

# Executive Summary

---

This document is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed One San Pedro (OSP) Specific Plan Project (hereafter referred to as the “proposed project” or “project”) located in the community of San Pedro, in the city of Los Angeles, California. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this section of EIR/EIS contains a brief summary of the proposed project and its potential environmental effects pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Also included in this section is an overview of the purpose and focus of the EIR/EIS, a description of the organization of this EIR/EIS, a general description of the proposed project, a general description of areas of controversy, a description of the public review process for this EIR/EIS, a list of the project design features (PDFs) and mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the proposed project, and a summary of the evaluated alternatives to the proposed project, including identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The reader is referred to Section 7, *Environmental Impact Statement*, for a summary of potential environmental effects pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) under the proposed project and evaluated alternatives.

## Purpose of the EIR/EIS

### Purpose of the EIR

As described in Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an informational document that informs decision-makers and the general public of the environmental impacts resulting from a project, identifies possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and considers reasonable project alternatives. The purpose of this EIR is to focus the discussion on the project’s potential environmental effects that have determined to be, or potentially may be, significant. Feasible mitigation measures are included, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid the project’s significant environmental impacts. As the CEQA Lead Agency, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) has the principal responsibility for processing and considering approval of the project for purposes of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21067. HACLA will consider the information in this EIR, along with other information that may be presented during the CEQA compliance process. The EIR will be used in connection with other permits and approvals necessary for construction and operation of the project.

### Purpose of the EIS

As described in the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Title 40, Chapter V, Subchapter A, Section 1502.1 (40 CFR Section 1502.1), the primary purpose of an EIS is to ensure that federal agencies consider the environmental impacts of their actions and inform decision-makers and the public of reasonable project alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Section 7 of this EIR/EIS acts as the EIS for the project and has been prepared in conformance with NEPA (42 United States Code [USC] Section 4321 et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations for Environmental Review Procedures for Entities Assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities (24 CFR Part 58). The NEPA procedures are to be followed by all federal agencies and apply to HUD policy actions (as defined in 24 CFR Section 50.16), and to all HUD project actions (as defined in 24 CFR 50.2[a]). Pursuant to 40 CFR Section 1500.2(c), NEPA is required to integrate its requirements with other planning and environmental review procedures (such as CEQA) that are required by law, so that all such procedures

run concurrently rather than consecutively. LAHD and HUD have the principal responsibility for processing and considering approval of the project for purposes of NEPA. The Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD), on behalf of HUD, is the NEPA Lead Agency, and decision-maker concerning the project in accordance with 42 USC Section 5304(g) and HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 58. LAHD will consider the information in this EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS will be used in connection with other permits and approvals necessary for construction and operation of the project.

## EIR/EIS Focus and Resources Not Discussed in Detail

### EIR Analysis

The EIR provides a detailed discussion of the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the EIR. Section 4.16, *Effects Found Not to be Significant*, of this document provides a discussion of the reasons the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to agriculture and forestry resources, biological resources, energy, mineral resources, or wildfire.

### EIS Analysis

The EIS provides a detailed discussion of the following resources:

- Aesthetics/Visual Quality
- Air Quality
- Global Climate Change, GHG Emissions, and Sea Level Rise
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Historic Resources
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise and Vibration
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Water Resources and Water Quality
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Socioeconomics
- Environmental Justice

Section 7.4.2, *Resources Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis in the EIS*, describes the environmental resources pursuant to NEPA that would not be affected by the project and the basis for their elimination from further analysis. These include airport hazards, coastal barrier resources,

floodplain management and flooding, coastal zone, farmlands and agricultural resources, sole source aquifers, federal wetlands and waters of the United States, wild and scenic rivers, unique natural features, federally listed as threatened and endangered species, and vegetation and plant communities.

## Existing Project Site Conditions

The project site consists of two locations in the community of San Pedro in the southwestern-most portion of the city of Los Angeles: One San Pedro Specific Plan Site (OSP Specific Plan Site) and 327 Harbor Site. The approximately 20-acre OSP Specific Plan Site encompasses approximately nine city blocks bounded by Santa Cruz Street on the north, Harbor Boulevard on the east, 3rd Street on the south, and Mesa Street on the west. The approximately 0.6-acre 327 Harbor Site is located one block to the north of the OSP Specific Plan Site at 319-327 North Harbor Boulevard. The project site is located on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, approximately 0.5 mile southeast of the southern terminus of SR-110, on the west side of Harbor Boulevard. The project site lies within the Barton Hill neighborhood of the community of San Pedro. Barton Hill is characterized as a low-density residential area with mostly single-family houses. The OSP Specific Plan Site is denoted by Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 7449-018-900 through -902, 7449-017-900 through -902, 7455-027-929 through -931, and 7455-017-900. The 327 Harbor Site is identified by APNs 7449-014-013 and 7449-014-014.

The OSP Specific Plan Site is currently occupied by Rancho San Pedro, a 478-unit public housing community with approximately 8,000 square feet (sf) of amenities, services, and administration within 60 buildings. The OSP Specific Plan Site is currently developed with the Rancho San Pedro public housing complex (hereafter referred to as “Rancho San Pedro”). Rancho San Pedro is considered eligible for listing in the in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Place, and as a City Historic Cultural Monument. OSP Specific Plan Site is zoned and has land use designations of Low Medium II Residential (RD1.5-1XL-CPIO<sup>2</sup>), which allows multi-family residential development of 18 to 29 dwelling units per acre, a height limit of 30 feet, and a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 3:1, and Community Commercial (C2-2D-CPIO<sup>3</sup>), which permits commercial uses such as hotels, restaurants, and retail; multi-family residential development; a height limit of 75 feet; and a maximum FAR of 4:1. The “D” limitation of the C2-zoned lots requires new projects to comply with the San Pedro Community Plan Implementation Overlay (CPIO) District and was established as Subarea 170 under Ordinance No. 185,541.

The 327 Harbor Site is a previously disturbed, currently vacant and undeveloped fenced site consisting of grasses, shrubs, and two palm trees. The 327 Harbor Site has a land use designation of Community Commercial, which allows commercial and mixed-use development. The 327 Harbor Site is within the San Pedro Community Plan Central Commercial Subarea E and is zoned Community Commercial ([T][Q]C2-2D-CPIO<sup>4</sup>). The “Q” conditions and “D” limitations are detailed in Ordinance No. 185,541. The ordinance states the 327 Harbor Site is not subject to the San Pedro Community Plan Implementation Overlay if the property is developed in compliance with the conditions in Ordinance No. 181,362 and the conditions of approval in City Planning Case No. CPC-2007-1513-GPA-ZC-HD-

---

<sup>2</sup> The “1XL” refers to the height district, which allows heights up to 30 feet. The “CPIO” indicates the OSP Specific Plan Site is governed by the San Pedro Community Plan Implementation Overlay.

<sup>3</sup> The “2” refers to the height district, which allows heights up to 75 feet.

<sup>4</sup> The “T” indicates there is a Tentative Classification on the parcel that shall be removed by the recordation of a final parcel or tract map. The “Q” indicates there are Qualified Conditions of Approval imposed on the use of the property. The “D” indicates there are Development Conditions imposed on the use of the property.

CDO-SPR. These conditions of approval and entitlements describe a 54-unit mixed-use residential building with 1,470 sf of commercial use at street level, which was approved by the City in 2010.

The project site is also within the boundary of the Pacific Corridors Redevelopment Plan Area. The OSP Specific Plan Site has a land use designation of Residential in the plan area, which allows single- and multi-family housing consistent with the San Pedro Community Plan. The 327 Harbor Site has a land use designation of Industrial in the Pacific Corridors Redevelopment Plan, which allows industrial uses consistent with the San Pedro Community Plan. Residential and mixed-use development consistent with the San Pedro Community Plan may also be permitted in Industrial areas, provided the development meets the criteria established in Section 503.4 of the Pacific Corridors Redevelopment Plan.

## Description of the Proposed Project

This EIR/EIS has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The following is a summary of the full project description, which can be found in Section 2, *Project Description*.

