

Discovery Cube Los Angeles Courtyard Improvement Project

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration



Prepared for:

City of Los Angeles

Department of Recreation and Parks
221 North Figueroa Street, Room 400
Los Angeles, California 90012

Contact: *Elena Maggioni, Environmental Supervisor*
213.482.6980



Prepared by:

Tetra Tech, Inc.

17885 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 500
Irvine, California 92614-5227

Contact: *Paula Fell*
Environmental Task Manager
949.809.5147

June 2024

DISCOVERY CUBE LOS ANGELES IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This serves as the Notice of Intent by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Discovery Cube Los Angeles Improvement Project; prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its guidelines.

Name of Project: Discovery Cube Los Angeles Improvement Project (“Project”).

Project Location: The approximately 0.5-acre Project site is located at 11800 Foothill Boulevard at the intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Osborne Street in the City of Los Angeles.

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles
Department of Recreation and Parks
221 North Figueroa Street, Room 400
Los Angeles, California 90012

Project Description: The Project involves renovation of the existing outside area with features and exhibits emphasizing sustainability of Discovery Cube Los Angeles (DCLA). The Project will involve creating additional outdoor exhibits emphasizing sustainability at its campus. The area to be improved is referred to as the “front yard” and is located immediately south of the entrance to the science center. All work is planned within the DCLA property, and no work is planned outside the property.

The Project site is not designated a hazardous waste property, nor is it a hazardous waste disposal site as defined under Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the above-cited Project. This Mitigated Negative Declaration is based on the finding that the Project’s potential impacts will be maintained at a less than significant level. The reasons to support such a finding are documented by the Initial Study prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. The proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and supporting materials are available for review at the Lake View Terrace Library 12002 Osborne St, Los Angeles, CA 91342 and on the Discovery Cube Los Angeles website at <https://www.discoverycube.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Discovery-Cube-LA-Initial-Draft-IS-MND-6122024-clean.pdf>

For questions regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration, please contact:

NAME:	Denise Aguilar	PHONE:	213.482.6976
TITLE:	Environmental Specialist	EMAIL:	Denise.Aguilar@lacity.org

ADDRESS: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
221 North Figueroa Street, Room 400
Los Angeles, California 90012

Public Review Period: 22 days **Begins:** 7/01/2024 **Ends:** 7/22/2024

Public Meeting: Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be considered at a public meeting by the Department of Recreation and Parks Board of Commissioners which is scheduled to take place on August 15, 2024, at the Friendship Auditorium at 3201 Riverside Dr, Los Angeles, CA 90027 at 9:00 a.m.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, any comments concerning the findings of the proposed Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration must be submitted in writing and **received by the no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 22, 2024**, in order to be considered prior to the final determination on the Project by the Department of Recreation and Parks Board of Commissioners. Please submit your written comments to Denise Aguilar, Environmental Specialist, City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 221 North Figueroa Street, Room 400, Los Angeles, California, 90012 or via email to Denise.aguilar@lacity.org.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1	STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND REQUIREMENTS	1-1
1.2	REQUIRED CONTENT	1-1
2.0	PROJECT INFORMATION	2-1
2.1	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	2-2
	2.1.1 Regional	2-2
	2.1.2 Project Area.....	2-2
2.2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-2
	2.2.1 General Description	2-2
	2.2.2 Site Plan	2-3
	2.2.3 Construction Details.....	2-4
	2.2.4 Operations	2-4
	2.2.5 Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features	2-4
2.3	PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED.....	2-6
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	3-1
3.1	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	3-1
3.2	DETERMINATION: (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY).....	3-1
3.3	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	3-2
3.4	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS	3-3
	3.4.1 AESTHETICS	3-3
	3.4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	3-6
	3.4.3 AIR QUALITY	3-8
	3.4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	3-15
	3.4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	3-19
	3.4.5.1 Federal Land Patent Search	3-24
	3.4.5.2 Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Land File Search	3-24
	3.4.6 ENERGY.....	3-27
	3.4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	3-29
	3.4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	3-33
	3.4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	3-35
	3.4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	3-38
	3.4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	3-41
	3.4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES	3-42
	3.4.13 NOISE.....	3-43
	3.4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING	3-46
	3.4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES.....	3-47
	3.4.16 RECREATION	3-49
	3.4.17 TRANSPORTATION.....	3-50
	3.4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	3-52
	3.4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	3-54
	3.4.20 WILDFIRE.....	3-56
	3.4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	3-58
4.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	4-1
5.0	REFERENCES.....	5-1

List of Tables

Table 3-1. State and Federal Criteria Pollutant Standards3-9
Table 3-2. South Coast Air Basin Attainment Status 3-10
Table 3-3. Cultural Resources Previously Recorded within 0.25 mile of the Project.3-22
Table 3-4. Cultural Resource Studies Previously Conducted within Project Site.3-22
Table 3-5. Review of Historic USGS Maps and Aerial Photographs for Township 2 North
Range 14 West, no Section.3-23
Table 3-6. Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment3-44

List of Figures

Figure 1 Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2 Project Location Map
Figure 3 Zoning Designation
Figure 4 Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan Area Map
Figure 5 Project Site Plan

Appendices

Appendix A Cultural Resources

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	micrograms per cubic meter
Air Basin	South Coast Air Basin
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
BMP	Best Management Practices
BP	before present
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of Los Angeles
dBA	A-weighted decibels
DCLA	Discovery Cube Los Angeles
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
GHG	greenhouse gas
LACFCD	Los Angeles County Flood Control District
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
Plan area	Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan area
PM_{10}	inhalable particulate matter
$\text{PM}_{2.5}$	fine particulate matter
PRC	Public Resources Code
Project	Discovery Cube Los Angeles Courtyard Improvement Project
Project site	northeast quadrant of the City of Los Angeles, in the central portion of Los Angeles County
PV	photovoltaic
RAP	City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
RTP/SCS	Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE	Southern California Edison
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SLF	Sacred Land Files
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Discovery Cube Los Angeles (DCLA) is an existing children’s science center located at 11800 Foothill Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 91342. The DCLA Courtyard Improvement Project (Project) site is on property owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and leased to the City of Los Angeles (City). The City, in turn, has leased use of the property to Discovery Science Foundation since December 2012. The Project involves renovation of DCLA’s existing outside area with features and exhibits emphasizing sustainability. The City’s Recreation and Parks Department (RAP), as Lead Agency, and USACE have requested that DCLA complete an environmental checklist prior to approving changes to the property. An Initial Study, following the most recent California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Checklist Form (Appendix G – 2023), has been prepared for the Project.

Following an initial review of the proposed Project, RAP has determined that it is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Initial Study addresses the environmental effects of the Project, as proposed.

1.1 STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND REQUIREMENTS

This Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared by RAP with technical assistance from Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) to evaluate if implementation of the Project would have a significant effect on the environment. Pursuant to Section 15070 of the *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act* (14 California Code of Regulations Sections [§§] 15070-15075), a public agency shall prepare or have prepared a proposed negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration for a project subject to CEQA when:

- (a) *The initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, or*
- (b) *The initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but:*
 - (1) *Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and*
 - (2) *There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.*

1.2 REQUIRED CONTENT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15071 indicate that a Negative Declaration circulated for public review shall include:

- (a) *A brief description of the project, including a commonly used name for the project, if any;*
- (b) *The location of the project, preferably shown on a map, and the name of the project proponent;*
- (c) *A proposed finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment;*
- (d) *An attached copy of the Initial Study documenting reasons to support the finding; and*
- (e) *Mitigation measures, if any, included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects.*

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title:	Discovery Cube Los Angeles Courtyard Improvement Project
Lead agency name and address:	City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks 221 North Figueroa Street, Room 400 Los Angeles, California 90012
Contact person and phone number:	Elena Maggioni, Environmental Supervisor 213.482.6980
Project sponsor's name and address:	Discovery Science Foundation 11800 Foothill Boulevard Los Angeles, California 91342
Contact person and phone number:	Stephen Sandland, A.I.A. Vice President Construction Discovery Science Foundation 949.294.4417
Project location:	The proposed Project site is located in the northeast quadrant of the City, in the central portion of Los Angeles County. The Project site is located at 11800 Foothill Boulevard at the intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Osborne Street. See Figure 1, Project Vicinity Map, and Figure 2 Project Location Map
General Plan Designation:	Open Space
Zoning Designation:	Open Space. See Figure 3, Zoning Designation.
Surrounding land uses:	Surrounding land uses primarily consist of municipal, recreation, commercial, and multi-family residential. Nearby major cross streets are Foothill Boulevard to the north and Osborne Street to the west. Interstate 210 is located approximately 0.26 miles to the north.

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1.1 Regional

The Project site is located in the Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan area (City of Los Angeles 2016a, 2020a), see Figure 4. The Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan is located approximately 23 miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles. It is bounded to the northwest by the City of San Fernando, northeast of the Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow Hills-Lake View Terrace, southeast of Sun Valley, and to the west of Mission Hills-Panorama City-Sepulveda Community Plan. The area is comprised of several subareas, the most prominent of these areas being Arleta, Pacoima, Hansen Dam, Northeast Valley Enterprise Zone, and Earthquake Disaster Assistance Project Area. The Hansen Dam area is bounded by Osborne Street to the northwest, Glenoaks Boulevard to the southwest, and the Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow Hills-Lake View Terrace and Sun Valley communities to the east.

The remainder of the DCLA is located in the Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan area (City of Los Angeles 2016b). This Plan area lies in the northeast quadrant of the City of Los Angeles. It is approximately 15 miles from downtown Los Angeles. Surrounding areas include: the Angeles National Forest, Little Tujunga Canyon, Big Tujunga Canyon, Kagel Canyon, the Deukmejian Wilderness Park, and a portion of the Verdugo Mountains. The community lies adjacent to the cities of Glendale and Burbank, and to the Los Angeles communities of Sun Valley and Arleta-Pacoima. Hansen Dam Park, Orcas Park, Verdugo Hills High School, and the Verdugo Hills Golf Course are situated within the Plan area. Tujunga Canyon Wash and natural resource preserve areas are also located in the community, as are flood plains of washes from watersheds draining portions of the San Gabriel Mountains. The Plan area is predominately comprised of open space/vacant land with Low Density Residential stretching across the center. Foothill Boulevard provides a shallow corridor of commercial land with concentrations of multiple family residential intermixed with commercial uses (City of Los Angeles 2016b).

2.1.2 Project Area

The Project site is approximately 0.26 miles south of Interstate 210 at the intersection of Foothill Boulevard and Osborne Street (Figure 1). The Project site is bordered by recreational uses and open space to the southwest and southeast, commercial uses to the northwest, and multi-family residential to the northeast.

The DCLA is located within the Project site. DCLA is a children's science center with more than 100 hands-on science exhibits designed for education, learning and fun.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.2.1 General Description

The Project will involve creating additional outdoor exhibits emphasizing sustainability at its campus, see Figure 5. The Project includes preparing a portion of the site (approximately 0.5 acre) for the exhibits as well as demolition of part of an existing structure. Preparing for the new area development includes grading, connecting utilities, providing drainage, and paving. The demolition work involves removal of a large room (about 1,000 square feet) currently attached to the main building at the campus. The area to be improved is referred to as the "front yard" and is located immediately south of the entrance to the science center. The room to be removed is on the southwest side of the main building. The Project site currently contains picnic tables, landscaping (including three large pine trees), lighting, a dinosaur fossil statue, a stormwater bioretention basin, and perimeter chain-link fencing. The three existing large pine trees located in the Project site yard will be protected in place. All work is planned within the DCLA property, and no work is planned outside the property. There is an existing Los Angeles County Flood

Control District (LACFCD) flood-control channel located adjacent to the site. The channel will not be impacted by the Project and will be protected in place.

2.2.2 Site Plan

As shown in Figure 5, the proposed Project would consist of improvements to the existing DCLA outdoor facilities. The courtyard improvements will highlight sustainable energy, water supply and preservation of the Los Angeles River, wildlife conservation, and fire science and safety. These improvements would include:

- Conservation solar carousel. The carousel, located near the courtyard entrance, features colorful animals representing protected and endangered species. The carousel will have a shade structure attached to the main building with solar panels to provide power for the carousel. The existing, approximately 1,000 square foot birthday party room, currently attached to the DCLA main building, will be demolished in order to install the carousel.
- Outdoor amphitheater stage and covered bench seating area. The outdoor stage will include a large format video wall, surround sound, built-in lighting and audio/visual equipment.
- Flex Space Pavilion (FSP). The outdoor FSP, approximately 1,250 square feet in size, will be used for multiple functions such as STEM education and community and private events. The FSP will replace the space lost from the demolition of the existing birthday party room. The FSP open space design will allow for multiple configurations and will also contain audio visual equipment.
- Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River exhibit. The exhibit will include Water Table exhibits highlighting specific features of these rivers while educating guests on conservation and preservation of these large, and important waterways.
- Fire Ranger Training Camp exhibit. The Fire Ranger Training Camp exhibit area will feature a fire truck with working water hoses for putting out fires, and an obstacle course for guests to climb and traverse, with focus on strengthening and stretching muscles, practicing communication skills, and building teamwork. The exhibit features a splash pad for children that will also include a helicopter guests can explore and learn how these aerial vehicles are used, both in combating wildfires and in aiding rescues.
- Cube structure. The Cube will serve as a symbol for DCLA. The Cube will be approximately 30 feet tall on a vertex and will highlight brand colors and generate power via solar panels.
- Courtyard Gardens. The Courtyard Gardens will demonstrate the plants and flowers that provide a habitat for pollinators. A variety of drought tolerant plants will be located in the gardens as well. Additionally, animal exhibitions featuring current day local wildlife to dinosaurs of our past will be featured throughout the gardens.
- Stormwater runoff improvements. In order to free up area to accommodate the above-mentioned exhibitions, the existing storm water runoff retention basin will need to be relocated. DCLA will work with the Los Angeles Department of Sanitation to create a new Low Impact Development Plan (LID Plan) using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to capture and use storm water runoff, where possible, as well as to clean the runoff before it drains into the adjacent drainage channel. The LID Plan will consider utilizing areas at the corner of Osbourne Street and Foothill Boulevard and the strip of landscaping along Foothill Boulevard before the runoff flows into the courtyard, where the runoff will be captured and retained for slow release into the drainage channel. The LID Plan will likely use a combination of below grade storage chambers and biofilters.

