

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
 - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
 - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
 - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
 - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question and
 - b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL (INITIAL STUDY) CHECKLIST

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title: Los Angeles State Historic Park Master Development Plan

Project ID#
PCA#

Contact Person: Tina Robinson, Environmental Coordinator **Telephone:** (619) 220-5300

Location: Los Angeles State Historic Park, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Checklist Date: November 2008

Project Description:

The California Department of Parks and Recreation is preparing the Los Angeles State Historic Park Master (LASHP) Development Plan and initiating the environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Park General Plan/EIR (SCH # 2003031096) was approved by the State Park and Recreation Commission on June 10, 2003. The Master Development Plan synthesizes the General Plan/EIR goals and guidelines into design concepts that will be implemented in phases as funding becomes available. The 32-acre site occupies a critical nexus within the geography and cultural history of Los Angeles. LASHP is located at the foot of the Elysian Hills on the previous site of the historic Southern Pacific River Station Railyard, between the channelized Los Angeles River and the expanding downtown core of the city. Surrounded by several diverse downtown neighborhoods, the Park's proposed long-term development design will express many of the interwoven histories and the multi-cultural significance of this site, while satisfying a broad range of year round recreational opportunities. The LASHP Master Development Plan includes the potential re-creation of more than ten acres of natural habitats and blends the historical importance and narratives of the site with programs, environments, and built structures to establish a major public open space and destination for future generations to celebrate the past, present, and future of Los Angeles. The site would include gateways, ecology demonstration projects, and ecology center, civic gathering and play areas, pathways, a lawn and performance venue, and cultural interpretive themes and sites.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
1. AESTHETICS.				
<u>ISSUES</u>				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS

The setting is a partially developed park located within a heavily urbanized light commercial/industrial area. There are residential areas nearby and ongoing planning efforts may bring new housing and mixed uses within close proximity. Design will be developed to maximize park views, attributes and goals identified in the General Plan.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Design of the Park's built features will incorporate public, professional, and other stakeholder concepts in accordance with the General Plan to develop a unique urban park that incorporates cultural, community and natural features.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. Would the project:

ISSUES

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

Although the Park has been used historically for agriculture, it is fully located within an urban setting and not on the inventory for Prime, Unique, or Important Farmland. Recently, a Park demonstration project planted corn on the site as part of a community interpretive event but not as commercial farmland. The use of the site as farmland prior to the railroad occupying the land will be part of the Park interpretation of the site's history.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

No mitigation required

3. AIR QUALITY.

ISSUES

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

COMMENTS:

The Park is in a non-attainment area for air quality so people attending activities at the Park during a poor air quality event could be exposed to poor air quality. It is not anticipated that the Park would be substantial generator of pollutants due to the small amount of parking at the site and the availability of users to access the Park from the Gold Line light rail.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Mitigation will be explored during the development of the EIR, however, it is not anticipated that there will be substantial mitigation measures employed due to limited effectiveness of or ability of the lead agency to control potential mitigation measures for the site.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

Except for limited natural landscape plantings, here are no biological resources on the site. However, the Master Development Plan would propose to add such resources to the site if a source of water can be reliably delivered.

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

PROPOSED MITIGATION

No mitigation required but biological enhancements may be added to the project.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The site contains significant, intact historic archaeological artifacts, particularly building foundations associated with the first rail station in Los Angeles and other important remnants of the settling of Los Angeles. These features will be preserved and interpreted as part of the Park development.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Phase II archaeological testing has been undertaken at the Park and significant features will be avoided during construction.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