### Project Overview

The proposed project involves the development and occupation of 47 residential units on the 327 Harbor Site, the adoption of the OSP Specific Plan to guide redevelopment of the OSP Specific Plan Site, the phased demolition of existing structures on the OSP Specific Plan Site, and the construction of up to 1,553 residential units on the OSP Specific Plan Site, as well as 85,000 sf of Neighborhood Serving Uses and 45,000 sf of commercial retail uses on the OSP Specific Plan Site. The 85,000 sf of Neighborhood Serving Uses would be primarily for the benefit of the residents of the proposed project and/or residents of the immediate neighborhood and are typically required for the needs of the future residents. These uses include, but are not limited to, a property management office, community rooms, social service offices, social hall, workforce development office, health clinic, wellness center, business incubator, nonprofit offices, and municipal offices. Neighborhood Serving Uses also include small-scale retail not exceeding 3,000 sf in size that would provide goods and services to future residents to meet typical needs, such as dry cleaners, flower shops, small convenience stores, and bakeries. The 45,000-sf commercial retail component of the proposed project would include businesses larger than 3,000 sf such as restaurants, grocery stores, and pharmacies. In addition, the proposed project would include a variety of public open space amenities, including a linear park along Palos Verdes Street, a community center, a youth sports field, a pedestrian street along 2nd Street from Palos Verdes Street to Harbor Boulevard, and several courtyards and plazas interspersed throughout the proposed buildings. In total, approximately 5.3 acres of public open space would be provided on the OSP Specific Plan Site. Parking on the site would include a mix of street parking and one- to two-level underground parking structures beneath the proposed buildings. The proposed project would generate an anticipated net increase of approximately 2,602 residents and 314 employees on the OSP Specific Plan Site. Table ES-1 provides an overview of the project characteristics for the OSP Specific Plan Site and Table ES-2 provides an overview of the project characteristics for the 327 Harbor Site.

**Table ES-1 OSP Specific Plan Site – Summary of Project Characteristics**

<b>Buildings</b>					
<b>Residential Uses (number of units)</b>					
<b>Replacement Affordable Housing</b>		<b>Additional Rental Housing</b>		<b>Ownership Homes</b>	
One-Bedroom	88	Affordable Housing	564	Affordable Ownership	45
Two-Bedroom	240	Market-Rate Rental	480	Market-Rate Ownership	32
Three-Bedroom	65				
Four-Bedroom	30				
Five-Bedroom	9				
<b>Total</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,044</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>
Residential Gross Building Area		1,660,910 sf			
<b>Non-residential Land Uses</b>					
Commercial/Retail		Up to 45,000 sf			
Neighborhood Serving		Up to 85,000 sf			
<b>Non-residential Gross Building Area</b>		<b>Up to 130,000 sf</b>			
<b>Overall OSP Specific Plan Site</b>					
Floor Area		1,946,163			
FAR		2.1:1			
<b>Parking</b>					
Garage Parking Spaces		1,390			
Garage Electric Vehicle Charging Spaces		230			
<b>Total Garage Vehicle Parking Spaces</b>		<b>1,800</b>			
On-Street Vehicle Parking Spaces <sup>1</sup>		292			
<b>Total Vehicle Parking Spaces</b>		<b>2,092</b>			
Secured Bicycle Parking Spaces		1,600			
<b>Open Space and Landscaping</b>					
Landscaped Area		504,051 sf			
Public Open Space		230,000 sf			
Common Open Space		143,050 sf			
Private Open Space		77,650 sf			
<b>Total Open Space</b>		<b>450,700 sf</b>			

sf = square feet

<sup>1</sup> The on-street parking spaces are not being counted as required parking. They would be constructed as part of the project infrastructure improvements.

**Table ES-2 327 Harbor Site – Summary of Project Characteristics**

<b>Residences</b>	
One-Bedroom Units	12
Two-Bedroom Units	23
Three-Bedroom Units	12
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>47</b>
Gross Building Area	66,210 sf
Floor Area	48,270 sf
FAR	2.15:1
<b>Parking</b>	
Standard Spaces	11
Electric Vehicle Charging Spaces	14
Compact Spaces	14
Tandem Spaces	2
Accessible Spaces	4
<b>Total Vehicle Parking Spaces</b>	<b>45</b>
Secured Short-Term Bicycle Parking	6
Exterior Long-Term Bicycle Parking	42
<b>Total Bicycle Parking Spaces</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Open Space and Landscaping</b>	
Common Open Space	4,906 sf
Private Open Space	2,100 sf
<b>Total Open Space</b>	<b>7,006 sf</b>
Landscaped Area	6,040 sf

sf = square feet

## Development Phases, Subareas, and Scenarios

The OSP Specific Plan includes three Phases<sup>1</sup> and four Subareas<sup>2</sup> (see Figure 2-7). To respond to the need for flexibility in existing resident relocation, the availability of funding for affordable housing and infrastructure, and project requirements resulting from future demographic and economic demands due to the length of the proposed project, the OSP Specific Plan includes a density reallocation program provision that permits the limited reallocation of dwelling units and floor area between Phases. The reallocation of units and floor area from a “donor” Phase may result in the exceedance of maximum dwelling unit and floor area yield allowed in the “recipient” Phase and Subarea by up to 20 percent. However, the total development across the OSP Specific Plan Site may not exceed 1,553 residential units, 45,000 sf of commercial uses, and 85,000 sf of Neighborhood Serving Uses. As such, the environmental impact analysis in this document considers two scenarios: (1) Scenario A, in which the Phases are built to the maximum development, and (2) Scenario B, in which Phases 1 and 2 are recipient Phases and Phase 3 is a donor Phase. Table ES-3 provides a comparison of OSP Specific Plan Site buildout under each scenario. Scenarios A and B are described in detail in Section 2.5.2.2, *Proposed Site Plan and Development Scenarios*.

<sup>1</sup> Phases are the geographic division of land within the OSP Specific Plan Site for the purposes of phasing the redevelopment.

<sup>2</sup> Subareas establish permitted uses within the boundaries of the OSP Specific Plan Site.

**Table ES-3 OSP Specific Plan Site Scenario A and Scenario B Development Summary**

Location	Scenario A Maximum Development			Scenario B Maximum Development		
	Dwelling Units	Commercial Retail Uses (sf)	Neighborhood Serving Uses (sf)	Dwelling Units	Commercial Retail Uses (sf)	Neighborhood Serving Uses (sf)
Phase 1	375	0	32,000	450	0	39,000
Phase 2	600	25,000	30,000	673	30,000	37,000
Phase 3	578	20,000	23,000	430	15,000	9,000
<b>Total Site</b>	<b>1,553</b>	<b>45,000</b>	<b>85,000</b>	<b>1,553</b>	<b>45,000</b>	<b>85,000</b>

## Relocation Plan

The phasing of the proposed project is planned to minimize disturbance to current residents on the OSP Specific Plan Site. The proposed project would pursue a build-first approach. When residents must be relocated, HACLA would adhere to all requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. Resident relocation would be guided by the One San Pedro Relocation Plan. The Relocation Plan sets forth procedures to assure the fair, uniform, and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes when development occurs. It identifies the administrative requirements for conducting relocation and sets forth relocation standards, occupancy standards, methods for obtaining replacement housing, payments available, and other related provisions of relocation practices.

## Green Building Features

The proposed project is based on principles of smart growth and environmental sustainability, as evidenced in its mixed-use nature, the project site's proximity to downtown San Pedro, accessibility of public transit, and availability of existing infrastructure to service the proposed uses. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate features to achieve LEED® Gold, Greenpoint, or similar rating system certification for residential and non-residential buildings. Such features would include energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, and water conservation measures, among others. Water conservation features would include a range of techniques that enhance site sustainability. As described above, drought-tolerant plants and indigenous species would be used in the proposed landscaping program. Stormwater would be collected and cleansed through a first-flush filtration system of rain gardens and urban bioswales, both within proposed parks and throughout the street network. Stormwater filtration planters would collect roof water. The proposed project would also comply with the latest Title 24 and building code regulations related to sustainability during project development. The minimum sustainability features and regulatory measures that would be implemented as part of the proposed project are detailed in Section 2.5.3.

## Project Construction

Construction of the 327 Harbor Site project component is anticipated to commence in 2023, with completion in 2025, and construction of the OSP Specific Plan is anticipated to occur over three Phases spanning approximately 14 to 20 years. For the purposes of a conservative analysis, it is anticipated that under both Scenario A and Scenario B, construction of Phase 1 is anticipated to occur between 2024 and 2030, construction of Phase 2 is anticipated to occur between 2031 and 2035, and construction of Phase 3 is anticipated occur between 2034 and 2037. Construction would be broken

up into 11 stages to minimize impacts to existing residents. Construction stages 1 through 4 would occur in Phase 1, construction stages 5 through 7 would occur in Phase 2, and construction stages 8 through 11 would occur in Phase 3.

## Project Design Features

The following PDFs would be implemented as part of the proposed project.

### *Aesthetics*

#### **PDF AES-1 Anti-reflective Glass**

The OSP Specific Plan includes a requirement that glass used in building façades be low-reflective or treated with an anti-reflective coating to minimize glare. Consistent with applicable energy and building code requirements, including Section 140.3 of the California Energy Code as may be amended, glass with coatings required to meet the Energy Code requirements will be permitted. This requirement will also apply to development on the 327 Harbor Site.