The Project will have significant areas of permeable surface for landscaping. Permeable material will be used for paving wherever possible. The final LID Plan will be created in conjunction with the final site plan and grading plan for the courtyard.

2.2.3 Construction Details

The Project will be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 will include demolition of the existing birthday party room, construction of the carousel and shade structure, construction of the Cube, and associated area development. Phase 2 will include all of the other Project features. Construction of Phase 1 is expected to start in the summer of 2024 and continue through the fall of 2024. Upon completion, Phase 1 will be open to the public while Phase 2 is under construction. Phase 2 will start after the completion of Phase 1 and last until approximately the fall of 2026.

During both phases, construction will be performed during regular work hours, primarily on weekdays with work on weekends performed only when required.

Construction BMPs will be used including those for stormwater, erosion/sediment control, and spill prevention. All staging and stockpiling will occur onsite. Waste and excess debris will be hauled away for disposal.

2.2.4 Operations

DCLA Courtyard Improvement Project exhibits will be operated and maintained by DCLA staff. DCLA hours of operation are seven days a week, typically from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Evening events will be held occasionally.

2.2.5 Mitigation Measures / Project Design Features

The Project will incorporate the following Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features:

Mitigation Measures

Phase 1

If the Phase 1 of the Project commences during February 15 through September 15, the following mitigation measure will take place least seven days prior to the onset of scheduled activities;

- **MM BIO-1: Nesting Birds** – Project activities that will remove or disturb potential nest sites will be scheduled outside the breeding bird nesting season. The breeding bird nesting season typically extends from February 15 through September 15.

If Project activities cannot be avoided during February 15 through September 15, a qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey for breeding birds and active nests or potential nesting sites within the limits of Project disturbance. The survey will be conducted at least seven days prior to the onset of scheduled activities, such as mobilization and staging. It will end no more than three days prior to vegetation, substrate, and structure removal and/or disturbance.

If no breeding birds or active nests are observed during the pre-construction survey or they are observed and will not be impacted, Project activities may begin, and no further mitigation will be required.

If a breeding bird territory or an active bird nest is located during the pre-construction survey and will potentially be impacted, the site will be mapped on engineering drawings and a no activity buffer zone will be marked (fencing, stakes, flagging, orange snow fencing, etc.) a minimum of 100 feet in all directions or 500 feet in all directions for listed bird species and all raptors. The biologist will determine the appropriate buffer size based on the type of activities planned near the nest and the type of bird that created the

nest. Some bird species are more tolerant than others of noise and activities occurring near their nest. This no-activity buffer zone will not be disturbed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, or the young will no longer be impacted by Project activities. Periodic monitoring by a biologist will be performed to determine when nesting is complete. Once the nesting cycle has finished, Project activities may begin within the buffer zone.

If listed bird species are observed within the Project site during the pre-construction survey, the biologist will immediately map the area and notify the appropriate resource agency to determine suitable protection measures and/or mitigation measures and to determine if additional surveys or focused protocol surveys are necessary. Project activities may begin within the area only when concurrence is received from the appropriate resource agency.

Birds or their active nests will not be disturbed, captured, handled, or moved. Active nests cannot be removed or disturbed; however, nests can be removed or disturbed if determined inactive by a qualified biologist.

Phase 2

The following mitigation measures will be undertaken during Phase 2 construction:

- **MM CUL-1:** Environmental Training – prior to construction of the Project, the Project owner shall retain a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of Interior qualifications for archaeology. The archaeologist will prepare an Inadvertent Discovery Plan that will provide a cultural resource briefing that includes all applicable laws and penalties pertaining to disturbing cultural resources, a brief discussion of the prehistoric and historic regional context and archaeological sensitivity of the area, types of cultural resources found in the area, instruction that Project workers will halt construction if a cultural resource is inadvertently discovered during construction, and procedures to follow in the event an inadvertent discovery is encountered, including appropriate treatment and respectful behavior of a discovery (e.g., no posting to social media or photographs). The archaeologist will present the initial cultural resource environmental training to all Project construction personnel and a handout identifying the key points will be provided. If requested, a local tribal representative(s) shall be invited to participate in the environmental training to discuss or provide text from a tribal cultural perspective regarding the cultural resources within the region.
- **MM CUL-2:** Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources During Construction – The Project owner shall retain a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of Interior qualifications for archaeology. The archaeologist will prepare an Inadvertent Discovery Plan for the Project that will outline procedures and contacts for an inadvertent discovery. In general, during Project-level construction, should subsurface archaeological resources be discovered, all activity 100 feet of a “find” shall stop and the qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the significance of the find according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and/or National Register of Historic Places criteria (as applicable). The archaeologist shall have the authority to halt any Project-related construction activities that could impact potentially significant resources. If any find is determined to be significant, the archaeologist shall determine, in consultation with the implementing agencies and any local Native American groups expressing interest, appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. Ground-disturbing activities shall not continue until the discovery has been assessed by the archaeologist. The archaeologist shall be afforded the necessary time to assess the find. With monitoring, construction activities may continue on other areas of the Project site during

evaluation and treatment of historic or unique archaeological resources. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place is the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources. Methods of avoidance may include, but shall not be limited to, (i) Project re-route or re-design, (ii) Project cancellation, or (iii) identification of protection measures such as capping or fencing. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if it is demonstrated that resources cannot be avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall develop additional treatment measures, such as data recovery or other appropriate measures, in consultation with the implementing agency and any local Native American representatives expressing interest in prehistoric or tribal resources. If an archaeological site does not qualify as an historical resource but meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 21083.2, then the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2.

- **MM GEO-1: Inadvertent Discoveries of Paleontological Resources** — If the construction staff or others observe previously unidentified paleontological resources during ground disturbing activities, they will halt work within a 200-foot radius of the find(s), delineate the area of the find with flagging tape or rope (may also include dirt spoils from the find area), and immediately notify a qualified Paleontologist. Construction will halt within the flagged or roped-off area. The Paleontologist will assess the resource as soon as possible and determine appropriate next steps in coordination with the City. Such finds will be formally recorded and evaluated. The resource will be protected from further disturbance or looting pending evaluation.

Project Design Feature

Both Phases:

The following Project Design Feature will be undertaken during construction for both Phases:

- **PDF NOISE-1:** The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.

2.3 PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

Public agencies whose approval is expected to be required in the form of permits, financing approval, or participation agreements are as follows:

- City of Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Department – Project approval and environmental compliance certification
- City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety – Building Permits
- USACE – Encroachment Permission

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

3.2 DETERMINATION: (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

Date

Print Name

3.3 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “no impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “no impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “no impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as on site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) If it is determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially significant impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.
- (4) “Negative declaration: less than significant with mitigation incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “potentially significant impact” to a “less than significant impact.” The mitigation measures must be described and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- (5) Supporting information sources. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- (6) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

3.4.1 AESTHETICS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c.	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Existing Conditions:

According to the Caltrans Map of Designated Scenic Routes (Caltrans 2023), there are no official State-designated routes in the Project vicinity. State Route 2, the closest designated State Scenic Highway, is located over 12 miles to the east. The Project site is not visible from State Route 2 due to distance and intervening structures and topography. Interstate 210, an eligible State Scenic Highway, is located approximately 0.26 miles to the north. The Project site is not visible from Interstate 210 due to intervening structures, vegetation, and topography.

The Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan designates Stonehurst Avenue, La Tuna Canyon Road, Lopez Canyon Road, Wentworth Street, Big Tujunga Canyon Road, Sunland Boulevard, and the Foothill Freeway as Scenic Highways (City of Los Angeles 2016b). Scenic Highway Corridors are defined as “the area extending 500 feet on either side of the centerline of the roadway of each of the Scenic Highways” (City of Los Angeles 2004). The closest identified Community Plan Scenic Highway Corridor is Interstate 210, located approximately 0.26 miles or 1,373 feet to the north. The Project site is not within the Interstate 210 Scenic Highway corridor and is not visible from any of the scenic highways due to intervening structures, vegetation, and topography.

The Project site is located in an urban setting characterized by views of recreational, open space, commercial, and residential uses. The Project site is developed. Views of the site are limited to the surrounding land uses.

Discussion:

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

No Impact. The Project site does not contain a scenic vista. As discussed above, direct views of the Project site are from surrounding recreational, open space, commercial, and residential uses, and adjacent roadways. The Project will involve the development of new outdoor exhibits in the front yard of the existing DCLA campus. Implementation of the proposed Project would not block any scenic vistas, and therefore, would not impact views of any scenic vista.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

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

No Impact. The Project site is not in the viewshed of any designated or eligible State scenic highway. No impact to a scenic highway will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Would the project in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

No Impact. The Project involves development of new outdoor exhibits at an existing site with similar elements already in place. While these elements will be new, they will be consistent with the existing land use and facilities present, and therefore, would not conflict with existing zoning. Therefore, the Project will not introduce any contrasting visual elements and will not degrade the existing visual character of the area.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. There are two primary sources of light: light emanating from building interiors that pass-through windows, and light from exterior sources (e.g., street lighting, parking lot lighting, building illumination, security lighting, and landscape lighting). Light introduction can be a nuisance to adjacent uses and diminish the view of the clear night sky. Currently, light and glare in the Project vicinity are produced by vehicle headlights, street lighting, and lighting from the adjacent buildings.

The Project would include new outside security lighting. The security lighting would be designed to direct the light toward the site to avoid spillage into the surrounding streets and buildings. The Project will also include an illuminated cube structure (approximately 30 feet in height) that will serve as a symbol for DCLA. Special events will occasionally occur in the evening and will involve the illumination of the courtyard exhibits. The illumination occurring during the evening will be designed to avoid spillage into the surrounding streets and buildings. The Project would not introduce a substantial amount of additional night lighting compared to the existing lighting around the Project site. The proposed Project also will install solar panels. The potential reflection from solar photovoltaic (PV) modules is inherently low since they are designed to capture and not to reflect sunlight. PV panels have a lower index of refraction/reflectivity than common sources of glare in residential environments. The glare and reflectance levels from a given PV system are lower than the glare and reflectance levels of steel, snow, standard glass, plexiglass, and smooth water (Shields 2010). The glare and reflectance levels of modules are further reduced with the application of anti-reflective coatings. PV suppliers typically use stippled glass for panels, providing “texturing” of the glass which allows more light energy to be

channeled/transmitted through the glass while weakening the reflected light. With the application of anti-reflective coatings and use of modern glass technology, Project solar panels would provide an overall low level of reflectivity. As a result, the Project is not expected to create any significant daytime glare. Therefore, a less than significant impact from the standpoint of light and glare would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>					
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?				X
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Existing Conditions:

On the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map for California (DOC 2023), the Project site and the surrounding area is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land. This classification is

generally described as land occupied by structures, which can have a variety of uses, such as residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes.

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map for California, the Project site is an area designated as Urban and Built-Up Land. No Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance exists within the Project site or vicinity; therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

No Impact. The Project site has a zoning designation of OS, Open Space (City of Los Angeles 2023a), and there are no agricultural zoning designations or agricultural uses within the Project limits or adjacent areas. The Project would not convert farmland or conflict with any land zoned for agriculture. No Williamson Act contracts apply to the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- c. **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

No Impact. The Project site is zoned as OS, Open Space. It is surrounded by land zoned as commercial, residential, and recreation areas. There are no forest land or timberland resources designations or forest land, or timberland resource uses within the Project limits or adjacent areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- d. **Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

No Impact. There is no forest land in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- e. **Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

No Impact. There is no farmland or forest land located within or near the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not involve any changes that could result in the loss or conversion of farmland or forest land to other uses. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.3 AIR QUALITY

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
c.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d.	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Existing Conditions:

The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (“Air Basin”), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Air Basin is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Air Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties and all of Orange County.

The Clean Air Act, first passed in 1963 with major amendments in 1970, 1977 and 1990, is the overarching legislation covering regulation of air pollution in the United States. The Clean Air Act has established the mandate for requiring regulation of both mobile and stationary sources of air pollution at the state and federal levels. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was created in 1970 in order to consolidate research, monitoring, standard-setting, and enforcement authority into a single agency.