All work will proceed according to current design standards and protocols and include a geotechnical evaluation. Standard BMPs will be incorporated to address potential erosion during construction and as part of the project design. The site is located near the Raymond Fault, identified on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and located in southern California, an area identified for frequent seismic events. The geotechnical evaluation will address this issue, and identify appropriate design measures to ensure safety standards are met. These issues will be further identified in the EIR. The project will connect to City of Los Angeles water and sewer systems.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Construction will occur per the site recommended design standards and protocols.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The site was remediated for hazardous waste prior to the acquisition of the property by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR). However, test wells indicated the presence of groundwater contamination. This issue will be addressed in greater detail in the EIR as studies are conducted and evaluated. The project would not create hazardous substances since the site is in Park use and the materials used for construction and construction methods will proceed with appropriate protocols and conditions to prevent the release of any potential hazardous substances. There are two schools within 1/4 mile of the project site, however, they are not directly adjacent to the site and separated by industrial uses. An adopted emergency response plan will be developed for the site by CDPR and include response plans for special events. The project site is in a urban location and not subject to wildland fires nor likely to produce landscaping that would place nearby land uses at risk of wildland fire.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Possible mitigation or remediation required for groundwater contamination - possibly from offsite source. Will be addressed in EIR in detail.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project site, although not part of the Los Angeles River channel, is located nearby and at a higher elevation. In order to utilize the river as a water source for the proposed wetland and riparian interpretive area on the project site, water would have to be piped onto the site from a location upstream. In concert with plans proceeding with the City of Los Angeles, a drainage system would also need to be constructed to remove water from the project site. All work would be coordinated with cooperating agencies for this portion of the project and in compliance with water quality standards.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Mitigation, if required, would be identified during the preparation of the EIR as design details are developed.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The Park is an existing site that will not divide existing communities but is anticipated to serve as a community focal point. The City of Los Angeles is actively planning land use changes adjacent and near the Park and CDPR is coordinating to ensure

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

that these planning efforts are compatible. No habitat is located on the site but a demonstration project may include the creation of habitat for interpretation.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

No mitigation is required but CDPR will continue to coordinate planning efforts with the City of Los Angeles.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

No mineral resources are located on the project site.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

No mitigation required.

11. NOISE.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

COMMENTS:

Project events may require mitigation as they occur and CDPR will coordinate with the City of Los Angeles in order to minimize potential noise impacts to future residents. However, in the existing condition, there are few residences in a close enough proximity to the Park. Therefore, there would be little increase in ambient noise levels to existing adjacent, sensitive land uses. Park users would be subject to high noise levels during special events such as concerts but these would be temporary in nature. Ambient noise levels from park users would be increased as the Park is used by more visitors

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Mitigation measures for special events will be addressed in the EIR. No other mitigation is anticipated at this time.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The City of Los Angeles is concurrently undergoing planning efforts to introduce mixed commercial and residential uses in the project area. CDPR is coordinating with the City of Los Angeles on their planning efforts but it is not anticipated that existing housing would be relocated. New infill development may occur in close proximity to the Park because the Park Master Development Plan will make mixed use development more attractive in the immediate area.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

No mitigation is required but CDPR will coordinate closely with the City of Los Angeles to develop appropriate uses at the Park site.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| CDPR? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The Park Master Development Plan will create a popular urban park utilized by many of the area's residents and attract regional users as well. It will become a community focal point and resource and require appropriate support to maintain its features and function. Additionally, special events will require additional public services for public safety and operational support.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Specific mitigation strategies will be developed and discussed in the EIR

14. RECREATION.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional CDPR or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

CDPR will provide a new recreational opportunity to underserved urban communities as well as regional users. It is anticipated that operational public safety and maintenance support will be needed to adequately service the Park, especially as the visitor use increases with implementation of the Master Development Plan

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Specific mitigation strategies will be developed and discussed in the EIR

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The project will attract greater numbers of park visitors to the site, particularly during special events. It is not anticipated that the site will contain adequate parking if these visitors were to all use motor vehicles to access the site. The Chinatown Station on the Gold Line light rail system is located immediately adjacent to the Park and it is anticipated that many visitors will access the Park without the need to drive motor vehicles. Additionally, joint planning is ongoing with the City of Los Angeles and other parties for additional parking areas offsite. A traffic study and further refinement of the traffic and parking issues will be addressed in the EIR.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Specific mitigation strategies will be developed and discussed in the EIR

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project will have new water and sewer service needs that will be addressed in the EIR. Since the project is a park use, it is anticipated that many of these needs would be minor in nature.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

Specific mitigation strategies will be developed and discussed in the EIR

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Would the project:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

- d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?

COMMENTS:

Due to its nature as an urban park and the sensitivity of the cultural resources on the project site, planning efforts will need to incorporate many issues during the development of the Master Development Plan and EIR. It is anticipated that the cultural resources will be fully protected and interpreted as part of the project. The Park may play a substantial role as an urban feature in the City of Los Angeles and require continued coordination in both long-term and special event planning between C DPR and the City of Los Angeles.

IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study,

- I find that the proposed project could not have an adverse 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 because the mitigation measures described in the attached Mitigation appendix will be required. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

PREPARER: Tina Robinson

TITLE: Environmental Coordinator **DATE:** November 2008