#### **PDF AES-2 Outdoor Lighting**

As required by the OSP Specific Plan, all new outdoor lighting required for the project will be shielded and directed towards the interior of the project site such that the light source does not project directly upon any adjacent property, while maintaining adequate lighting levels for public safety and security. This requirement will also apply to development on the 327 Harbor Site.

#### **PDF AES-3 Mechanical Equipment and Utility Screening**

As required by the OSP Specific Plan, mechanical, electrical, and roof top equipment (including HVAC systems), as well as building appurtenances and trash enclosures, will be integrated into the project's architectural design and screened from view. This requirement will also apply to development on the 327 Harbor Site.

### *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*

#### **PDF GHG-1 Photovoltaic Solar**

Active photovoltaic (PV) solar will be installed on the project site to produce a minimum rate of 15 percent electricity demand for either Scenario<sup>3</sup>.

#### **PDF GHG-2 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**

The proposed project will comply with Tier II voluntary Title 24 measures which require that a total of 40 percent of parking spaces are EV ready and a minimum of 15 percent of parking spaces are equipped with EV chargers<sup>4</sup>. Consistent with these requirements, a minimum of 855 spaces would be EV ready and EV charging stations would be incorporated on site to accommodate a minimum of 321

---

<sup>3</sup> Under the proposed project, 15 percent reduction in carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) emissions from PV solar offsets would result in a reduction of 156 metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually for Scenario A and 165 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually for Scenario B.

<sup>4</sup> EV ready = a vehicle space which is provided with a branch circuit and any necessary raceways to accommodate EV charging stations, including a receptacle for future installation of a charger (see California Green Building Standard Code, Title 24 Part 11 for full explanation of mandatory measures, including exceptions).



spaces for Scenario A and B (15 percent of total parking spaces)<sup>5</sup>. In addition to the added EV charging stations, electric outlets for use by delivery vehicles in loading areas shall be incorporated where feasible.

### **PDF GHG-3 Additional Measures**

The following additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures will be incorporated into the proposed project, as feasible, as outlined in the Transportation Assessment (Fehr & Peers 2023)<sup>6</sup>:

- Construction of a mobility hub at 1st Street;
- Implement/improve on-street bicycle facilities;
- Include bicycle parking per the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC);
- Include secure bike parking and showers (end of trip facilities);
- Improve pedestrian network within the project site;
- Use of transit subsidies assuming that 7 percent of employees and residents are eligible and a daily equivalent of \$5.96 is subsidized;
- Implementation of a car-share program; and
- A comprehensive bicycle-share program for the development.

#### *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Implementation of PDF T-1 from the Transportation section (see below) would also reduce impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

#### *Land Use and Planning*

Implementation of PDF GHG-1 through PDF GHG-3 from the Greenhouse Gas Emissions section (see above) and PDF T-1 from the Transportation section (see below) would also reduce impacts associated with land use and planning.

#### *Public Services*

Implementation of PDF T-1 from the Transportation section (see below) would reduce impacts associated with public services. In addition, the following PDFs would be implemented to reduce public services impacts.

### **PDF POL-1 Construction Security**

During construction on the OSP Specific Plan site and the 327 Harbor Site, the project Applicant will implement temporary security measures including security fencing (e.g., chain-link fencing), low-level security lighting, and locked entry (e.g., padlocked gates or guard-restricted access) to limit access by the general public. Regular private security patrols during non-construction hours will be provided.

---

<sup>5</sup> The inclusion of 321 EV charging spaces would result in a reduction of 6,013 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) annually for Scenario A and 6,035 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e annually for Scenario B. The difference is based on anticipated CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity factors for the various years and the years of implementation of the charging stations based on the timing of residential development by phases. Electric use by delivery vehicles is not quantified as this portion of the measure is not specific enough to provide the detail needed to model emissions reductions.

<sup>6</sup> Implementation of these measures would reduce annual vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 718,320 (Appendix I of this EIR/EIS). This would reduce GHG emissions from the project by approximately 206 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e.

### **PDF POL-2 Safety Lighting**

As required by OSP Specific Plan, the project will provide sufficient lighting of building entries and walkways to provide for pedestrian orientation and clearly identify a secure route between parking areas and points of entry into buildings. The project will also provide sufficient lighting of parking areas, elevators, and lobbies to maximize visibility and reduce areas of concealment. This requirement will also apply to development on the 327 Harbor Site.

### **PDF POL-3 Operational Security**

The project will provide a security program to ensure the safety of residents, employees, and other visitors to the project site. The project would incorporate strategies in design and planning, as well as active security features. On-site security measures during project operation will include:

- Provide on-site security personnel at the OSP Specific Plan Site, as necessary, whose duties shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - Monitoring entrances and exits;
  - Patrol the perimeter of the property;
  - Control and monitor activities in the public spaces and private outdoor areas;
  - Managing and monitoring fire/life/safety systems; and
  - Controlling and monitoring activities in the parking facilities.
- Install security industry standard security lighting at recommended locations, including parking areas, pedestrian pathways, and alleys.
- Install closed-circuit television at select locations, including, but not limited to, entry and exit points, lobby areas, outdoor open spaces, and parking areas.
- Provide adequate lighting of parking areas, elevators, and lobbies to reduce areas of concealment.
- Provide lighting of building entries and open spaces to provide pedestrian orientation and to clearly identify a secure route between the parking areas and access points.
- Prominently display throughout the project site the contact information for on-site security staff.

This PDF will also apply to the 327 Harbor Site.

### **PDF LIB-1 Universal Wi-Fi**

The proposed project will include free, publicly accessible Wi-Fi in the residential common areas and publicly accessible open space areas of the OSP Specific Plan Site, as required by the Master Development Agreement. This PDF also applies to the 327 Harbor Site.

## *Recreation*

### **PDF REC-1 Recreational Programming**

Programming for the proposed parks will include the following:

- **Palos Verdes Linear Park:** The park will include a variety of playgrounds serving different ages and physical abilities, a picnic area, and an open field. Other potential amenities could include a skate park, dog park, and bandshell, determined through future community engagement.

- **Centre Street Park:** The park will include both indoor and outdoor space amenities to provide opportunities for art, education, sports, and exercise.
- **Harbor Plaza:** Flexible seating will be provided within the space for the public. The plaza will also be designed to host a variety of informal and programmed activities, including, but not limited to, live entertainment, outdoor games, and other community programming.
- **Paseo Plazas:** These spaces will serve as gateways into the project site as an extension of the downtown San Pedro area, and would be intended to host dynamic public art. The paseos will include art such as climbable sculptures, outdoor galleries with rotating exhibits, kiosks for selling or creating art, and art walls.

## *Transportation*

### **PDF T-1 Construction Management Plan**

Prior to the start of construction, a Construction Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) for review and approval in accordance with the time frames set forth in Executive Directive 1. The Construction Management Plan will include a Worksite Traffic Control Plan and Construction Worker Parking Plan that will facilitate traffic and pedestrian movement, minimize the potential conflicts between construction activities, street traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians, and ensure appropriate parking for construction workers is provided. Furthermore, the Construction Management Plan will include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

- A Worksite Traffic Control Plan(s), approved by the LADOT in accordance with the time frames set forth in Executive Directive 1, will be implemented to route vehicular traffic, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians around any lane and/or sidewalk closures;
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists will be implemented through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers as appropriate, especially as it pertains to maintaining safe access to the Port of Los Angeles High School;
- Minimize obstruction to land uses in proximity to the project site during construction, including temporary traffic constraints, temporary loss of access, and temporary loss of bus stops or rerouting of bus lines;
- Parking for construction workers will be provided either on-site or at off-site, off-street locations; and
- Ensure adequate emergency access is maintained to the project site and neighboring businesses and residences.

## Areas of Controversy

Based on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and/or Notice of Intent (NOI) comment letters provided in Appendix A of this EIR/EIS, issues known to be of concern include, but are not limited to, project impacts associated with air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, energy, socioeconomics, and environmental justice. Refer to Table 1-1 for a summary of the comments received and Appendix A for this EIR/EIS for copies of the NOP/NOI comment letters.