The EPA is responsible for setting and enforcing the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for atmospheric pollutants. It regulates emission sources that are under the exclusive authority of the federal government, such as aircraft, ships, and certain locomotives. NAAQS pollutants were identified using medical evidence and are shown below in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. State and Federal Criteria Pollutant Standards

Air Pollutant	Concentration / Averaging Time		Most Relevant Effects
	California Standards	Federal Primary Standards	
Ozone (O ₃)	0.09 ppm / 1-hour 0.07 ppm / 8-hour	0.070 ppm / 8-hour	(a) Pulmonary function decrements and localized lung edema in humans and animals; (b) Risk to public health implied by alterations in pulmonary morphology and host defense in animals; (c) Increased mortality risk; (d) Risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans; (e) Vegetation damage; and (f) Property damage.
Carbon Monoxide	20.0 ppm / 1-hour 9.0 ppm / 8-hour	35.0 ppm / 1-hour 9.0 ppm / 8-hour	(a) Aggravation of angina pectoris and other aspects of coronary heart disease; (b) Decreased exercise tolerance in persons with peripheral vascular disease and lung disease; (c) Impairment of central nervous system functions; and (d) Possible increased risk to fetuses.
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.18 ppm / 1-hour 0.030 ppm / annual	100 ppb / 1-hour 0.053 ppm / annual	(a) Potential to aggravate chronic respiratory disease and respiratory symptoms in sensitive groups; (b) Risk to public health implied by pulmonary and extra-pulmonary biochemical and cellular changes and pulmonary structural changes; and (c) Contribution to atmospheric discoloration.
Sulfur Dioxide	0.25 ppm / 1-hour 0.04 ppm / 24-hour	75 ppb / 1-hour 0.14 ppm/annual	(a) Bronchoconstriction accompanied by symptoms which may include wheezing, shortness of breath and chest tightness, during exercise or physical activity in persons with asthma.
Inhalable Particulate Matter	50 µg/m ³ / 24-hour 20 µg/m ³ / annual	150 µg/m ³ / 24-hour	(a) Exacerbation of symptoms in sensitive patients with respiratory or cardiovascular disease; (b) Declines in pulmonary function growth in children; and (c) Increased risk of premature death from heart or lung diseases in elderly.
Fine Particulate Matter	12 µg/m ³ / annual	35 µg/m ³ / 24-hour 12 µg/m ³ / annual	
Sulfates	25 µg/m ³ / 24-hour	No Federal Standards	(a) Decrease in ventilatory function; (b) Aggravation of asthmatic symptoms; (c) Aggravation of cardio-pulmonary disease; (d) Vegetation damage; (e) Degradation of visibility; and (f) Property damage.
Lead	1.5 µg/m ³ / 30-day	0.15 µg/m ³ / 3-month rolling	(a) Learning disabilities; and (b) Impairment of blood formation and nerve conduction.
Visibility Reducing Particles	Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer - visibility of 10 miles or more due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70 percent.	No Federal Standards	Visibility impairment on days when relative humidity is less than 70 percent.

µg/m³ – micrograms per cubic meter; ppm – parts per million

Source: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf>.

As part of its enforcement responsibilities, the EPA requires each state with federal nonattainment areas to prepare and submit a State Implementation Plan that demonstrates the means to attain the national standards. The State Implementation Plan must integrate federal, state, and local components and regulations to identify specific measures to reduce pollution, using a combination of performance standards and market-based programs within the timeframe identified in the State Implementation Plan. The California Air Resources Board

defines attainment as the category given to an area with no violations in the past three years. As indicated below in Table 3-2, the Air Basin has been designated by EPA for the national standards as a non-attainment area for ozone and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), and a partial non-attainment area for lead. Currently, the Air Basin is in attainment with the NAAQS for carbon monoxide, inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂).

Table 3-2. South Coast Air Basin Attainment Status

Criteria Pollutant	Standard	Averaging Time	Designation ^{a)}	Attainment Date ^{b)}
1-Hour Ozone ^{c)}	NAAQS	1979 1-Hour (0.12 ppm)	Nonattainment (Extreme)	2/6/2023 (revised deadline)
	CAAQS	1-Hour (0.09 ppm)	Nonattainment	N/A
8-Hour Ozone ^{d)}	NAAQS	1997 8-Hour (0.08 ppm)	Nonattainment (Extreme)	6/15/2024
	NAAQS	2008 8-Hour (0.075 ppm)	Nonattainment (Extreme)	8/3/2038
	NAAQS	2015 8-Hour (0.070 ppm)	Pending – Expect Nonattainment (Extreme)	Pending (beyond 2032)
	CAAQS	8-Hour (0.070 ppm)	Nonattainment	Beyond 2032
Carbon Monoxide	NAAQS	1-Hour (35 ppm) 8-Hour (9 ppm)	Attainment (Maintenance)	6/11/2007 (attained)
	CAAQS	1-Hour (20 ppm) 8-Hour (9 ppm)	Attainment	6/11/2007 (attained)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) ^{e)}	NAAQS	2010 1-Hour (0.10 ppm)	Unclassifiable/Attainment	N/A (attained)
	NAAQS	1971 Annual (0.053 ppm)	Attainment (Maintenance)	9/22/1998 (attained)
	CAAQS	1-Hour (0.18 ppm) Annual (0.030 ppm)	Attainment	---
Sulfur Dioxide (SO) ₂ ^{f)}	NAAQS	2010 1-Hour (75 ppb)	Designations Pending (expect Unclassifiable/Attainment)	N/A (attained)
	NAAQS	1971 24-Hour (0.14 ppm) 1971 Annual (0.03 ppm)	Unclassifiable/Attainment	3/19/1979 (attained)
Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM) ₁₀	NAAQS	1987 24-hour (150 µg/m ³)	Attainment (Maintenance) ^{g)}	7/26/2013 (attained)
	CAAQS	24-hour (50 µg/m ³) Annual (20 µg/m ³)	Nonattainment	N/A
Fine Particulate Matter (PM) _{2.5} ^{h)}	NAAQS	2006 24-Hour (35 µg/m ³)	Nonattainment (Serious)	12/31/2023
	NAAQS	1997 Annual (15.0 µg/m ³)	Attainment (final determination pending)	4/5/2015 (attained 2013)
	NAAQS	2012 Annual (12.0 µg/m ³)	Nonattainment (Moderate)	12/31/2025
	CAAQS	Annual (12.0 µg/m ³)	Nonattainment	N/A
Lead ⁱ⁾	NAAQS	2008 3-Months Rolling (0.15 µg/m ³)	Nonattainment (Partial) (Attainment determination requested)	12/31/2015

µg/m³ – micrograms per cubic meter; CAAQS – California Ambient Air Quality Standards; N/A – not applicable; NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards; ppb – parts per billion; ppm – parts per million

Notes:

- EPA often only declares Nonattainment areas; everywhere else is listed as Unclassifiable/Attainment or Unclassifiable.
- A design value below the NAAQS for data through the full year or smog season prior to the attainment date is typically required for attainment demonstration.
- The 1979 1-hour ozone NAAQS (0.12 ppm) was revoked, effective 6/15/2005; however, the Basin has not attained this standard and therefore has some continuing obligations with respect to the revoked standard; original attainment date was 11/15/2010; the revised attainment date is 2/6/2023.
- The 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS (0.075 ppm) was revised to 0.070 ppm. Effective 12/28/15 with classifications and implementation goals to be finalized by 10/1/17; the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS (0.08 ppm) was revoked in

the 2008 ozone implementation rule, effective 4/6/15; there are continuing obligations under the revoked 1997 and revised 2008 ozone until they are attained.

- e) New NO₂ 1-hour standard, effective August 2, 2010; attainment designations January 20, 2012; annual NO₂ standard retained.
- f) The 1971 annual and 24-hour SO₂ standards were revoked, effective August 23, 2010.
- g) Annual PM₁₀ standard was revoked, effective December 18, 2006; 24-hour PM₁₀ NAAQS deadline was 12/31/2006; SCAQMD request for attainment redesignation and PM₁₀ maintenance plan was approved by EPA on June 26, 2013, effective July 26, 2013.
- h) The attainment deadline for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS was 12/31/15 for the former “moderate” classification; EPA approved reclassification to “serious”, effective 2/12/16 with an attainment deadline of 12/31/19; the 2012 (proposal year) annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS was revised on 1/15/13, effective 3/18/13, from 15 to 12 µg /m³; new annual designations were final 1/15/15, effective 4/15/15; on July 25, 2016 EPA finalized a determination that the Air Basin attained the 1997 annual (15.0 µg/m³) and 24-hour PM_{2.5} (65 µg/m³) NAAQS, effective August 24, 2016.
- i) Partial Nonattainment designation – Los Angeles County portion of Air Basin only for near-source monitors. Expect to remain in attainment based on current monitoring data; attainment re-designation request pending.

Source: SCAQMD 2022

In 2020, one or more stations in the Air Basin exceeded the most current federal standards on a total of 181 days (49 percent of the year), including: 8-hour ozone (157 days over 2015 ozone NAAQS), 24-hour PM_{2.5} (39 days), PM₁₀ (3 days), and NO₂ (1 day). Despite substantial improvement in air quality over the past few decades, some air monitoring stations in the Air Basin still exceed the NAAQS for ozone more frequently than any other area in the United States. Nine of the top 10 stations in the nation which most frequently exceeded the 8-hour ozone NAAQS in 2015 were located within the Air Basin, including stations in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties (SCAQMD 2022).

PM_{2.5} levels in the Air Basin have improved significantly in recent years. Since 2015, none of the monitoring stations¹ in the Air Basin have recorded violations of the former 1997 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS (15.0 µg/m³). On July 25, 2016, the EPA finalized a determination that the Air Basin attained the 1997 annual (15.0 µg/m³) and 24-hour PM_{2.5} (65 µg/m³) NAAQS, effective August 24, 2016. However, the Air Basin does not meet the 2012 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS (12.0 µg/m³), with six monitoring stations having design values above the standard for the 2018-2020 period.² These stations include: Ontario-Route 60 Near Road (Air Basin maximum at 13.8 µg/m³), Mira Loma, Rubidoux, Long Beach-Route 710 Near Road, Pico Rivera, and Compton. The Coachella Valley is in attainment of both the annual and 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. In 2020, 16 stations in the Air Basin had one or more PM_{2.5} daily average concentrations exceeding the level of the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS (35.4 µg/m³), with a total of 28 days³ over that standard in the Air Basin. However, in the 2018-2020 period, after removing likely exceptional events, the Air Basin met the 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS.⁴ (SCAQMD 2022).

1 SCAQMD employs continuous monitors at several stations in the Air Basin to provide real-time data for the public and to support daily air quality forecasting. Continuous PM_{2.5} monitors at seven stations, including Anaheim, Central Los Angeles, Long Beach-Route 710 Near Road, Long Beach (South), Ontario-Route 60 Near Road, Mira Loma, and Rubidoux are FEM monitors. On scheduled sampling days, when Federal Reference Methods (FRM) measurements are not available at a Federal Equivalent Methods (FEM) station, FEM measurements are used to replace missing FRM measurements for regulatory/attainment determination purpose. In the 2018-2020 period, the EPA has granted SCAQMD a waiver from using the FEM monitor at Central Los Angeles for regulatory/attainment determination purposes since it does not meet the accuracy requirements to be considered comparable to the NAAQS.

2 Six stations exceed the 2012 annual PM_{2.5} standard after removing likely exceptional events.

3 Data includes exceptional events. FRM filter-based measurements and NAAQS-comparable FEM continuous measurements were used to do the calculation.

4 The 24-hour PM_{2.5} design value is based on the annual 98th percentile concentration for each station averaged over the 3-year period; for stations that monitor every day, this is typically the eighth highest concentration.

The Air Basin is currently in attainment for the federal standards for sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, NO₂, and PM₁₀ (with the exception of the Coachella Valley). The Los Angeles County portion of the Air Basin is designated a nonattainment area for the federal lead standard on the basis of source-specific monitoring at two locations as determined by EPA using 2007–2009 data. For the most recent design value periods, 2012–2014 and 2018–2020, no stations in Los Angeles County showed violations of the federal lead standard, with a maximum 3-month rolling average design value in the most recent period (2018–2020) of 0.01 µg/m³. While the concentration level of the 1-hour NO₂ federal standard (100 parts per billion) was exceeded in the Air Basin for one day in 2020 (in San Bernardino at the CA-60 Near Road Station), the NAAQS NO₂ design value has not been exceeded. Therefore, the Air Basin remains in attainment of the NO₂ NAAQS (SCAQMD 2022).

Discussion:

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The CEQA requires a discussion of any inconsistencies between a proposed Project and applicable General Plans and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125). The regional plan that applies to the proposed Project includes the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Therefore, this section discusses any potential inconsistencies of the proposed Project with the AQMP.

The purpose of this discussion is to set forth the issues regarding consistency with the assumptions and objectives of the AQMP and discuss whether the proposed Project would interfere with the region's ability to comply with Federal and State air quality standards. If the decision-makers determine that the proposed Project is inconsistent, the lead agency may consider Project modifications or inclusion of mitigation to eliminate the inconsistency.

