed project provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-6: The proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-7: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
HYDRO-8: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
NOISE			
NOISE-1: The proposed project would not generate or expose persons to noise levels in excess of established standards.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
NOISE-2: The proposed project would not generate or expose persons to excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
NOISE-3: The proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
NOISE-4: The proposed project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.	Significant	**NOISE-A**: Special events that would include use of an audio system with amplifiers or fireworks displays within the project site shall require a special event permit from local authorities with jurisdiction. The permit shall require a noise management plan that includes the following: • Short-term (no less than 20-minute) ambient noise measurements taken within one month of the event at the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site (sensitive receptors shall be defined in the most recent L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide); • A site plan showing placement of the stage (if used) and each amplifier, and/or showing the placement of the fireworks launch area; • Predicted combined noise levels from the amplifiers or fireworks displays at the sensitive receptors; and • If necessary, measures to reduce amplified or fireworks noise levels to less than 10 dBA over the ambient noise levels at the	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		receptors. The event-specific noise management plan shall be incorporated into the special event permit prior to its issuance by the local authorities with jurisdiction. CDPR shall receive a copy of the noise management plan. **NOISE-B**: No less than two weeks before a special event that involves amplified sound and/or fireworks, the event organizer(s) shall inform individual property owners/tenants within 1,000 feet of the project site of the date and location of the event, the activities that would take place at the event, and the potential for the event to be audible at off-site locations. A telephone number shall be provided where a representative of the event organizer or other party would respond to questions or comments regarding the event. This requirement shall be incorporated into the special event permit prior to its issuance by the local authorities with jurisdiction.	
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
PS-1: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities or require the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of fire stations to maintain service.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
PS-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-3: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-4: The proposed project would not result in or accelerate the substantial physical deterioration of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or recreational facilities.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-5: The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of parks and recreational facilities.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-6: The proposed project would not result in substantial physical adverse impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-7: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-8: Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project from existing entitlements and resources.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-9: The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-10: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Additionally, the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

TABLE ES-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential Environmental Impacts	Significance Determination	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
commitments.			
PS-11: The proposed project would not 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.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-12: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
PS-13: The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
TRANS-1: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
TRANS-2: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
TRANS-3: The proposed project does not include aviation-related uses and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
TRANS-4: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable
TRANS-5: The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance of safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable

This page is intentionally left blank.