## EIR/EIS Public Review Process

Pursuant to Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, HACLA circulated an NOP to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on January 13, 2021 for a 30-day review period, which ended on February 12, 2021. Pursuant to 24 CFR Section 58.55, the NOI was published in the Federal Register (Vol. 86, No. 63) on April 9, 2021 for a 30-day review period, which ended on May 10, 2021. Pursuant to Section 15060(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study was not prepared for this project because all impacts are analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Additionally, three virtual scoping meetings were held for the project on February 6, 2021, April 27, 2021, and May 11, 2021. The public scoping meetings were held in English and Spanish. Copies of the NOP and NOI are provided in Appendix A of this EIR/EIS. The meetings allowed interested individuals, groups, and public agencies an opportunity to provide written and oral comments regarding the scope and focus of the EIR/EIS.

This Draft EIR/EIS is being circulated for a 60-day public review period. Following the public review period, a Final EIR/EIS will be prepared that will include responses to the comments raised regarding this Draft EIR/EIS.

## Summary of Environmental Impacts

Table ES-4 provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the proposed project evaluated in the EIR, pursuant to CEQA. The reader is referred to Section 7, *Environmental Impact Statement*, for a summary of potential environmental effects pursuant to NEPA under the proposed project and evaluated alternatives.

Based on the analysis in Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, implementation of the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources, construction and operational noise, and construction groundborne vibration. Implementation of the proposed project would also result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts associated with historical resources and on-site construction and operational noise. Where mitigation is required, the mitigation measures are listed below for each environmental impact area.

**Table ES-4 Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact*
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Scenic Vistas	Less Than Significant
Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway	No Impact
Visual Character	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Light and Glare	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<b>Air Quality</b>	
Conflicts with Applicable Air Quality Plan	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact*</b>
Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Odors	Less Than Significant
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	
Historical Resources <sup>7</sup>	<b>Significant and Unavoidable</b>
Archaeological Resources	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Human Remains	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	
Fault Rupture	Less Than Significant
Seismic Ground Shaking	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Liquefaction	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Landslides	Less Than Significant
Erosion	Less Than Significant
Soil Instability	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Expansive Soil	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Septic Systems	No Impact
Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	
GHG Emissions Generation	Less Than Significant
Conflicts with Plans, Policies, or Regulations	Less Than Significant
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	
Routine Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Upset and Accident Conditions, Schools, and Hazardous Materials Sites	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
Airport Hazards	No Impact
Impairment of or Interference of an Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan	Less Than Significant
Wildland Fires	No Impact
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	
Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements	Less Than Significant
Decrease Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge	Less Than Significant
Substantial Alteration of Existing Drainage Patterns	Less Than Significant
Pollutant Release Due to Inundation	Less Than Significant
Conflicts with a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan	Less Than Significant

<sup>7</sup> As discussed in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on historical resources.

Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles Housing Department  
**One San Pedro Specific Plan**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact*</b>
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>	
Physically Divide an Established Community	Less Than Significant
Conflicts with Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations	Less Than Significant
<b>Noise</b>	
Temporary or Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels <sup>8</sup>	<b>Significant and Unavoidable</b>
Groundborne Vibration	
<i>Construction</i>	<b>Significant and Unavoidable</b>
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Airport Noise	No Impact
<b>Population and Housing</b>	
Substantial Unplanned Population Growth	Less Than Significant
Displace Existing People or Housing	Less Than Significant
<b>Public Services</b>	
Fire Protection Facilities	Less Than Significant
Police Protection Facilities	Less Than Significant
School Facilities	Less Than Significant
Library Facilities	Less Than Significant
<b>Recreation</b>	
Physical Deterioration of Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities	Less Than Significant
Inclusion of Recreational Facilities	Less Than Significant
<b>Transportation</b>	
Conflicts with Programs, Plans, Ordinances, or Policies Addressing the Circulation System	Less Than Significant
Vehicle Miles Traveled	Less Than Significant
Geometric Design Features or Incompatible Uses	Less Than Significant
Inadequate Emergency Access	Less Than Significant
<b>Tribal Cultural Resources</b>	
Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>	
Construction or Relocation of Water Infrastructure	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	No Impact
Water Supply	Less Than Significant
Construction or Relocation of Wastewater Infrastructure	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	No Impact
Wastewater Treatment Capacity	

<sup>8</sup> As discussed in Section 4.9, *Noise*, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative noise impacts related to on-site construction and operational noise.

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact*
<i>Construction</i>	No Impact
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Solid Waste Generation and Infrastructure	Less Than Significant
Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Infrastructure	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	No Impact

\* Impacts apply to both the construction and operation of the proposed project, unless otherwise called out in this table.

## Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be implemented as part of the proposed project for each of the environmental areas listed below.

### *Aesthetics*

#### **AES-1 Construction Screening**

Temporary construction fencing shall be placed along the periphery of active construction staging and work areas to shield construction activity from view at the street level.

#### **AES-2 Construction Lighting**

Outdoor lighting used during construction shall be shielded and/or aimed such that the light source cannot be seen from adjacent residential properties and the public right-of-way. However, construction lighting shall be sufficient to protect the safety of construction workers.

### *Air Quality*

#### **AQ-1 Construction Equipment**

The project Applicant shall ensure the following requirements are incorporated into applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Contractors shall confirm the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities:

- Mobile off-road construction equipment (wheeled or tracked) greater than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall meet the U.S. EPA Tier 4 final standards. In the event of specialized equipment use where Tier 4 equipment is not commercially available at the time of construction, the equipment shall, at a minimum, meet the Tier 3 standards. Zero-emissions construction equipment may be incorporated in lieu of Tier 4 final equipment. A copy of each equipment's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available upon request at the time of mobilization of each piece of equipment.
- Mobile off-road construction equipment less than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall be electric or other alternative fuel type. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

- Electric hook-ups to the power grid shall be used instead of temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, whenever feasible. If generators need to be used, the generators shall be non-diesel generators.

## **AQ-2 Landscaping Equipment Electrification**

The project shall include a minimum of 25 percent electric landscaping equipment use in all contracts for landscaping services to be rendered on site. This requirement shall be added to the Master Development Agreement between HACLA and the project Applicant.

## *Cultural Resources*

### **CUL-1 Interpretive Display**

HACLA shall ensure that the project Applicant prepares and installs an interpretive display in the Phase 1 Community Room, which will be open to the public. The interpretive display shall be completed to coincide with the opening of the Phase 1 Community Room. It shall include a brief history of the historical resource, its significance in the contexts of public and defense worker housing in Los Angeles during the Second World War and public housing design related to the Garden City and Modern movements, and a description of the project which led to the demolition of the historical resource. The display shall be professionally written, illustrated, and designed, and shall include the website address associated with the informational website created by implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The content shall be prepared by persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history or architectural history in coordination with the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. The Interpretive Display may be rotated amongst Community Rooms and/or public outdoor spaces throughout the OSP Specific Plan Site with approval by HACLA.

### **CUL-2 Informational Website**

HACLA and/or the project Applicant shall add to their existing website a section dedicated to the history of Rancho San Pedro Complex and public housing in Los Angeles within six months of the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the Phase 1 Community Room. The website shall be maintained by HACLA and shall provide content on the history of Rancho San Pedro Complex, the significance of public housing in the city, and notable examples of public housing architecture and site planning. It shall include links to other scholarly sources of information on the history and design of the site within the context of public housing in the city. The new website section shall be professionally written, illustrated, and designed. The content shall be prepared by persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history or architectural history and shall be periodically updated, as needed, if new scholarly information related to the history or significance of Rancho San Pedro and public housing become available following the initial publishing of the website.

### **CUL-3 Project Archaeologist**

HACLA shall retain a Project Archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology to ensure mitigation and/or conditions of approval for the project, as they relate to archaeological resources, are completed. The Project Archaeologist shall oversee and implement the Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) and cultural resources monitoring (CUL-4 and CUL-5). The Project Archaeologist shall be responsible for preparing



and executing any testing and/or reporting programs necessary in the event of a find during project execution.

#### **CUL-4 Worker's Environmental Awareness Training**

A qualified archaeologist and Native American representative shall be retained to conduct a WEAP training on archaeological sensitivity for all construction personnel prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities associated with the project. The training shall be conducted by an archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology and a locally affiliated Native American representative. Archaeological sensitivity training shall include a description of the types of cultural materials that may be encountered, cultural sensitivity issues, the regulatory environment, and the proper protocol for treatment of materials in the event of a find.

#### **CUL-5 Archaeological Monitoring**

Working under the direct supervision of the Project Archaeologist, an archaeological monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the aforementioned activities or until the Project Archaeologist, in consultation with HACL A and monitoring tribes, determines monitoring is no longer necessary (e.g., initial ground disturbance is complete, soils are sterile for cultural resources). The archaeological monitor shall prepare daily logs to be submitted at the completion of the project as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report. In the event that previously unidentified prehistoric or historical archaeological materials or human remains are encountered during project construction, the archaeological monitor shall retain the authority to halt and/ or redirect work up to 100 feet away from the discovery until an evaluation of the resource is complete and the location of the find has been cleared for further activity by the Project Archaeologist.