The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook states that "New or amended GP Elements (including land use zoning and density amendments), Specific Plans, and significant projects must be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP." Strict consistency with all aspects of the plan is usually not required. A proposed project should be considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook identifies two key indicators of consistency:

- (1) Whether the project will result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.
- (2) Whether the project will exceed the assumptions in the AQMP, or increments based on the year of Project buildout and phase.

Both of these criteria are evaluated below.

- Criterion 1 - Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations?

As discussed below in 3.4.3.b, short-term regional construction air emissions and operation air emission would not result in significant impacts. A less than significant long-term impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, based on the information provided above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the first criterion.

- Criterion 2 - Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP?

Consistency with the AQMP assumptions is determined by performing an analysis of the proposed Project with the assumptions in the AQMP. The emphasis of this criterion is to ensure that the analyses conducted for the proposed Project are based on the same forecasts as the AQMP. The AQMP is developed through use of the planning forecasts provided in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Federal Transportation

Improvement Program. The RTP/SCS is a major planning document for the regional transportation and land use network within Southern California. The RTP/SCS is a long-range plan stipulated by federal and state requirements placed on Southern California Association of Governments and is updated every four years. The Federal Transportation Improvement Program provides long-range planning for future transportation improvement projects that are constructed with state and/or federal funds within Southern California. Under CEQA local governments are required to make their plans consistent with applicable regional plans (such as the RTP/SCS). For this Project, the Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan and land use map (City of Los Angeles 2016a; 2020a) defines the assumptions that are represented in the AQMP.

The Project involves improvements to an existing land use and would not require a General Plan Amendment or zone change. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in an inconsistency with the current land use designations with respect to the regional forecasts utilized by the AQMPs. As such, the proposed Project is not anticipated to exceed the AQMP assumptions for the Project site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the second criterion. Based on the logic above, the proposed Project will not result in an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP. Therefore, a less than significant impact will occur in relation to implementation of the AQMP.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will produce fugitive dust and mobile source emissions as a result of construction activity. As described above, the Air Basin is currently classified as a federal and state non-attainment area for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and lead, and state non-attainment area for PM₁₀. As a result, there is an on-going regional cumulative impact associated with these pollutants. However, an individual project can emit these pollutants without significantly contributing to this cumulative impact, if the level of project emissions does not exceed project-level significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. Based on the Los Angeles Department of City Planning screening criteria for Categorical Exemptions, if the proposed project has less than 75,000 square feet of nonresidential use and involves less than 20,000 cubic yards of soil export, it will not likely exceed the SCAQMD construction or operational thresholds (City of Los Angeles 2018a).

The proposed Project involves demolition of 1,000 square feet of non-residential floor area, addition of approximately 1,500 square feet of non-residential floor area, and less than 1,000 cubic yards of grading. Therefore, regional emission impacts for the proposed Project would be less than significant for both construction phases. Emission associated with the operation of the Project are expected to be similar or less than existing conditions, due to the incorporation of solar panels. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located adjacent to park uses and the nearest residential uses are located over 150 feet north. As described in the Response to 3.4.3.b. previously, construction and operation of the Project would not result in emissions of criteria pollutants in excess of established thresholds. Because emissions of toxic air contaminants from diesel-powered construction equipment are expected to be minimal, intermittent, and of short duration, the Project is not expected to substantially increase ambient

concentrations of toxic air contaminants regionally or locally. Therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would result in less than significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Individual responses to odors are highly variable and can result in a variety of effects. Generally, the impact of an odor results from a variety of factors such as frequency, duration, offensiveness, location, and sensory perception. The frequency is a measure of how often an individual is exposed to an odor in the ambient environment. The intensity refers to an individual's or group's perception of the odor strength or concentration. The duration of an odor refers to the elapsed time over which an odor is experienced. The offensiveness of the odor is the subjective rating of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of an odor. The location accounts for the type of area in which a potentially affected person lives, works, or visits; the type of activity in which he or she is engaged; and the sensitivity of the impacted receptor.

Sensory perception has four major components: detectability, intensity, character, and hedonic tone. The detection (or threshold) of an odor is based on a panel of responses to the odor. There are two types of thresholds: the odor detection threshold and the recognition threshold. The detection threshold is the lowest concentration of an odor that will elicit a response in a percentage of the people that live and work in the immediate vicinity of the Project site and is typically presented as the mean (or 50 percent of the population). The recognition threshold is the minimum concentration that is recognized as having a characteristic odor quality, this is typically represented by recognition by 50 percent of the population. The intensity refers to the perceived strength of the odor. The odor character is what the substance smells like. The hedonic tone is a judgment of the pleasantness or unpleasantness of the odor. The hedonic tone varies in subjective experience, frequency, odor character, odor intensity, and duration. Potential odor impacts have been analyzed separately for construction and operations below.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the diesel exhaust associated with the operation of construction equipment. The objectionable odors that may be produced during the construction process would be temporary and would not likely be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project site's boundaries. Due to the transitory nature of construction odors, a less than significant odor impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required. Operational activities are expected to be similar to existing conditions and would not involve any odor impacts.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Existing Conditions:

Regional and Local Plans

The Project site is not located within or near a Habitat Conservation Plan area or a Natural Community Conservation Plan area (City of Los Angeles 2001).

The Project vicinity is highly urbanized and is an area that has been heavily modified by humans, including roadways, existing buildings, and landscaping with ornamental vegetation. Because of the high degree of disturbance in these areas, they generally have low habitat value for wildlife; wildlife found here are adapted to living in heavily urbanized areas.

Wetlands/Riparian Habitat

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2023) was reviewed for potential wetlands and riparian habitat in the vicinity of the Project site. No wetlands are mapped in or near the Project site. An existing LACFCD flood-control channel is located adjacent to the west side of the Project site.

Project Site

The Project site will involve improvements to an existing science center, and is surrounded by recreational, open space, commercial, and residential uses. Three existing large pine trees are located in the Project site. No wetlands or riparian habitat occur on or in the vicinity of the Project site.

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. The Project site is the outside portion of an existing science center and is surrounded by recreational, open space, commercial, and residential uses. The Project site does not contain any sensitive habitat or wildlife resources. The three existing pine trees located in the Project site will be protected in place. Therefore, the Project will result in no impact to biological resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. There are no riparian habitats or sensitive natural communities present on or near the Project site. No impacts would occur to riparian habitats or sensitive natural communities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- c. **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No Impact. There are no wetlands, marshes, or vernal pools within or in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur to any federally protected wetlands under the Clean Water Act.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- d. **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. With no native habitat, and no wildlife corridors that traverse the Project site, implementation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to interfere with the movement of native animals of any kind, or to impede the use of any native wildlife nursery sites.

The Project site supports trees that could potentially provide cover, forage, and nesting habitats for bird species that have adapted to urban areas, such as rock pigeons (*Columba livia*) or mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*). Mourning doves are protected by the Migratory Bird

Treaty Act and certain Fish and Game Codes. The statutes make it unlawful to take native breeding birds, and their nests, eggs, and young. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, provided in the event that any nesting birds are found at the Project site location during construction, will reduce impacts to less than significant.

If Phase 1 Project activities cannot be avoided during February 15 through September 15, a qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey for breeding birds and active nests or potential nesting sites within the limits of Project disturbance. The survey will be conducted at least seven days prior to the onset of scheduled activities, such as mobilization and staging. It will end no more than three days prior to vegetation, substrate, and structure removal and/or disturbance.

If no breeding birds or active nests are observed during the pre-construction survey or they are observed and will not be impacted, Project activities may begin, and no further mitigation will be required.

If a breeding bird territory or an active bird nest is located during the pre-construction survey and will potentially be impacted, the site will be mapped on engineering drawings and a no-activity buffer zone will be marked (fencing, stakes, flagging, orange snow fencing, etc.) a minimum of 100 feet in all directions or 500 feet in all directions for listed bird species and all raptors. The biologist will determine the appropriate buffer size based on the type of activities planned near the nest and the type of bird that created the nest. Some bird species are more tolerant than others of noise and activities occurring near their nest. This no-activity buffer zone will not be disturbed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, or the young will no longer be impacted by Project activities. Periodic monitoring by a biologist will be performed to determine when nesting is complete. Once the nesting cycle has finished, Project activities may begin within the buffer zone.

If listed bird species are observed within the Project site during the pre-construction survey, the biologist will immediately map the area and notify the appropriate resource agency to determine suitable protection measures and/or mitigation measures and to determine if additional surveys or focused protocol surveys are necessary. Project activities may begin within the area only when concurrence is received from the appropriate resource agency.

Birds or their active nests will not be disturbed, captured, handled, or moved. Active nests cannot be removed or disturbed; however, nests can be removed or disturbed if determined inactive by a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Measure:

MM BIO-1: Nesting Birds – Project activities that will remove or disturb potential nest sites will be scheduled outside the breeding bird nesting season. The breeding bird nesting season typically extends from February 15 through September 15.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not require the removal of the three existing pine trees and will not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan area, a Natural Community Conservation Plan area, or in any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan areas. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in Section 15064.5?				X
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			X	

A records search was conducted by Tetra Tech and is provided under Appendix A. The following summarizes the results and conclusions.

Existing Conditions:

Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines generally defines a historical resource as one that is (a) listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, (b) listed in a local register of historical resources, (c) identified as significant in a historical resource survey (meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code [PRC]), or (d) determined to be a historical resource by a project's lead agency. Historic, cultural, and paleontological resources include historic buildings, structures, artifacts, sites, and districts of historic, architectural, archaeological, or paleontological significance.

Regionally, the Project is situated just south of the San Gabriel Mountains, west of the Tujunga Valley, Wash, and Mountains, and northeast of the broad San Fernando Valley region. The San Gabriel Mountains are located within the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province that is comprised of steeply sloped, east to west trending compressional (folding and faulting) mountain ranges and valleys. The San Gabriel Mountain range is comprised of igneous and metamorphic rocks that were formed over 65 million years ago and consist of steep and rugged topography, with peaks exceeding 9,000 feet above mean sea level. Streams from the mountain range carried alluvial deposits down into the valley, with deposits consisting of coarse gravels to fine-grained sands deposited more than 10,000 years ago. These alluvial deposits can range from 500 to over 1,000 feet in depth. Sediments within the Project site consist of Quaternary aged alluvial deposits of gravel, sand, and clay that are Holocene in age (recent to 10,000 years old) (Dibblee 1991). Holocene deposits are generally considered more likely to contain prehistoric archaeological deposits. Soils on the Project site consist of Urban land – Palm view-Tujunga gravely complex up to 79 inches in depth within the north western portion of the site; and the soils within the south eastern portion of the site consist of Conejo-Urban land of clay loam up to 75 inches in depth (Natural Resource Conservation Science 2023). Due to modern development, the Project site may contain fill soils at various unknown depth.

Vegetation in the Project area consists of landscaping and nonnative species. Prior to water diversions in the nineteenth century for agricultural use and the introduction of nonnative species, Los Angeles County had a variety of vegetation zones and biological diversity that was supported by climatic and hydrological conditions conducive to abundant resource availability and subsistence procurement by pre-contact populations and historic populations. The Tujunga Wash is within a half mile east of the Project site. Prior to historic and modern alterations to the landscape, the region was characterized by vegetation communities such as chaparral,

sagebrush, and grassland with upland foothill oak-woodland areas. Wildlife in the region included mammals such as deer, rabbits, foxes, small rodents, various birds, reptiles, and insects.

The prehistory of the southern California region has been generally summarized within four major horizons or cultural periods (dates approximate) (Byrd and Raab 2007; Warren 1968; Wallace 1955):

- Horizon I – Early Period (Early Holocene: 12,000 to 7,500 years before present [BP]) characterized by small mobile groups that utilized lithic tools such as fluted projectile, scrapers, and choppers.
- Horizon II – Millingstone Horizon (Middle Holocene: 7,500 to 3,000 BP) characterized by the extensive use of milling stones (manos and metates) to process small, hard seeds from plants associated with shrub-scrub communities and littoral zone resource exploitation.
- Horizon III – Intermediate Culture (Middle Holocene: 3,000 to 1,000 BP) is characterized by mixed subsistence strategy of plant exploitation (increased use of pestles for larger, hard seeds) and the hunting of terrestrial and marine resources.
- Horizon IV – Late Prehistoric (Late Holocene: 1,000 BP to European historic contact) is characterized by an increasing human population and associated expansion of cultural practices, and the use of the bow and arrow, pottery, shell fishhooks, use of asphaltum, and decorative shell and bone ornaments were all typical during this time.

Based on previously conducted archaeological investigations (Martz 1977; Romani et al. 1994), two previously recorded prehistoric village sites dating to the Middle and Late Holocene are recorded within 1.5 miles of the Project site: CA-LAN-167 and CA-LAN-300 (both sites are recorded as eligible for listing to the National Register of Historic Resources). Site CA-LAN-167 is previously recorded as a large Gabrieliño-Tongva village site of Tujunga or the Big Tujunga Site consisting of the following components: ceremonial center, house pits, ancestral remains and mortuary features, floral and faunal remains, and ceramic and lithic artifacts indicative of trade with coastal and inland desert tribes. Site CA-LAN-300 is previously recorded as village site (most likely associated with the Tujunga village site) consisting of ancestral remains and mortuary features, midden, cooking and food processing areas, house pits, flora and fauna remains, and ceramic and lithic artifacts.

The Project is within the ethnographic territory traditionally inhabited by the Gabrieliño (Tongva) people. The Gabrieliño occupied most of Los Angeles and Orange counties, including the watersheds of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana rivers, the Los Angeles basin to the Santa Monica and Santa Ana mountains, along the coast from Aliso Creek in the south to Topanga Creek in the north, and the islands of San Clemente, San Nicolas, and Santa Catalina (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1925). The name Gabrieliño was derived from the San Gabriel Spanish mission located along the coast within Gabrieliño territory. Settlement patterns on the mainland were located near water sources and exhibit a logistical mobility with large villages and smaller satellite camps occupied seasonally. Structures were domed, circular structures with tule, fern, or Carrizo thatching and sweathouses were small, semicircular, earth-covered buildings. The Gabrieliño were fisher-hunter-gatherers and exploited a variety of coastal bay, littoral, riverine, and inland floral and faunal resources available within the diverse ecological zones of their territory (i.e., coastal plain, rivers, foothills, mountains, and ocean). Subsistence resources included items such as several species of oak trees, grasses, sage bushes, rabbits, deer, fish, shellfish, and other terrestrial and marine mammals. The Gabrieliño would move seasonally throughout the region, between mountain and coastal locales, to hunt terrestrial and sea mammals and to collect terrestrial flora and intertidal species. Currently, the Gabrieliño-

Tongva Tribe (historically known as the San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians) are a state of California recognized tribe and their tribal office is located in Los Angeles, California.

The first recorded contact between California natives and Europeans occurred in 1542, when the Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo expedition traveled along the west coast of California (Castillo 1978). In 1769, long term interaction with the Tongva (Gabrieliños) people began with the Gaspar De Portolá overland expedition. The Spanish Colonization and Mission Period (between 1769 and 1821) designates the time when the Spanish settled and established missions along the California coast. Between 1769 and 1833, the Spanish founded 21 missions from San Diego north to the San Francisco Bay area (Presidio). Mission San Gabriel (founded 1771), the Pueblo of Los Angeles (founded 1781), and the Mission San Fernando (founded 1797), were established within the Project region (California Missions 2021). The Spanish priest's directive was to convert the indigenous population to Catholicism and exploit them as a labor force. (Bean and Smith 1978) The local Tongva population was forcibly indoctrinated into the mission system and were baptized as neophytes. By 1800s, the mental and physical health of the Tongva suffered and many people died due to introduced disease, dietary deficiencies, conflict, or forceful reduction, and many fled or escaped to other areas (Bean and Smith 1978). Following the Mexican American War and secularization of the nearby missions in 1834, the region was transferred to private landowners (ranchos) who established a primary economy of cattle ranching. The Project region is within the Rancho Ex-Mission De San Fernando that included approximately 116,771 acres and was sold to Eulogio De Celis in 1845 by Governor Pio Pico. After the fall of the rancho system around 1846, many European settlers purchased land holdings in the area and operated farms (olive orchards being a primary crop) and ranches. By the late 1940s, the orchards that once covered the region were replaced by residential subdivisions, commercial industry, and associated infrastructure.

Record Search Results

A record search of the cultural resources site and project file collection at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), Fullerton State University in Fullerton, California, of the California Historical Resources Information System, was conducted on October 1, 2021 (Record Search File No.: 22740.8907; Attachment 2: Non-Confidential). As part of this records search, the SCCIC database of survey reports and overviews was consulted, as well as documented cultural resources, cultural landscapes, and ethnic resources. Additionally, the search included a review of the following publications and lists: California Office of Historic Preservation Historic Properties Directory, National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, and the City of Los Angeles's Historic-Cultural Monument List and Historic Preservation Overlay Zone list. A preliminary literature search of ethnographic information, historical literature, historical maps and plats, and local historic resource inventories was also conducted. The records search focused specifically on the proposed Project and a 0.25-mile buffer centered on the Project.

The SCCIC records search identified five previously conducted cultural resource studies that overlap with the Project: LA-00384, -02969, -03095, -04671, and -10756. These studies were conducted between 1977 and 2010 and consist of archaeological field surveys, a cultural resource management planning, and a literature review. Ten previously conducted surveys were identified within 0.25 mile of the Project. These surveys were conducted between 1976 and 2015. These previous investigations consist of architectural and archaeological assessments, construction monitoring projects, and other research purposes.

No previously recorded cultural resources were identified in the Project site. Three previously recorded cultural resources were identified within 0.25 mile of the Project. The three resources are historic and consist of a former subdivision that is no longer extant (P-19-002073), the Southern California Edison's (SCE) Big Creek East & West Transmission Line (P-19-186861),

and a historic structure associated with the Hansen Dam Recreation Area (P-19-186958). The previously recorded resources identified within 0.25 mile are presented in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Cultural Resources Previously Recorded within 0.25 mile of the Project.

Primary or Trinomial #	Time Period	Site Type/Name	Date/Recorder	CRHR/NRHP Eligibility
P-19-002073	Historic	Former location of a 1920s-1930s residential subdivision.	1992 (J. Brock, Archaeological Advisory Group)	No longer extant. Status unknown.
P-19-186861	Historic	Structure: SCE's Big Creek East & West Transmission Line	2002 (J. Schmidt, Compass Rose); 2016 (Audry Williams, SCE)	unknown
P-19-186958	Historic	Structure: Hansen Dam Recreation Area	2005 (M. J. Wuellner, EDAW)	unknown

CRHR/NRHP – California Register of Historical Resources/National Register of Historic Places

Disclosure of site locations prohibited. Information contained in this document is confidential, in compliance with 36 CFR 800.11(c), and access to this information is restricted by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) Section 1 (16 USC 470), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (as amended).

The records search results for previously conducted surveys within the Project site are listed in Table 3-4. The record search results (SCCIC data sheets and figures) are included in Attachment 2.

Table 3-4. Cultural Resource Studies Previously Conducted within Project Site.

Report No.	Year	Author(s)/Affiliation	Title	Survey Type
LA-00384	1977	Martz, Patricia	<i>Description and Evaluation of the Cultural Resources Within Haines Debris Basin, Hansen Dam, Lopez Dam, and Sepulveda Dam, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County</i>	Archaeological, Field study
LA-02969	1994	Romani, Gwendolyn R., John F. Romani, and Bradley L. Sturm/Greenwood and Associates	<i>Historic Properties Management Plan for the US Army Corps of Engineers Hansen Dam Flood Control Basin Los Angeles County, California</i>	Management/ Planning
LA-03095	1993	Brock, James P., John F. Elliot, and Nina M. Harris/ Archaeological Advisory Group	<i>A Cultural Resources Assessment of the Hansen Dam Flood Control Basin, City of Los Angeles, California</i>	Archaeological, Field study
LA-04671	1992	Archaeological Advisory Group	<i>Interim Cultural Resources Report on Proposed Swimming Area at Hansen Dam (p.o. No. Dacw09-92-m-0505)</i>	Archaeological, Field study
LA-10756	2021	McKenna, Jeanette	<i>A Cultural Resources Overview and Preliminary Assessment of the Pacoima/Panorama City Redevelopment Plan Amendment/Expansion Project Area, Los Angeles County, California</i>	Literature search

*see attached data sheets for studies within 0.25 mile of the Project.

Historic United States Geological Survey Map and General Land Office Plat Map and Historic Aerial Review

Review of historic maps and aerial imagery provides information regarding potential unrecorded historic features or sites within the Project. Based on the map review, the Project Site appeared as undeveloped land from at least 1900 through 1952. By 1953, three buildings appear within the northwestern portion of the site and improved roads are to the north and south of the Project. By the 1960s, the Hansen Flood Control Basin was developed to the south of the Project. A building was added to the southern portion of the Project Site in the mid-1960s. By the 1990s, the buildings are no longer extant, and the Project Site appears as undeveloped land

with several large trees. Based on aerial imagery, the Discovery Cube building is present by 2009 and occupies most of the Parcel. No General Land Office plat maps were available. The results of the review of available historic aerials and USGS quadrangle maps are presented in Table 3-5 below.

Table 3-5. Review of Historic USGS Maps and Aerial Photographs for Township 2 North Range 14 West, no Section.

Map Name	Date(s)	Author	Legal Description	Description of Potential Resource within Project Study Site
USGS 1:62,500 15' San Fernando, CA	1979	USGS Staff	T2N, R14W	No features, buildings, or structures are in the Project Site. The Tujunga Wash and Valley are to the south, east, and southeast. The San Gabriel Mountains are further to the north.
USGS 1:24,000 7.5' Sunland, CA	1932	USGS Staff	T2N, R14W	No features, buildings, or structures are in the Project Site. The SCE Power Line is illustrated beyond the Project to the north, and Mulholland Street is to the south (adjacent). The Tujunga Wash and Valley and the Verdugo Mountains are approximately a mile and beyond to the east and southeast.
USGS 1:24,000 7.5' Sunland, CA	1942	USGS Staff	T2N, R14W	No features, buildings, or structures are in the Project Site. Foothill Blvd. is illustrated to the north, and Stonehurst Avenue (formerly Mulholland Street) is to the south, and the Hansen Flood Control Basin is further south.
USGS 1:24,000 7.5'San Fernando, CA	1953	USGS Staff	T2N, R14W	No features or structures illustrated in the Project Site, Foothill Blvd. illustrated as an improved road, and an improved road is adjacent to the southwestern portion of the Project Site. The Hansen Flood Control Basin is illustrated approximately 0.5 miles to the south.
USGS 1:24,000 7.5' San Fernando, CA	1966 (1972)	USGS Staff	T2N, R14W	No features or structures illustrated in the Project Site. A building is illustrated to the southeast (adjacent). To roads are adjacent to the Project (Foothill Blvd. to the north, and Stonehurst Avenue to the south). The Hansen Flood Control Basin is renamed and is illustrated as the Hansen Dam Park (Flood Control Basin) and Hansen Lake to the south of the Project.
Historic Aerial	1952	Netronline	-	The Project Site appears as a vacant lot. An improved road (Foothill Blvd.) is to the north, and an improved northwest to southeast trending road is to the south.
Historic Aerial	1953, 1954	Netronline	-	Three buildings are present in the northwest portion of the Project Site and the remaining portion is undeveloped.
Historic Aerial	1964	Netronline	-	The aerial imagery lacks clarity and features are difficult to discern. It appears an additional building is located within the southern portion of the site.
Historic Aerial	1967, 1969	Netronline	-	Only one building appears in the northwestern portion of the Project Site (the other two that are present in 1953 are no longer extant). No other changes present.
Historic Aerial	1972	Netronline	-	1972: The building in the northwest is no longer extant and the Project Site appears graded. One structure remains within the southeastern portion of the project.

Map Name	Date(s)	Author	Legal Description	Description of Potential Resource within Project Study Site
Historic Aerial	1994, 1999	Netronline	-	The Project Site appears as an undeveloped lot with several large trees. No features, buildings, or structures are present.

T=Township, R=Range, Netronline=Historic Aerials by Netronline 2021. Electronic database located at <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer> accessed 9/02/2021.

3.4.5.1 Federal Land Patent Search

A search of federal land patents through the Bureau of Land Management's General Land Office Records website identified one early patent holder in 1873, Eulogio De Celis, for Township 2 North, Range 14 West, under the authority of the March 3, 1851: Grant-Spanish/Mexican (9 Stat. 631). The land grant geographic name was [rancho] Ex-Mission De San Fernando and encompassed an area of 116,771 acres. Federal land patents provide information on the initial transfer of land titles from the federal government to private ownership (individuals or companies) or local governments by the title transfer authority.

3.4.5.2 Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Land File Search

Tetra Tech contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 8, 2021 and requested that the NAHC conduct a Sacred Land File (SLF) search for the proposed Project. The NAHC replied on September 8, 2021, that the SLF results were Positive for the Project. The NAHC recommended contacting the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The NAHC also provided a list of local Native American contacts with knowledge of the region (see Attachment 3). The NAHC recommends contacting the listed tribes or individuals as they may have knowledge of cultural resources within or near the Project. Native American government to government consultation is part of the lead CEQA agency's responsibilities under Assembly Bill 52.

Discussion:

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

No Impact. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically defines a "historical resource" as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria:

- Listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- A resource listed in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC; or
- Identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC; or
- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California that may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC, Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulation, Section 4852) including the following:

- An association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
- An association with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- An embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or a representation of the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
- A resource that has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

The Project site does not contain any known historic resources. The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines. Therefore, the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource and no Project impact would result.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The cultural resource record search did not identify any existing cultural resources within the Project site. The NAHC SLF search was positive and suggests there is a potential for tribal resources. Based on the natural setting, NAHC SLF results, SCCIC records search results and preliminary literature review, distribution patterns of previously recorded sites near the Project site, and previous disturbance to native soils (i.e., modern development, artificial fill), the Project site is assessed as having an overall low to moderate sensitivity for significant buried precontact or historic archaeological resources within undisturbed native subsurface deposits. Therefore, there is a possibility that buried archaeological deposits may be encountered during Project-related subsurface excavation within undisturbed native soils (e.g., Holocene age deposits).