A Native American monitor representing one of the consulting Native American Tribes shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the proposed project or until the Project Archaeologist determines monitoring is no longer necessary. The Native American monitor shall prepare daily logs and submit weekly updates to the Project Archaeologist. In addition, the Native American monitor shall prepare and submit a summary statement upon completion of monitoring to include in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project. The Project Archaeologist and HACL A shall review and include the statement as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project.

At the completion of monitoring, the Project Archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring Report to document the findings during the monitoring effort for the project. The report shall include the monitoring logs completed for the project and document any discoveries made during construction monitoring. The report shall also include the monitoring logs prepared by the Native American monitor for the project. The Cultural Resources Monitoring Report shall be submitted to HACL A and the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).

#### **CUL-6 Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources**

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities that have not been previously identified, work in a 100-foot radius of the find shall be halted and redirected. The Project Archaeologist or the archaeological monitor shall provide recommendations regarding the resource's

potential significance and potential treatment in consultation with the Native American monitor. If the discovery is identified to be a site (generally more than three artifacts), the evaluation shall require preparation of an Archaeological Testing Plan (ATP) to determine if the resource qualifies for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and/or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing. Such evaluations will be used to determine if the project may have a significant impact/adverse effect on the resource. Following the execution of the ATP, if the lead agency in consultation with the Project Archaeologist, determines the discovery is significant and cannot be avoided by the project, additional work such as an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) shall be completed prior to the resumption of ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area to mitigate any significant impacts to cultural resources. The ATP and ADRP are described in further detail below.

NRHP/CRHR criteria for evaluating the significance of archaeological resources shall be used in the event a cultural resource is discovered. If resources are discovered that the Project Archaeologist recommends the resource meets the significance criteria of NRHP Criterion D and or the CRHR Criterion 4, and if preservation in place is not feasible, an ADRP shall be implemented. If resources are found to meet NRHP criteria A and/or B and/or C and or the CRHR criteria 1 and/or 2 and/or 3, then representatives of the appropriate descent community or the appropriate community members shall be notified upon the determination.

- **Archaeological Testing Plan:**

The purpose of the ATP will be to determine the extent and possible presence/absence of archaeological resources and to identify whether the resources constitute an historic property or historical resource using the criteria of the NRHP/CRHR.

- The ATP shall be conducted in accordance with an approved ATP that will be reviewed by the consulting Native American Tribes.
- At the completion of the ATP, the Project Archaeologist and Staff Archaeologists shall submit a written report of the findings.
- If the Project Archaeologist determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the project, at the discretion of the project sponsors either:
  - The project shall be re-designed as to avoid any adverse effects; or
  - A data recovery program shall be implemented.

- **Archaeological Data Recovery Program:**

Should a cultural resource that qualified for NRHP/CRHR listing under Criterion D/4 for data potential be identified and cannot be avoided by the project, an ADRP shall be completed to comprehensively document the resource and exhaust the data potential. The ADRP shall be conducted by the Project Archaeologist in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's (OHP) 1990 *Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format*.

Prior to implementing the field component of the ADRP, a Data Recovery Plan (Plan) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist selected to carry out the ADRP. The Plan shall be prepared in consultation with Native American groups who have participated in consultation for the project and reviewed and approved by HACLA. The Plan shall, at minimum, include the following:

- Field Methods and Procedures
- Thresholds for Achieving Data Redundancy
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis

- Discard and Deaccession Policy
- Interpretive Program
- Security Measures
- Final Report
- Curation

## **CUL-7 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Grave Goods**

In the event human remains are unexpectedly discovered at any time during the implementation of the project, HACL, the Project Archaeologist and the project sponsors shall follow the California Health and Human Safety Code Section 7050.5, which states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. Therefore, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98(d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Any items associated with human remains that are placed or buried with Native American human remains are to be treated in the same manner as the remains in accordance with PRC 5097.98(d)(2). The NAHC shall notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD), and the MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted site access to make recommendations. The landowner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from subsequent disturbance. Any discovery of human remains or grave goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

## *Geology and Soils*

### **GEO-1 Final Geotechnical Report**

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit final design plans and a final design-level geotechnical report for the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) for review and approval. The final design-level geotechnical reports shall be used for final design of the foundation systems for the structures and shall take into consideration the engineering properties beneath the proposed structures and the projected loads. The final reports shall specify geotechnical design parameters that are needed by structural engineers to determine the type and sizing of structural building materials. The final reports shall be subject to the specific performance criteria imposed by applicable State and local codes and standards. The final geotechnical reports shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified engineering geologist and include appropriate measures to address seismic hazards and ensure structural safety of the proposed structures and future residents and employees. The proposed structures shall be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable provisions of the CBC and the Los Angeles Building Code. The final design-level geotechnical reports shall address the recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geotechnical Reports prepared by Group Delta Consultants, Inc. (Group Delta), including the following:

- Construction and operation of the proposed project shall be implemented in accordance with the applicable regulatory and code requirements.

- The subsurface geotechnical profile on the OSP Specific Plan Site is complex and variable. The transitions between native materials, fill, and groundwater conditions shall be considered in conjunction with the proposed site plans and building layouts in order to develop the most suitable foundation option for each proposed structure. All recommendations regarding the foundation options for Zones A, B, and C and Transition Zones shall be considered and implemented.
- Mat foundations, deep foundations, and pile types shall be designed and implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the geotechnical reports. The contour of the foundation pressure shall be provided during the structural design phase.
- Floor slabs may be supported on grade if the existing soils on site can be removed and replaced with properly compacted fill soils. If expansive soils are present at the slab-on-grade elevation, floor slabs shall be structurally supported.
- Temporary excavation shall be implemented using conventional heavy-duty grading equipment such as scrapers, loaders, dozers, and excavators. Temporary excavations up to 5 feet deep may stand in vertical cuts, and deeper excavations shall be sloped according to the recommendations of the final geotechnical reports. Temporary shoring shall be designed and implemented according to the guidelines set forth in the Preliminary Geotechnical Reports.
- If unstable or wet subgrade material is encountered during project design and construction, stabilization shall consist of the placement of granular working mats consisting of course gravel and geogrid, or subexcavation and replacement with dried soil.
- Basement walls shall be in compliance with the Los Angeles Building Code to resist at-rest earth pressures. The recommended pressure shall be confirmed during the design-level geotechnical investigations and shall consider the presence of expansive soils, which may require the use of higher design earth pressures.
- Final design-level geotechnical investigations shall assess the corrosion potential of on-site soils and the extent and severity of expansive soils.
- Sandy soils, after clearing, grubbing, and removal of deleterious material, are generally suitable for reuse as compacted fills. However, not all on-site sandy soils will be suitable for specific purposes, and selective grading and testing may be required if on-site soils are to be used as select materials. Import fill sources, if any, shall be observed and tested prior to hauling onto the site to evaluate the suitability for use. Imported fill shall comply with the guidance outlined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Reports.
- Further study is required to accurately characterize the complex subsurface conditions on the OSP Specific Plan Site. Design-level geotechnical investigations shall be conducted, and the installation of monitoring wells, borings, and cone penetration tests shall be completed to narrow down the location of uncertified fill transitions zones and further characterize the subsurface materials.

## **GEO-2 Geotechnical Professional Observation**

A certified geotechnical professional shall be retained to observe and test all grading operations for shallow foundations and pile installation for deep foundations during the construction stage of the project. Furnishing of pile load test results shall be required. Evidence of the observations of the certified geotechnical professional at the project site shall be provided to the City Engineer in the form of weekly logs during all grading operations for foundations and pile installation activities.