Phase 1 activities do not involve ground disturbance within native soils and therefore, no impacts are expected. During Phase 2, if construction ground disturbance depths range within native soils, there would be a potential to impact previously unrecorded subsurface archaeological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are recommended below:

Mitigation Measures:

MM CUL-1: Environmental Training – prior to construction of Phase 2 of the Project, the Project owner shall retain a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of Interior qualifiers for archaeology. The archaeologist will prepare an Inadvertent Discovery Plan that will provide a cultural resource briefing that includes all applicable laws and penalties pertaining to disturbing cultural resources, a brief discussion of the prehistoric and historic regional context and archaeological sensitivity of the area, types of cultural resources found in the area, instruction that Project workers will halt construction if a cultural resource is inadvertently discovered during construction, and procedures to follow in the event an inadvertent discovery is encountered, including appropriate treatment and respectful behavior of a discovery (e.g., no posting to social media or photographs). The archaeologist will present the initial cultural resource environmental training to all Project construction personnel and a handout identifying the key points will be provided. If requested, a local tribal representative(s) shall be invited to participate in the environmental training to discuss or provide text from a tribal cultural perspective regarding the cultural resources within the region.

MM CUL-2: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources During Construction – The Project owner shall retain a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of Interior qualifiers for archaeology. The archaeologist will prepare an Inadvertent Discovery Plan for the Project that will outline procedures and contacts for an inadvertent discovery. In general, during Project-level construction, should subsurface archaeological resources be discovered, all activity 100 feet of a “find” shall stop and the qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the significance of the find according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and/or National Register of Historic Places criteria (as applicable). The archaeologist shall have the authority to halt any Project-related construction activities that could impact potentially significant resources. If any find is determined to be significant, the archaeologist shall determine, in consultation with the implementing agencies and any local Native American groups expressing interest, appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. Ground-disturbing activities shall not continue until the discovery has been assessed by the archaeologist. The archaeologist shall be afforded the necessary time to assess the find. With monitoring, construction activities may continue on other areas of the Project site during evaluation and treatment of historic or unique archaeological resources. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place is the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources. Methods of avoidance may include, but shall not be limited to, (i) Project re-route or re-design, (ii) Project cancellation, or (iii) identification of protection measures such as capping or fencing. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if it is demonstrated that resources cannot be avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall develop additional treatment measures, such as data recovery or other appropriate measures, in consultation with the implementing agency and any local Native American representatives expressing interest in prehistoric or tribal resources. If an archaeological site does not qualify as an historical resource but meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 21083.2, then the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2.

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant Impact. Ground disturbance within native soils may potentially contain unanticipated human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Existing regulations require that if human remains and/or cultural items defined by Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, are inadvertently discovered, all work in the vicinity of the find would cease and the Los Angeles County Medical Examiner-Coroner at (323) 434-0512: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday); or at (323) 343-0714: after business hours, will be contacted immediately. If the remains are found to be Native American as defined by Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, the coroner will contact the NAHC by telephone within 24 hours. The NAHC shall immediately notify the person it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) as stipulated by California PRC, Section 5097.98. The MLD(s), with the permission of the landowner and/or authorized representative, shall inspect the site of the discovered remains and recommend treatment regarding the remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendations within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. Any discovery of human remains would be treated in accordance with Section 5097.98 of the PRC and Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, with compliance with existing regulations, Project impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required. Compliance with existing regulations will ensure that any Project impact on human remains would be less than significant.

3.4.6 ENERGY

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b.	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

Discussion:

a. Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the CEQA Guidelines, “[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the Project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the Project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.” Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is to identify any significant irreversible environmental effects of Project implementation that cannot be avoided.

Both construction and operation of the proposed Project would lead to the consumption of limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources, committing such resources to uses that future generations would be unable to reverse. The Project would require the commitment of resources that include: (1) building materials; (2) fuel and operational materials/resources; and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project site.

During Project construction, energy will be consumed in the form of electricity associated with powering lights, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power. Project construction will also consume energy in the form of petroleum-based fuels associated with the use of construction vehicles and equipment on the Project site, construction worker travel to and from the Project site, and truck trips delivering building materials to the Project site and hauling solid waste from the Project site. Consumption of fuel would be short-term during construction.

During Project operation, energy consumption is expected to be similar to existing consumption levels. However, the Project includes the installation of solar panels on the new shade structure and the Cube structure. Therefore, the Project’s operational energy demands will be reduced in comparison to existing levels.

The Proposed Project will comply with all applicable regulations and codes which require achievement of various levels of energy efficiency in building construction, design, and operation. The consumption of such resources would represent a long-term commitment of those resources. The commitment of resources required for the construction and operation of

the Proposed Project would limit the availability of such resources for future generations or for other uses during the life of the Project. However, use of such resources will be short-term and minimal during construction and during operation will result in reduced energy demands and therefore, will not require a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider. In addition, the Proposed Project will comply with all applicable regulations and codes. The energy demand associated with the proposed Project will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required. Regulatory compliance will maintain impacts at a less than significant level.

b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. As noted above, the Project will include solar panels reducing operational energy demands and will not result in energy consumption requiring a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider. In addition, the Project will comply with applicable regulatory requirements, such as the Los Angeles Municipal Code which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code Title 24. The Project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency and therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
	ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
	iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
	iv.) Landslides?				X
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				X
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?		X		

Existing Conditions:

The Project site is not located near an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (USGS 2023).

The Project site is not located within a landslide zone or a liquefaction zone (City of Los Angeles 2023a).

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (USGS 2023). The proposed Project will be designed in accordance with applicable seismic safety standards. Operation of the proposed Project, therefore, is not anticipated to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death from the rupture of a known earthquake fault; therefore, no impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project is located within the seismically active Southern California region and is likely to experience strong ground shaking from seismic events generated on regionally active faults. No active faults cross the Project; however, the Project site is located in close proximity to the Verdugo Fault Zone (City of Los Angeles 2023a). The Project has been designed in accordance with applicable seismic safety standards. Operation of the proposed Project, therefore, is not anticipated to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground-shaking. The impact is anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Liquefaction occurs when loosely packed sediments are also water-logged near the ground surface. Such sediments can lose their structural integrity in response to strong ground shaking. During earthquakes, if liquefaction occurs beneath buildings or other structures, it can cause major damage. The Project is not located within a liquefaction hazard zone (City of Los Angeles 2023a). No impacts associated with liquefaction are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

iv.) Landslides?

No Impact. The Project site and surrounding area is relatively flat and is not located in a landslide area; therefore, no impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No Impact. Construction of the Project would include minor ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading in order to build the proposed Project. As the proposed Project is less than one acre, the proposed Project would not be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program administered by the State Water Resources Control Board. Construction activities would be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Building Code, including applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, including the use of BMPs during construction. The Project site will be paved or landscaped so that no exposed soil would remain after construction is complete. Therefore, the Project will not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil and no impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Is the project located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

No Impact. Based on the analysis provided in Responses 3.4.7.a.iii. and 3.4.7.a.iv. above, no impacts would be expected related to liquefaction or onsite or off-site landslides. Since the Project site does not contain free-faces or slopes, occurrence of lateral spreading is unlikely. Subsidence is a localized mass movement that involves the gradual downward settling or sinking of the ground, resulting from the extraction of mineral resources, subsurface oil, groundwater, or other subsurface liquids, such as natural gas. The Project site is not located within an area of known subsidence associated with oil or ground water withdrawal (City of Los Angeles 1996, 2023). In addition, construction of the Project will comply with applicable measures of the Los Angeles Building Code and the California Building Code regarding seismic safety measures; therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

d. Is the project located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less than Significant Impact. Expansiveness refers to the potential to swell and shrink with repeated cycles of wetting and drying and is a common feature of fine-grained clayey soils. This wetting and drying causes damage due to differential settlement within buildings and other improvements. The design and construction of the Project will comply with applicable regulations and standard specifications to prevent potential risk of damage from expansive soils. The Project would be required to comply with building codes in order to minimize the potential for hazards due to expansive soils. Therefore, regulatory compliance will ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

e. Would the project have soils that are incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems will be constructed as part of the Project, and thus no impacts related to septic system use will occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Given the highly disturbed condition of the Project site and surroundings, the likelihood that paleontological resources or unique geologic features exist onsite is considered low. However, ground-disturbing activities, such as grading or excavation, could unearth undocumented paleontological resources or unique geologic features by disturbing native soils that may contain such resources. Phase 1 activities do not involve ground disturbance of native soils and therefore, no impacts are expected.

During Phase 2, the proposed Project would implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and notify the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety immediately should an inadvertent discovery occur, and all construction activities would be halted until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find. The qualified paleontologist shall determine the location, time frame, and extent to which any monitoring or earthmoving activities shall occur. The discoveries shall be handled in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, which includes those set forth in

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources or geological features would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

MM GEO-1: *Inadvertent Discoveries of Paleontological Resources* — If the construction staff or others observe previously unidentified paleontological resources during ground disturbing activities, they will halt work within a 200-foot radius of the find(s), delineate the area of the find with flagging tape or rope (may also include dirt spoils from the find area), and immediately notify a qualified Paleontologist. Construction will halt within the flagged or roped-off area. The Paleontologist will assess the resource as soon as possible and determine appropriate next steps in coordination with the City. Such finds will be formally recorded and evaluated. The resource will be protected from further disturbance or looting pending evaluation.

3.4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b.	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Existing Conditions:

The State of California has enacted key legislation in an effort to reduce its contribution to climate change. Climate change is a result of greenhouse gases (GHG) emitted all around the world from sources such as the combustion of fuel for transportation and heat, cement manufacture, and refrigerant emissions.

Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, required that GHGs emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The California Air Resources Board is the State agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of GHGs. Assembly Bill 32 required the California Air Resources Board to adopt and implement a list of discrete and early action GHG reduction measures, which was completed in October 2007.

The Southern California Association of Governments is the regional planning agency for ensuring implementation of Senate Bill 375. Senate Bill 375, or the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, supports the State's climate action goals to reduce GHG emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning with the goal of more sustainable communities. Under the Sustainable Communities Act, the California Air Resources Board sets regional targets for GHG emissions reductions from passenger vehicle use.

Area sources of GHG include emissions from natural gas combustion, fireplaces, landscaping equipment, consumer products, and architectural coatings. Indirect sources include emissions from energy consumption and water conveyance. Mobile sources include emissions from passenger vehicles and delivery trucks. Typically, mobile sources are the primary contributor of GHG emissions.

The City has adopted the 2019 L.A.'s Green New Deal pLAn (City of Los Angeles 2019) which includes adoption of a GHG reduction pathway that charts a course to carbon neutrality.

Discussion:

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves improvements to an existing land use and would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The proposed Project is anticipated to generate GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, mobile sources, waste disposal, water usage, and construction equipment. The Los Angeles Green Building Code (Ordinance No. 181,480) was adopted with the goal of improving energy conservation and efficiency, The Los Angeles Green

Building Code requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water use and wastewater generation. The Project also involves the installation of solar panels, which will contribute to the reduction of Project generated GHG emissions. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur from development of the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The applicable plan for the proposed Project is the 2019 L.A.'s Green New Deal pLAN (City of Los Angeles 2019) which includes adoption of a GHG reduction pathway that charts a course to carbon neutrality. The Project also involves the installation of solar panels, which will contribute to the reduction of Project generated GHG emissions. In addition, the Project would be required to meet the Los Angeles Green Building Code (Ordinance No. 181,480) and Title 24 Part 10 CalGreen standards. Through required implementation of the applicable rules and regulations, the proposed Project would be consistent with local and statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.				X

Existing Conditions:

The Project Area is urbanized with recreation, commercial, and multi-family residential uses.

The Project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (DTSC 2023; CWRCB 2023).

The Project site is located within 1.5 miles northwest of the Whiteman Airport. The Project site is not within the Whiteman Airport Safety Zones (County of Los Angeles 2011).

Fire protection and other related services will be provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department, from the Valley Bureau, Fire Station 98 (City of Los Angeles 2023a) located at 13035 Van Nuys Boulevard, approximately 1.4 miles from the Project site (Google Earth 2023).

The Los Angeles Fire Department provides emergency response to fires and hazardous materials incidents.

Discussion:

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact. The short-term construction process for the proposed Project would not involve any routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Some examples of hazardous materials include fuels, lubricating fluids such as paints, adhesives, and solvents. Fuels and solvents for construction would be stored and utilized pursuant to existing regulatory requirements. Therefore, short-term construction impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the Project would involve limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in commercial developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. The Project would not result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal.

All chemical storage and usage would comply with existing federal, State, and local requirements (including chemical hygiene requirements administered by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health). With the aforementioned procedures, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. During construction, there is a potential for accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid used by construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials utilized during construction. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are quickly and appropriately contained, and then remediated, as required by local, State, and federal law. As with the discussion for 3.4.9.a. above, all chemical and fuel storage and usage would comply with existing federal, State, and local requirements (including chemical hygiene requirements administered by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health). With the aforementioned measures implemented as part of the proposed Project, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. There are no schools within 0.25 mile. The closest schools are Santiago Elementary School (located approximately 0.5 mile to the south of the Project site) and Penton Avenue Elementary School (located approximately 0.4 mile to the north of the Project site). Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- d. Is the project located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No Impact. Since the Project site is not on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, there would be no hazard to the public or environment and therefore, no impact would be experienced.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact. The Project site is located within 1.5 miles northwest of the Whiteman Airport; however, the Project site is not within the Whiteman Airport Safety Zones (County of Los Angeles 2011). The Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project Area and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- f. Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No Impact. Foothills Boulevard, on which the Project is located, is designated as an emergency route (City of Los Angeles 1996). The Project would not require the closure of any public or private streets and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.**

No Impact. The Project site is located in an urbanized and fully developed area and is not located within Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2023; City of Los Angeles 2023a). The DCLA parking lot has been used and will continue to be available to the Los Angeles Fire Department as an emergency command center to support any area fire-fighting efforts. In addition, the Project's Fire Ranger Training Camp will provide information to participants regarding wildland fires and response methods. Therefore, the Project would not pose a fire hazard due to wildland fires and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X
b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
	(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?				X
	(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?				X
	(iii) create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
	(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

Existing Conditions:

The Project is in a Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Zone X (FEMA 2008). The areas that are in Zone X have been determined to be outside of the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. The existing Lopez Canyon LACFCD flood-control channel is located adjacent to the site.

The Project site is not located in a tsunami run-up area (City of Los Angeles 2023a).

Discussion:

- a. **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?**

No Impact. The proposed Project will be compliant with the applicable regulations set forth by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Stormwater runoff has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants to the environment which may be associated with landscaped areas, such as pesticides and fertilizers, and paved surfaces, or ordinary cleaner products. The Project will be compliant to the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Regulation (Ordinances No. 172,176 and No. 173, 494) which ensure that pollutant loads from a project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. These ordinances include the requirements for construction activities and operation of projects in order to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater mitigation and other related requirements through the City's Development BMPs Handbook. Therefore, the Project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface and ground water quality. No impact is expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

No Impact. The Project involves improvements to an existing land use and will not involve an increase in demand for groundwater supplies, thus, the Project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table level. In addition, the Project will comply with the Stormwater Low Impact Development Ordinance (Ordinance #181899, updated September 2015 [Ordinance #183833]) to address water runoff and storm water pollution. Conformance would be ensured during the City's building plan review and approval process. Therefore, no impacts to the groundwater supply are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:

(i). Result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site?

No Impact. Refer to Response 3.4.10.a. above. Development of the Project will not alter drainage conditions in, nor runoff efficiency from, the Project Area. The proposed Project will construct any improvements to storm drains based on Regional Water Quality Control Board Non-Stormwater discharge requirements and will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

(ii). Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site?

No Impact. The proposed Project will not alter off-site runoff in comparison to existing conditions. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

(iii). Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

No Impact. Refer to Responses 3.4.10.a. and 3.4.10.c.(i) above. The Project will not alter off-site runoff in comparison to existing conditions. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

(iv). Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. The proposed Project will not alter off-site runoff in comparison to existing conditions. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2008). The Project site is approximately 0.8 miles northwest of the Hansen Dam emergency spillway and is 65 feet higher in elevation. As a result, potential for project inundation and associated release of pollutants is not expected. The Project site is not located near any areas at risk for seiche, tsunami or mudflows; therefore, no impacts associated with these hazards would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. Refer to Response 3.4.10.a and 3.4.10.b. above. The Project will be compliant to the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Regulation. Development of the Project would include requirements for the implementation of BMPs to minimize the potential for water quality impacts during construction. The Project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table level. The Project will also be compliant with the Stormwater Low Impact Development Ordinance. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
b.	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

Existing Conditions:

The Project is located in an urban setting and is designated as Open Space (City of Los Angeles 2023a). The Project site is predominately developed. Land Use surrounding the Project site is designated as either open space, community commercial, and multiple family residential (City of Los Angeles 2023a).

Discussion:

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Project would include improvements to an existing science center located in an already developed area. Improvements would be contained within the existing science center’s outside facility. The Project would not involve any road closures or other types of barriers to travel. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The Project would include improvements to an existing land use and is consistent with one purpose of Open Space Zoning, which is to provide outdoor recreation opportunities. The proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project; therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

Existing Conditions:

Mineral Resource Zones are commercially viable mineral or aggregate deposits, such as sand, gravel, and other construction aggregate. The Project Site is not located within a City-designated Mineral Resource Zone where significant mineral deposits are known to be present (City of Los Angeles 2001). No mineral extraction operations occur on the Project site or in the vicinity.

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No Impact. No mineral recovery activities currently occur in the Project Area, and the Project site is not underlain by any known mineral resources of value to the region and residents of the State. Thus, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

No Impact. As stated above, the Project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone or an area of oil and gas resources. Thus, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.13 NOISE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
a.	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b.	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c.	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion:

- a. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Less than Significant. A significant impact may occur if the proposed Project would generate excess noise that would cause the ambient noise environment at the Project site to exceed noise level standards set forth in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element and the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

Noise impacts from construction activities associated with the proposed Project would be a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, equipment location, sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the construction activities. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are residential apartments located approximately 150 feet north of the Project site. These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 decibels A-weighted (dBA) per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 84 dBA Leq (Equivalent sound level) measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 78 dBA Leq at 100 feet from the source to the receptor and reduce by another 6 dBA Leq to 72 dBA Leq at 200 feet from the source to the receptor.

The Project will comply with any applicable requirements of the Noise Element of the General Plan, Section 111 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, or any other applicable noise standard. The Project shall also comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances, which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Construction noise is typically governed by ordinance limits on allowable times of equipment operations. The City limits construction activities to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday. The Project will also incorporate Project Design Feature Noise-1

to further reduce construction noise. As a result of compliance with applicable regulations, construction noise impacts are expected to be less than significant.

As the proposed Project involves improvements to an existing use, operation noise is expected to be similar to existing conditions. In addition, DCLA will continue to comply with all applicable noise rules and regulations. Therefore, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Project Design Feature:

PDF NOISE-1: The project contractor shall use power construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices.

b. Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact. Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment used on the site. Operation of construction equipment causes ground vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with distance. Buildings in the vicinity of the construction site respond to these vibrations with varying results ranging from no perceptible effects at the low levels to slight damage at the highest levels. Table 3-6 gives approximate vibration levels for particular construction activities. The data in this table provides a reasonable estimate for a wide range of soil conditions.

Table 3-6. Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second)	Approximate Vibration Level (L _v) at 25 feet
Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)	0.202	94
Vibratory Roller	0.210	94
Hoe Ram	0.089	87
Large bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson drill	0.089	87
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58

Source: Federal Transit Administration 2018.

Vibration impacts from construction activities associated with the proposed Project would typically be created from the operation of heavy off-road equipment. The nearest off-site sensitive receptors are the residents at the multi-family homes located approximately 150 feet north of the Project site.

Caltrans defines the threshold of perception from transient sources at 0.25 inch per second peak particle velocity.

From Table 3-6 above, a vibratory roller would create a vibration level of 0.21 inch per second peak particle velocity at 25 feet. This would be within the 0.25 inch per second peak particle velocity threshold. Propagation would further reduce the vibration level at the nearest off-site sensitive receptor. The operation of the proposed Project would not include any known vibration sources. Therefore, a less than significant vibration impact is anticipated from the operation and construction of the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport

or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels from aircraft. The Project site is located within 1.5 miles northwest of the Whiteman Airport. Noise contours have been determined for this airport (County of Los Angeles 2011). The 65 dB noise contour is the threshold by which the Federal Aviation Administration determines where residential land uses are compatible with an airport. The Project site is located outside of the 65 dB noise contours of this airport. Therefore, no aircraft noise impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Existing Conditions:

As of 2021, the Arleta population was 103,591 people and has approximately 23,877 housing units (City of Los Angeles 2023b). As of 2018, the Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan population was 61,748 people and has approximately 21,921 housing units (City of Los Angeles 2018b).

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would consist of improvements to an already developed science center. In addition, the proposed Project would not involve nor induce the construction of any new homes, businesses, or other uses that could result in direct population growth. Therefore, no impacts with regard to growth-inducement would be expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. Construction of the Project would not require the removal or obstruction of existing housing and thus would not require the displacement of people or the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
	i.) Fire protection?				X
	ii.) Police protection?				X
	iii.) Schools?				X
	iv.) Parks?				X
	v.) Other public facilities?				X

Existing Conditions:

Public services include critical facilities such as police stations, fire stations, hospitals, shelters, and other facilities that provide important services to the community. Other public services include schools and parks and libraries that serve the communities.

Fire protection and other related services will be provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department, from the Valley Bureau, Fire Station 98 (City of Los Angeles 2023a). Fire Station 98 is located at 13035 Van Nuys Boulevard, approximately 1.4 miles from the Project site (Google Earth 2023). Another fire station is located at 12605 Osborne Street, approximately 1.4 miles from the Project Site (Google Earth 2023).

Police protection services will be provided by the Los Angeles Police Department from the Foothills Community Police Station (City of Los Angeles 2023a), located at 12760 Osborne Street, approximately 1.7 miles from the Project site (Google Earth 2023).

The surrounding area of the Project site is serviced by the Los Angeles Unified School District (Google Earth 2023). Penton Avenue Elementary School is located approximately 0.4 miles to the north of the Project site. The Lake View Terrace Branch Library is directly adjacent to the Project site and provides programs and events for children, teens, and adults (LA Public Library 2023). The Project is located within the Hansen Dam which includes Roger Jessup Park, Kagel Canyon Park and Orcas Park (LA Parks 2023; Google Earth 2023).

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**
 - i.) **Fire Protection**

No Impact. The proposed Project would not increase the need for fire protection services as no residential uses are proposed, the Project involves improvements to an existing land use, and is not expected to result in an increase in the City of Los Angeles' population. Therefore, no impacts to fire protection services or facilities are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

ii.) Police Protection

No Impact. The proposed Project would not increase the need for police services as the Project involves improvements to an existing land use and is not expected to result in an increase in the City's population. Therefore, no impacts to police services or facilities are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

iii.) Schools

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the need for the construction of additional school facilities, as the Project would not result in an increase in population, nor would it result in a removal of a school, a reduction of school capacity, or displacement of students from existing schools. Therefore, no impact to school services or facilities are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

iv.) Parks

No Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the need for the construction of additional park facilities, as the Project would not result in an increase in population, nor would it result in a removal of a park. Therefore, no impacts to parks are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

v.) Other Public Facilities

No Impact. The proposed Project would not alter any of the government facilities in the area or produce a need for additional or new government services; therefore, no impacts to other public facilities are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.16 RECREATION

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Existing Conditions:

The surrounding area contains many parks including the Hansen Dam Recreation Area and the Kagel Canyon Park which is approximately 0.85 miles from the Project site. The Project site is within the Hansen Dam Recreation Area which encompasses many recreational facilities including four parks, a soccer field, a bike path, stables, a lake for boating, and walking trails.

Discussion:

- a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would not add additional residences or businesses in the neighborhood and thus would not cause additional use of any park or other recreational facilities in the area. Therefore, no impact to existing neighborhoods and regional parks or other recreational facilities would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact. The proposed Project involves improvements to an existing children’s science center. Construction of the Project will not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities that would require construction of new, or expansion of existing, facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.17 TRANSPORTATION

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?				X
b.	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c.	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
d.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

Existing Conditions:

The Project site located at the southwestern corner of the intersection of Osbourne Street and Foothill Boulevard. The entrance to the Project site is off of Osbourne Street and Dronefield Avenue to the east.

Discussion:

- a. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would not conflict with any transit plan or ordinance. Construction of the Project would not involve road or lane closures. Traffic associated with the operation of the Project is expected to be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

Less than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) states that land use projects that indicate vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Vehicle miles traveled is a function of the number of trips and the length of those trips. Traffic associated with the construction of the Project is expected to be minor and short-term. Traffic associated with the operation of the Project is expected to be similar to existing conditions. Given that the proposed Project is not anticipated to significantly change the number of trips or the average trip distance, the Project is anticipated to have a negligible effect on vehicle miles traveled and no significant impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact. The proposed Project involves improvements to an existing facility that do not alter any transportation routes, will not lead to additional traffic and will remain compatible with the area. The proposed Project would not involve any changes to existing roadways. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The existing access to the Project site by emergency vehicles would remain as currently configured. Therefore, there would be no impact on the availability of emergency access to the Project site. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
a.	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		X		
b.	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision © of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

PRC section 21074 defines tribal resources as follows:

- (a) “Tribal cultural resources” are either of the following:
 - (1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
 - (A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
 - (B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
 - (2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision ©(c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision ©(c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
- (b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- (c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

Existing Conditions: Tetra Tech contacted the NAHC on August 8, 2021 and requested that the NAHC conduct a SLF search for the proposed Project. The NAHC replied on September 8, 2021, that the SLF results were Positive for the Project. The NAHC recommended contacting the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The NAHC also provided a list of local Native American contacts with knowledge of the region (see Attachment 3 of Appendix A). In compliance with Assembly Bill 52, Native American nations traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project site were notified of the proposed project in June 2024. To date, no requests for consultation on this project have been received from Consultation has not been requested by California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area.