### GEO-3 Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation

1. **Qualified Paleontologist.** The project applicant shall retain a Qualified Paleontologist to direct all mitigation measures related to paleontological resources. A qualified professional paleontologist is defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) standards (SVP 2010) as an individual preferably with an M.S. or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology who is experienced with paleontological procedures and techniques, who is knowledgeable in the geology of California, and who has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor for a least two years (SVP 2010).
2. **Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program.** Prior to the start of construction, the Qualified Paleontologist or their designee shall conduct a paleontological WEAP training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff.
3. **Paleontological Monitoring.** Full-time paleontological monitoring shall be conducted during ground-disturbing construction activities (i.e., grading, trenching, foundation work) within native (i.e., previously undisturbed) sediments of any depth in all project areas. Ground-disturbing activities that only impact artificial fill (i.e., previously disturbed) sediments do not require paleontological monitoring. Paleontological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, who is defined as an individual who has experience with collection and salvage of paleontological resources and meets the minimum standards of the SVP (2010) for a Paleontological Resources Monitor. The duration and timing of the monitoring will be determined by the Qualified Paleontologist based on the observation of the geologic setting from initial ground disturbance, and subject to the review and approval by the City of Los Angeles. If the Qualified Paleontologist determines full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, based on the specific geologic conditions once the full depth of excavations has been reached, they may recommend monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or ceased entirely. Monitoring shall be reinstated if any new ground disturbances are required, and reduction or suspension shall be reconsidered by the Qualified Paleontologist at that time. In the event of a fossil discovery by the paleontological monitor, all work within a 50-foot radius of the find shall cease. The Qualified Paleontologist shall evaluate the find before restarting construction activity in the area. If it is determined that the fossil(s) is (are) scientifically significant, the Qualified Paleontologist shall complete the following conditions to mitigate impacts to significant fossil resources:
  - a. **Salvage of Fossils.** If fossils are discovered, the paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt or temporarily divert construction equipment within 50 feet of the find until the monitor and/or lead paleontologist evaluate the discovery and determine if the fossil may be considered significant. Typically, fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases, larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. Bulk matrix sampling may be necessary to recover small invertebrates or microvertebrates from within paleontologically sensitive deposits.
  - b. **Preparation and Curation of Recovered Fossils.** Once salvaged, significant fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County), along with all pertinent field notes, photographs, data, and maps. Fossils of undetermined significance at the time of collection may also warrant curation at the discretion of the Qualified Paleontologist.

4. **Final Paleontological Mitigation Report.** Upon completion of ground-disturbing activity (and curation of fossils, if necessary), the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a final report describing the results of the paleontological monitoring efforts associated with the project. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered (if any), an analysis of fossils recovered (if any), and the scientific significance, and recommendations. The report shall be submitted to the City of Los Angeles. If the monitoring efforts produced fossils, then a copy of the report shall also be submitted to the designated museum repository.

## *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

### **HAZ-1 Voluntary Oversight Agreement with the Los Angeles County Fire Site Mitigation Unit**

Because contaminated soil is present on the project site, the project Applicant shall coordinate on-site remediation activities on the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site with the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) Site Mitigation Unit (SMU). Prior to initiation of soil grading, excavation, or remediation activities, the Applicant shall enter into a Voluntary Oversight Agreement with the LACFD SMU. The LACFD SMU shall oversee the assessment and remediation of the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site through completion of building demolition, excavation, soil remediation, and building construction. Prior to commencement of demolition and excavation/grading activities on the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site, the Applicant shall submit the following documents to the LACFD SMU for review and approval:

- All Environmental Site Assessments and subsurface investigation reports completed for the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site
- Current development plan, including plans for soil excavation and removal and/or vapor barriers
- Soil management plans completed for the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site
- Any additional hazardous materials-related reports completed for the project

Upon submittal of the information above, LACFD SMU may require further actions such as: additional subsurface investigation, including additional soil, soil vapor or groundwater monitoring wells; soil excavation and off-site disposal; completion of human health risk assessments; installation of soil vapor barriers, and/or completion of remediation reports or case closure documents. The Applicant shall submit all reports and documentation to the LACFD SMU for review and approval prior to initiation of soil grading, excavation, or remediation activities.

The Applicant shall obtain an approval letter from LACFD SMU prior to initiation of grading and construction activities. The approval letter shall specify that LACFD SMU is in agreement that the on-site soil has been remediated to LACFD SMU standards and project construction can commence. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit the approval letter to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety.

It should also be noted that LACFD SMU may determine that the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) may be best suited to perform the cleanup oversight agency duties for the assessment and/or remediation of the project site. Should the cleanup oversight agency be transferred from LACFD to the Los Angeles RWQCB or DTSC, this and other mitigation measures shall still apply and will be overseen by the designated cleanup oversight agency.

## HAZ-2 Soil Management Plan

Prior to commencement of grading and excavation activities at the project site, the Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (professional geologist [PG] or professional engineer [PE]) to prepare a Soil Management Plan (SMP) for the OSP Specific Plan Site and the 327 Harbor Site. The SMP shall specify the limits of soil that require removal to remediate the soil contamination on the OSP Specific Plan Site and the 327 Harbor Site. The SMP will provide the City of Los Angeles and the construction contractor with guidance and procedures for the proper handling and management of impacted soil, if any is encountered, during site construction activities. The SMP shall include measures required for compliance with all application regulations, including but not limited to, SCAQMD Rule 1466. The SMP shall address:

- On-site handling and management of contaminated soils or other hazardous wastes (e.g., stained soil, and soil with solvent or chemical odors) if such soils or hazardous wastes are encountered; and
- Specific actions to reduce hazards to construction workers and off-site receptors during the construction stages.

The SMP shall specifically address hazards to residences and schools within 0.25 mile of the project site.

The SMP must establish remedial measures and soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, the health of future workers and visitors, and the prevention of off-site migration of contaminants from the project site. These measures and practices shall include, but are not limited to:

- Stockpile management including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of Best Management Practices
- Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials
- Investigation procedures for encountering known and unexpected odorous or visually stained soils, other indications of hydrocarbon piping or equipment, and/or debris during ground-disturbing activities
- Monitoring and reporting
- A health and safety plan for contractors working at the project site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each stage of construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection
- The health and safety plan shall outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction

The project Applicant shall submit the SMP to the LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) for review and approval prior to grading, excavation, or remediation activities at the project site. The approved SMP shall be submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety prior to issuance of grading permits. The project Applicant shall ensure the construction contractor implements the SMP during demolition, grading, and construction at the project site.

## HAZ-3 Soil Remediation

Where contaminated soil that exceeds hazardous waste screening levels is known to be present on the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site, the Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental

consultant (PG or PE) to properly remove and dispose of the contaminated soil. All soil removal and disposal activities shall be conducted in accordance with the recommendations of the SMP. The qualified environmental consultant shall utilize the project site analytical results for waste characterization purposes prior to off-site transportation or disposal of potentially impacted soils or other impacted wastes. The qualified consultant shall provide disposal recommendations and arrange for proper disposal of the waste soils or other hazardous wastes (as necessary), and/or provide recommendations for remedial engineering controls, if appropriate.

Remediation of impacted soils and/or implementation of remedial engineering controls may require additional delineation of sub-surface impacts, additional analytical testing per landfill or recycling facility requirements, soil excavation, and off-site disposal or recycling.

Prior to initiation of soil excavation or soil remediation activities, the LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) shall review and approve the soil removal and disposal recommendations prior to transportation of waste soils off site and review and approve remedial engineering controls.

The project Applicant shall review and ensure the qualified environmental consultant implements the disposal recommendations prior to transportation of waste soils off site and review and implements the remedial engineering controls prior to and during construction.

The City shall review and approve the disposal recommendations and remedial engineering controls prior to issuing a grading permit.

#### **HAZ-4 Construction Vapor Monitoring Plan**

The project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a Construction Vapor Monitoring Plan. The Vapor Monitoring Plan shall specify the controls required to be implemented during construction activities at the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site to mitigate the effects of subsurface gases on workers and the public. Controls could include, but are not limited to:

- Gas monitoring devices would be present to alert workers of elevated gas concentrations when basement or subsurface soil disturbing work is being performed;
- Contingency procedures would be in place if elevated gas concentrations are detected such as the mandatory use of personal protective equipment, evacuating the area, and/or increasing ventilation within immediate work area where the elevated concentrations are detected;
- Workers would be trained to identify exposure symptoms and implement alarm response actions;
- Soil exposed during excavations would be minimized to reduce the surface area which could off-gas (this will be done by staggering exposed excavation areas);
- Soil removed as part of construction will be sampled and tested for off-site disposal in a timely manner (if soil is stockpiled prior to disposal, it would be managed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan);
- Fencing would be established to limit public access and allow for gas dilution; and
- HASP development which would describe the work activities and hazards associated with each work activity.

Hazard mitigation shall be presented in the HASP to limit construction risks to workers. The HASP shall contain emergency contact numbers, maps to the nearest hospital, gas monitoring action levels, gas response actions, allowable worker exposure times, and mandatory personal protective equipment



requirements. The HASP shall be signed by all workers on site to demonstrate their understanding of the construction risks.

The Applicant shall submit the Construction Vapor Monitoring Plan to the LACFD SMU for review and approval. The Applicant shall submit the approved Construction Vapor Monitoring Plan to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety prior to issuance of a grading permit.