Discussion:

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. If construction ground disturbance depths range within native soils, there would be a potential to impact previously unrecorded subsurface tribal cultural resources. In compliance with Assembly Bill 52, Native American nations traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project site were notified of the proposed project in June 2024. To date, no requests for consultation on this project have been received from Consultation has not been requested by California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. With Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 incorporated, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. If construction ground disturbance depths range within native soils, there would be a potential to impact previously unrecorded subsurface tribal cultural resources. In compliance with Assembly Bill 52, Native American nations traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project site were notified of the proposed project in June 2024. To date, no requests for consultation on this project have been received from Consultation has not been requested by California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. With Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 incorporated, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

3.4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
c.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
d.	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e.	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Existing Conditions:

The Proposed Project Site is served by an existing sewer collection and conveyance system and wastewater treatment services provided and maintained by the City's Bureau of Sanitation. Any wastewater that would be generated by the Site would be treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has been designed to treat 450 million gallons per day, while average daily flows are 275 million gallons per day (LA Sanitation and Environment 2023).

The water purveyor to the City is the Los Angeles Department of Public Works. The Los Angeles Department of Public Works obtains water supplies from four sources: the Los Angeles Aqueduct, water provided by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, local groundwater, and recycled water.

The Los Angeles County storm drain system consists of channels, drains, debris basins, and catch basins owned and maintained by the LACFCD, the City, and USACE. The primary drainage channel in the Los Angeles River Watershed is the Los Angeles River. The City's storm drain system comprises 82,000 catch basins, with 3,330 miles of underground pipes and 483 miles of open channels (City of Los Angeles 2020b). The City's storm drains are designed to provide capacity for up to a 25-year storm.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation and private waste management companies are responsible for the collection, disposal, and recycling of solid waste within the City, including the project site.

Discussion:

- a. **Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will construct connections to the existing systems adjacent to the Project site. Construction of these connections would result in temporary and minor impacts to air, noise, and traffic during construction activities (as described in this Initial Study), however, these impacts were found to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

No Impact. Project construction activities will use minor amounts of water. This usage will be short term and less than significant. Water use associated with the operations of the Project is expected to be similar to existing conditions and therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- c. **Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

No Impact. Demands on wastewater treatment associated with the operations of the Project is expected to be similar to existing conditions and therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- d. **Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Less than Significant Impact. Although the Project may require the disposal of construction and/or demolition debris during the construction process (soil, asphalt, demolished materials, etc.), the generation of these materials would be short-term in nature and would not have the capability to substantially affect the capacity of regional landfills. Generation of solid waste associated with the operations of the Project is expected to be similar to existing conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- e. **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact. The proposed Project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act and City requirements. This applies to solid waste generated during the construction process as well as solid waste produced during operation of the Project. Waste amounts produced during operation are not expected to increase significantly, if at all, over current operations. As a result, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.20 WILDFIRE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b.	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c.	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d.	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

Existing Conditions:

The Project site is located in an urbanized and fully developed area and is not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2023). The Project site is not located in a landslide area. The land within and in the vicinity of the Project site is relatively flat.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department provides emergency response to fire and hazardous materials to the Project site and the surrounding area.

Discussion:

a. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. Foothill Boulevard, on which the project is located, is designated as an emergency route (City of Los Angeles 1996). The Project would not require the closure of any public or private streets during construction (including Foothill Boulevard) and would not impede emergency vehicle access to the Project site or surrounding area. Additionally, emergency access to and from the Project site would be provided in accordance with requirements of the Los Angeles Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

b. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No Impact. The Project site is located in an urbanized and fully developed area and is not located within Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2023; City of Los Angeles 2023a). The DCLA parking lot has been used by and will continue to be available to the Los Angeles Fire Department as an emergency command center to support any area firefighting efforts while the Project is under construction and after it is completed. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

c. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No Impact. The Project site is located in an urbanized and fully developed area and is not located within Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Project does not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk. No impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

d. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact. The land within and in the vicinity of the Project site is relatively flat. The Project site is not located in a flood or landslide hazard zone; therefore, no impacts are expected.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

3.4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Mandatory Findings of Significance					
a.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion:

- a. **Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As discussed in Section 3.4.4, Biological Resources, the Project is located in an urban area and does not provide biological habitat for species of concern or for federally listed species. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the existing environment, reduce habitat of fish or wildlife species, threaten plant or animal communities, and/or reduce the number or restrict the range of rare plants or animals.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.4.5, Cultural Resources, the Project site and surrounding area has been completely disturbed by development and has been subject to extensive ground disturbance in the past. As such, any historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources which may have existed in the Project site would have likely been disturbed. However, adherence to Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and GEO-1 would be required in the event unexpected resources are uncovered during the grading and excavation process. With implementation of recommended Mitigation Measures, the proposed Project is not expected to

eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

- b. **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)**

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in substantial population growth within the area, either directly or indirectly. Although the Project may incrementally affect other resources at a less than significant level, the Project’s contribution to these effects is not considered “cumulatively considerable”, in consideration of the relatively nominal impacts of the Project. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- c. **Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Less than Significant Impact. Previous sections of this Initial Study reviewed the proposed Project’s potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, geology, and soils, GHGs, hydrology/water quality, noise, hazards and hazardous materials, traffic, and other issues. As concluded in these previous discussions, the proposed Project would result in less than significant environmental impacts with implementation of Project Design Feature Noise-1; therefore, the proposed Project would not result in environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings and impacts would be less than significant.

Project Design Feature: Implement **NOISE-1**.

4.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks

Elena Maggioni, Environmental Supervisor

Tetra Tech, Inc. (Technical Assistance)

Paula Fell, Project Manager

Derrick Coleman, PhD, Deputy Project Manager

Elizabeth Bradley, Environmental Planner

Jenna Farrell, Cultural Resources

DeeAnna Garcia, Word Processor/Editor

Sierra Marrs, Mapping/Graphics

5.0 REFERENCES

Bean, L.B. and C.R. Smith

1978 Gabrieliño. In California. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, pp. 538-549, edited by W.L. D’Azevedo. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Byrd, Brian F. and L. Mark Raab

2007 Prehistory of the Southern Bight: Models for a New Millennium. In California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 215-227. Altamira Press.

California Code of Regulations

Title 14. Natural Resources, Division 6. Resources Agencies, Chapter 3. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Article 6. Negative Declaration Process, Sections 15070 to 15075. Available online at: <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>.

California Missions

2021 California Missions, Keeping the Past Present. Electronic document available online at: <https://missionscalifornia.com/nuestra-senora-de-la-soledad-mission> accessed August 2021.

Castillo, Edward D.

1978 The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement. In California. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, pp. 99-127, W.L. D’Azevedo eds, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation)

2023 California Scenic Highway Mapping System. Available online at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed February 2023.

CAL FIRE

2023 Fire Hazard Severity Zone. 2023. Available online at: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed February 2023.

California State Water Resources Control Board (CWRCB)

2023 Geotraker. <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>. Accessed February 2023.

City of Los Angeles

1996 Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. Adopted November 26, 1996. Available online at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/31b07c9a-7eea-4694-9899-f00265b2dc0d/Safety_Element.pdf. Accessed February 2023.

2001 Conservation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. Adopted September 26, 2001. Available online at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/28af7e21-ffdd-4f26-84e6-dfa967b2a1ee/Conservation_Element.pdf. Accessed February 2023.

2004 San Gabriel Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan. Adopted December 19, 2003; Effective February 8, 2003. Available online at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/d7d9eb52-206e-4521-9cc2-69fac3b1f4cf/San_GabrielVerdugo_Mountains_Scenic_Preservation_Specific_Plan.pdf Accessed February 2023.

2016a Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan. Adopted November 6, 1996. Amended September 7, 2016. Available online at:

- https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/7de7c06e-77cb-4283-addf-8d98b5533674/Arleta-Pacoima_Community_Plan.pdf. Accessed February 2023.
- 2016b Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan. Adopted November 18, 1997. Amended September 7, 2016. Available online at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/b4307861-43a8-4bff-8221-3f4c4eab86a4/Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow_Hills-Lake_View_Terrace-East_La_Tuna_Canyon_Community_Plan.pdf. Accessed February 2023.
- 2018a City of Los Angeles. Special Requirements, Infill Development Projects, Class 32 Categorical Exemption, Special Requirement Criteria. February 23, 2018. Available online at: <https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/ad70d15e-11b8-49ef-aba3-b168f670a576/Class%2032%20Categorical%20Exemption.pdf> Accessed February 2023.
- 2018b City of Los Angeles Community Plan Areas with ACS for Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon. February 26, 2018. Available online at: <https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=9fafea6482184bc8978028b5ca5f3b44>. Accessed February 2023.
- 2019 L.A.'s Green New Deal Sustainable City pLAN 2019. Available online at: https://plan.lamayor.org/sites/default/files/pLAN_2019_final.pdf. Accessed February 2023.
- 2020a General Plan Land Use Map, Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan. December 2020. Available online at: [https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/47edaabe-eae7-4718-87f5-e9c259aa87d8/Landuse\(P\)_ARL.pdf](https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/47edaabe-eae7-4718-87f5-e9c259aa87d8/Landuse(P)_ARL.pdf). Accessed February 2023.
- 2020b Floodplain Management Plan. Available online at: <https://eng2.lacity.org/projects/fmp/pdf/2020FMPSubmittalDraft.pdf>. Accessed February 2023.
- 2023a ZIMAS. Available online at: zimas.lacity.org. Accessed February 2023.
- 2023b 2021 Arleta-Pacoima Demographic Profile. 2021. Available online at: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/b246a842-50c0-4027-b85f-a36e0fdc5dd1/standard_report2021_ARLETA_mail.pdf#:~:text=ARLETA%20-%20PACOIMA%20DEMOGRAPHIC%20PROFILE%20%28SOURCE%3A%20American%20Community,Percent%20Total%20person%20103%2C591%20Total%20Males%2051%2C681%2049.9%25. Accessed February 2023.
- County of Los Angeles
- 2011 Whiteman Airport Master Plan. February 2011. Available online at: https://dpw.lacounty.gov/avi/airports/documents/Whiteman_MP.pdf Accessed February 2023.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation)
- 2023 Division of Land Resource Protection. 2023. California Important Farmland Finder. Available online at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed February 2023.
- DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control)
- 2023 “EnviroStor” mapping tool, database of hazardous substance release sites, Government Code Section 65962.5. Available online at: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed February 2023.

Dibblee, Thomas W.

- 1991 Geologic Map of the San Fernando and North 1/2 Van Nuys Quadrangles, Los Angeles County, California. Available online at: https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_217.htm. Accessed February 2023.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

- 2008 Flood Insurance Rate Map, City of Los Angeles, California, Map Number 06037C1069F, Effective Date December 26, 2008.

Federal Transit Administration

- 2018 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. September 2018.

Google Earth

- 2023 Available online at: <https://earth.google.com/web/>. Accessed February 2023.

Kroeber, A.L.

- 1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington.

LA Sanitation and Environment

- 2023 Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant. Available online at: https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/wcnav_externalId/s-lsh-wwd-cw-p-hwrp?_adf.ctrl-state=dqmz5fbz3_5&_afLoop=5046747758181496#! Accessed February 2023.

LA Public Library

- 2023 Branches. Available online at: <https://www.lapl.org/branches/lake-view-terrace>. Accessed February 2023.

LA Parks

- 2023 Playgrounds. Available online at: <https://www.laparks.org/playgrounds/hansendamUAPRC> (accessed February 2023).

Martz, Patricia

- 1977 Report No. LA-00384 – Description and Evaluation of the Cultural Resources Within Haines Debris Basin, Hansen Dam, Lopez Dam, and Sepulveda Dam, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County.

Natural Resource Conservation Science

- 2023 Web Soil Survey. Available online at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx> (accessed February 2023).

Romani, Gwendolyn R., John F. Romani, and Bradley L. Sturm/Greenwood and Associates

- 1994 Report No. LA-02969 – Historic Properties Management Plan for the US Army Corps of Engineers Hansen Dam Flood Control Basin Los Angeles County, California.

Shields, Mark

- 2010 PV Systems: Low Levels of Glare and Reflectance vs. Surrounding Environment.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District)

- 2022 Final 2022 Air Quality Management Plan. Available online at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan>. Accessed February 2023.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

2023 National Wetlands Inventory. Available online at:
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>. Accessed February 2023.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey)

2023 Alquist-Priolo Faults. Available online at:
<https://earthquake.usgs.gov/education/geologicmaps/apfaults.php>. Accessed February 2023.

Wallace, W.J.

1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology.
Southwestern Journal of Anthropology. 11:214-230.

Warren, C.N.

1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In
Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States, editor C. Irwin-Williams, pp.
1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology 1(3).
Portales.

FIGURES

APPENDIX A
CULTURAL RESOURCES