### **HAZ-5 Vapor Mitigation System**

Where soil vapor is known to be present at chemical concentrations exceeding screening levels for sub-slab/soil gas (vapor) intrusion, the project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) or other qualified person to prepare a soil vapor Human Health Risk Assessment for the OSP Specific Plan Site and 327 Harbor Site. The Human Health Risk Assessment shall evaluate the risk to future on-site residences from VOCs in on-site soil vapor. If the Human Health Risk Assessment determines that a vapor mitigation system is required for the proposed building, the qualified environmental consultant shall prepare a Vapor Mitigation Plan and shall design the vapor mitigation system for the proposed project.

The Vapor Mitigation Plan shall include, but is not limited to:

- Design specifications
- Material specifications
- Installation requirements
- Monitoring requirements

The qualified environmental consultant shall design and implement engineering measures or institutional controls (e.g., soil vapor barrier) to prevent potential soil vapor intrusion into new residences or businesses in accordance with the measures included in the DTSC's Vapor Intrusion Guidance Document – Final (October 2011) and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Advisory, Revision 1 (October 2011), or current guidance (DTSC 2011a and 2011b).

The Applicant shall submit the Human Health Risk Assessment and Vapor Mitigation Plan to the LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) for review and approval prior to construction. Design of engineering measures or institutional controls shall be submitted to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits. If determined to be required by the Human Health Risk Assessment, the contractor shall incorporate a sub-slab vapor barrier during construction, the implementation of which would prevent the potential for soil gas VOCs from migrating to indoor air.

The Applicant shall retain a qualified professional to certify that the required vapor measures and controls are properly constructed and functioning at the project site. The efficacy of the measures and controls shall be confirmed and certified by a qualified professional pursuant to the construction quality assurance/quality control testing guidance of the DTSC's Vapor Intrusion Guidance Document – Final (October 2011). Written verification shall be submitted to the LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) and the City prior to issuance of Certificates of Occupancy.

LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) may require the creation of a Soil Vapor Operations and Maintenance Plan to ensure that future operational activities (e.g., underground utility repairs), do not alter the effectiveness of the selected vapor mitigation system. LACFD SMU (or other designated oversight agency) shall review and approve the Soil Vapor Operations and Maintenance Plan (if required) prior to occupancy. The City shall review the Operations and

Maintenance Plan (if required) prior to Certificates of Occupancy. The project Applicant shall implement the Operations and Maintenance Plan during occupancy at the project site.

## Noise

### **NOI-1 Construction Noise Reduction Measures**

The following measures shall be implemented at the project site during construction to minimize the community exposure to construction noise:

- All construction equipment shall be outfitted with manufacturer-recommended mufflers and silencers.
- Staging and delivery areas shall be located as far as feasible from existing residences.
- Material hauling and deliveries shall be coordinated by the construction contractor to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload for protracted periods of time.
- To the extent feasible, hydraulic equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic impact tools, and electric powered equipment shall be used instead of diesel-powered equipment.
- For smaller equipment (such as air compressors and small pumps), line powered (electric) equipment shall be used to the extent feasible.
- Stationary noise sources (e.g., generators and air compressors) shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers.
- Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the on-site construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes. The construction manager shall be responsible for enforcing this.
- At least 10 days prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the entrance(s) to the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as the telephone numbers of the City's and contractor's authorized representatives that are assigned to respond in the event of a noise or vibration complaint. If the authorized contractor's representative receives a complaint, they shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the City. The sign will have a minimum dimension of 48 inches wide by 24 inches high. The sign shall be placed 5 feet above ground level.
- Temporary noise barriers of 12-feet in height shall be erected along the project property boundaries adjacent to sensitive receivers. Barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. Alternately, if an acoustical blanket, curtain or equivalent absorptive material is used, it shall be rated sound transmission class (STC) 32 or higher.

### **NOI-2 Stationary Recreational Noise Reduction Measures**

The following measure shall be included to minimize stationary recreational noise at the OSP Specific Plan Site:

- Prior to holding the first amplified event at any new site with amplified sound (e.g., at the youth sports field and bandshell), HACLA or its designee shall install signs at entry points that state prohibited activities during the event (e.g., use of air horns, unapproved audio amplification systems, loud activity in parking lots or streets upon exiting the facility). In addition, and prior to

holding the first amplified event at the facility, the sound system contractor shall create a PA System Design Plan to minimize special event noise at nearby residences, to the extent feasible. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, bandwidth and peak limiter installation, and speaker angle and directivity techniques. Prior to the first amplified special event, the sound system contractor shall perform a system check to verify that the PA system meets the PA System Design Plan.

- Once the precise locations and design details of the project's proposed youth sports field and other potential recreational uses, such as a skate park, bandshell, and/or dog park, is finalized, HACLA or its designee shall conduct a quantitative analysis of the operational noise levels from such sources to determine if the project's recreational uses would result in an exceedance of the City of Los Angeles' exterior noise level standards. If these recreational uses will not exceed established thresholds, no additional measures are necessary. However, if it is determined that these recreational uses could potentially result in exceedance of the City's adopted exterior noise standards, the project Applicant shall be required to implement additional feasible measures to minimize noise generated at the recreational uses. Such additional measures to reduce recreational noise impacts may include, but are not limited to, operational hour restrictions, setbacks, barriers, and other shielding techniques. HACLA shall verify these additional measures are included on the final site plan prior to issuing construction permits for the recreational uses.

### **NOI-3 Construction Vibration Reduction Measures**

Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the following measures shall be included as notes on all construction plans:

- If paving activities occur within 25 feet of off-site buildings or structures, a pneumatic or static roller shall be used in lieu of a vibratory roller.
- Grading and earthwork activities within 15 feet of adjacent residential structures shall be conducted with off-road equipment that is limited to 100 hp or less.

### *Tribal Cultural Resources*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

#### **TCR-1 Native American Monitoring by the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council**

Consistent with Mitigation Measure CUL-5 in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*, a Native American monitor representing the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council shall be invited to monitor during ground-disturbing activities for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the aforementioned activities or until the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American monitor determines monitoring is no longer necessary based on soil conditions and negative findings, whichever occurs first. In the event a mutual agreement cannot be made between the Project Archaeologist and the Native American monitor to terminate monitoring services prior to the end of ground-disturbing activities, the Native American monitor shall be given the opportunity to continue monitoring for tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities. The project Applicant shall notify the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council at least 30 days prior to commencement of ground-disturbing construction activities and request monitoring services. The Tribe must respond to the request for monitoring within 30 days of the notification. The Applicant

shall provide HACLA with a copy of the executed tribal monitoring agreement with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council prior to commencement of construction. If no response from the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council is received within 30 days, project construction can commence without the monitoring services of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council for the duration of ground-disturbing construction activities.

The Native American monitor shall prepare daily monitoring logs that provide the location, type and description of the ground-disturbing construction activities performed, soil types, and cultural materials, if discovered. The daily monitoring logs shall describe Native American artifacts, remains, and places of significance, as well as any Native American human remains or burial goods, if identified. The Native American monitor shall submit weekly updates to HACLA. In addition, the Native American monitor shall prepare and submit a summary statement upon completion of monitoring to include in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project. The Project Archaeologist and HACLA shall review and include the statement as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project.

### **TCR-2 Consultation with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council in the Event of Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources**

In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, work within a 100-foot radius of the find shall be halted and redirected. HACLA shall consult with the Project Archaeologist and initiate Native American consultation procedures with the project's consulting tribes. If HACLA, in consultation with the Native American monitor representing the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with State guidelines and in consultation with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and other consulting tribes. The mitigation plan may include, but would not be limited to, avoidance, capping in place, excavation and removal of the resource, interpretive displays, sensitive area signage, and/or other mutually agreed upon measures. The mitigation plan shall be prepared within 30 days of discovery of the find(s) and approved by the HACLA Chief Executive Officer or their designee. Procedures for the unanticipated discovery of human remains and associated grave goods are outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-7 in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*.

### **TCR-3 Native American Monitoring by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation**

Consistent with Mitigation Measure CUL-5 in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*, a Native American monitor representing the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation shall be invited to monitor during ground-disturbing activities for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the aforementioned activities or until the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American monitor determines monitoring is no longer necessary based on soil conditions and negative findings, whichever occurs first. In the event a mutual agreement cannot be made between the Project Archaeologist and the Native American monitor to terminate monitoring services prior to the end of ground-disturbing activities, the Native American monitor shall be given the opportunity to continue monitoring for tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities. The project Applicant shall notify the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation at least 30 days prior to commencement of ground-disturbing construction activities and request monitoring services. The Tribe must respond to the

request for monitoring within 30 days of the notification. The Applicant shall provide HACL A with a copy of the executed tribal monitoring agreement with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council prior to commencement of construction. If no response from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation is received within 30 days, project construction can commence without the monitoring services of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation for the duration of ground-disturbing construction activities.

The Native American monitor shall prepare daily monitoring logs that will provide the location, type and description of the ground-disturbing construction activities performed, soil types, and cultural materials, if discovered. The daily monitoring logs shall describe Native American artifacts, remains, and places of significance, as well as any Native American human remains or burial goods, if identified. The Native American monitor shall submit weekly updates to HACL A. In addition, the Native American monitor shall prepare and submit a summary statement upon completion of monitoring to include in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project. The Project Archaeologist and HACL A shall review and include the statement as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project.

#### **TCR-4 Consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation in the Event of Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources**

In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, work within a 100-foot radius of the find shall be halted and redirected. HACL A shall consult with the Project Archaeologist and initiate Native American consultation procedures with the project’s consulting tribes. If HACL A, in consultation with the Native American monitor representing the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with State guidelines and in consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and other consulting tribes. The mitigation plan may include, but would not be limited to, avoidance, capping in place, excavation and removal of the resource, interpretive displays, sensitive area signage, and/or other mutually agreed upon measures. The mitigation plan shall be prepared within 30 days of discovery of the find(s) and approved by the HACL A Chief Executive Officer or their designee. Procedures for the unanticipated discovery of human remains and associated grave goods are outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-7 in Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*.

#### **TCR-5 Tribal Cultural Resource Finds Dispute Resolution**

In the event a resource(s) of Native American origin is identified during monitoring, including but not limited to projectile points, chipped stone, groundstone, beads, and shell artifacts, that cannot be directly associated with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council or the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation through analysis, such as deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) analysis, HACL A shall request a consultation meeting with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to consult on the disposition of the find(s). The tribes must respond within 30 days of the consultation request and the meeting shall occur no later than 45 days after HACL A transmits the request for a consultation meeting. As part of a good faith effort, HACL A shall reach out to the tribes via telephone up to two times during that 30-day period to attempt to schedule a consultation meeting. If any one tribe does not respond to HACL A’s consultation request within 30 days, HACL A may consult with the responding tribe as to the disposition of the find(s). If both tribes respond to HACL A’s consultation request within 30 days,

HACLA shall consult with both tribes to determine final disposition of the find(s) and, if desired by the tribe(s), a reburial ceremony(ies).

Once the consultation effort is complete, HACLA shall notify the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation in writing as to the final disposition of the find(s). The timing and location of any reburial efforts shall be determined by HACLA based on the construction schedule and availability of a reburial location. Construction activities may continue on site outside the 100-foot radius during the consultation effort and may resume at the location of the find(s) once the find(s) has been secured. In the event a mutual agreement on the treatment of the resource(s) cannot be made between the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation within 30 days of the initial consultation meeting, the artifact(s) under review shall be reinterred on site in a location free from future ground-disturbing construction activities. In the event that neither tribe consults with HACLA on the find(s), HACLA shall rebury the artifact(s) on site in a location free from future ground-disturbing construction activities. This measure does not apply to the finding of human remains which must comply with California Health and Safety Code 7050.5.

## Summary of Alternatives

This EIR/EIS examines three alternatives to the proposed project, which includes the No Project Alternative, the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative, and the Partial Preservation Alternative. Descriptions of these alternatives are provided below. The reader is referred to Section 6, *Alternatives*, for a comparative analysis of the impacts of these alternatives with those of the proposed project and a description of the alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible.

### *Alternative 1 No Project Alternative*

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states in part that, “in certain instances, the No Project Alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.” Accordingly, for purposes of this analysis, Alternative 1 assumes that the proposed project would not be approved, no new permanent development would occur within the project site, and the existing conditions would be maintained. However, HACLA would continue to maintain the site in accordance with its standard practices and policies and abide by regulatory requirements such as the need for seismic upgrades. Residential unit renovations would continue to occur over the long term as units become vacant and turn over. Thus, the physical conditions of the project site would generally remain the same as existing conditions. Specifically, the existing Rancho San Pedro housing complex would remain on the OSP Specific Plan Site, and the 327 Harbor Site would remain vacant and undeveloped. No new development would occur under the No Project Alternative.

### *Alternative 2 Historic Rehabilitation*

Under the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative (Alternative 2), the OSP Specific Plan would not be implemented, and the existing Rancho San Pedro buildings would not be demolished. The existing buildings on the OSP Specific Plan Site would be rehabilitated and would continue to be used for public housing by existing/future residents. The existing housing is generally substandard in quality and does not meet the HUD unit size standards. Existing physical deficiencies would require building upgrades in the long term, as described in the Physical Needs Assessment completed for the existing buildings in 2017 (EMG 2017). Alternative 2 would include the necessary extensive repairs to ensure

the structures are up to current Building Code standards for historic properties, ensure seismic safety and integrity, remediate suspect asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead based paint (LBP) contaminants, modernize building HVAC systems and appliances to the extent feasible, upgrade and repair electrical systems, remediate Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility deficiencies, exterminate any present termites and remediate termite damage, and repair deficient sewer and water infrastructure serving the site. Rehabilitation would be completed in conformance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Secretary's Standards) (National Park Service [NPS] 2017) and in accordance with the California Historic Building Code. Rehabilitation activities on the OSP Specific Plan Site would generally involve the use of small hand and power tools typically used for housing renovation. Under this alternative, the 327 Harbor Site would be developed with the same land uses as the proposed project, which would consist of a four-story, 47-unit multi-family affordable housing development. Certain PDFs required by the OSP Specific Plan would not be included under Alternative 2, as they would be infeasible or would not be applicable, including the following:

- PDF GHG-1, Photovoltaic Solar
- PDF GHG-2, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
- PDF GHG-3, Additional Measures
- PDF POL-3, Operational Security
- PDF LIB-1, Universal Wi-Fi
- PDF REC-1, Recreational Programming

### *Alternative 3 Partial Preservation*

Under the Partial Preservation Alternative (Alternative 3), the original portion of Rancho San Pedro, completed in 1942, consisting of 284 dwelling units, would be preserved and rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary's Standards and in accordance with the California Historic Building Code, as described above under Alternative 2. Building deficiencies identified under Alternative 2 would be remediated for those buildings to be preserved and rehabilitated, and the existing, original Rancho San Pedro buildings would continue to serve as public housing. The preserved and rehabilitated buildings would include 284 existing residential units. The Rancho San Pedro expansion that was completed in 1953, which includes 194 existing residential units, would be demolished in phases and redeveloped with new, improved multi-family housing, amenities, and commercial retail uses under a modified version of the OSP Specific Plan. There would be a total of 1,207 residential units on the OSP Specific Plan Site, consisting of 923 newly constructed residential units, including 194 replacement affordable housing units, 390 market-rate rental units, 275 affordable units, 32 market-rate homeownership units, and 32 affordable homeownership units. In addition, 45,000 sf of commercial uses, 61,500 sf of Neighborhood Serving Uses, and one acre of refurbished public open space and one acre of new open space would be developed. Under Alternative 3, development on the 327 Harbor Site would consist of a four-story, 47-unit multi-family affordable housing development, consistent with the proposed project.

### **CEQA Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates an analysis of alternatives to a project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative based on the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The environmentally superior alternative is defined as the alternative with the least adverse impacts on

the project site and its surrounding environment. Section 15126.6(e)(2) also states if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Of the alternatives analyzed in this EIR/EIS, the No Project Alternative would avoid all of the proposed project's significant environmental impacts, including the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to historical resources, construction noise and vibration, and operational noise. Alternative 1 would avoid the proposed project's cumulatively considerable contributions to historical resources and construction noise impacts. However, the No Project Alternative would result in increased impacts to transportation compared to the proposed project.

In accordance with the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines to identify an environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. The Historic Rehabilitation Alternative is the only alternative that would both result in new development and eliminate the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources and operational noise. The Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would rehabilitate Rancho San Pedro in accordance with the Secretary's Standards and the California Historic Building Code. In addition, the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would not include sources of recreational noise at the OSP Specific Plan Site, and therefore, would reduce the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impact related to operational noise. Furthermore, the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would reduce most of the proposed project's impacts due to a reduction in development, with the exception of impacts related to temporary construction-related displacement, consistency with transportation policies, and transportation design hazards. Although significant and unavoidable construction noise and vibration impacts would occur under the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative, of the range of alternatives analyzed, the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would result in the fewest significant and unavoidable impacts and would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, the Historic Rehabilitation Alternative would only partially achieve the project objectives, and would not meet the underlying purpose of the proposed project or satisfy the project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project.