



NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

COPY

This serves as the City of Carson's Notice of Intent to adopt an Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the below described project, prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CEQA Guidelines, and local implementation procedures.

Name of Project: Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project

Project Location: The project the premises of Carriage Crest Park, located at 23800 Figueroa Street in the City of Carson.

Lead Agency: City of Carson, Public Works Department, 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745

Project Description: The Project proposes to capture all dry-weather runoff from a nearby storm drain, County Project No. 1201, and the first flush of stormwater to reduce the transport of pollutants downstream in Wilmington Drain and Machado Lake. The proposed project includes the following components:

1. An underground stormwater storage facility with a maximum capacity of 17 acre-feet at the Carriage Crest Park;
2. A storm drain diversion system with a maximum intake of 30 cubic feet per second (cfs), including a rubber dam or a drop inlet structure and diversion pipelines;
3. Pretreatment devices, such as hydrodynamic separators or nutrient baffle boxes to remove gross solids;
4. A dewatering system to the sanitary sewer for further treatment at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) at a maximum nightly discharge rate of 20 cfs, including a pump station and a discharge pipeline, and
5. A return pipeline back to the existing downstream storm drain.

The Project will require a maximum excavation area of 1.5 acre to a depth of 28 feet and maximum removal of approximately 35,000 cubic yards of soil from the park to accommodate construction of the stormwater collection system.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT The City proposes to adopt a Negative Declaration for the above-referenced project. Such Negative Declaration is based upon the finding that, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. The reasons to support such finding are documented by an Initial Study prepared by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County on behalf of the City.

Copies of the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration are available for review at the following locations:

- City of Carson website: ci.carson.ca.us
- City of Carson Public Library, 151 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745
- City of Carson City Hall Engineering Counter, 701 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745

Written comments regarding the proposed Negative Declaration must be received prior to 5:30 p.m. on the last day of the 30-day public review/comment period (May 24, 2017). All correspondence and any questions regarding the Negative Declaration should be directed to the following City staff:

NAME: Julio Gonzalez
TITLE: Senior Engineering Technician
ADDRESS: City of Carson
 Public Works Department
 701 East Carson Street
 Carson, California 90745
PHONE: 310.952.1761 ext. 1822
EMAIL: JGonzale@carson.ca.us

ORIGINAL FILED
APR 24 2017
LOS ANGELES, COUNTY CLERK

Date: 4.19.2017

 Julio Gonzalez
 Senior Engineering Technician
 Engineering Services Division



NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROPOSED

FINAL

Name of Project: Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project

Project Location: The project the premises of Carriage Crest Park, located at 23800 Figueroa Street in the City of Carson.

Entity or Person

Undertaking Project: City of Carson, Public Works Department, 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745

Project Description: The Project proposes to capture all dry-weather runoff from a nearby storm drain, County Project No. 1201, and the first flush of stormwater to reduce the transport of pollutants downstream in Wilmington Drain and Machado Lake. The proposed project includes the following components:

1. An underground stormwater storage facility with a maximum capacity of 17 acre-feet at the Carriage Crest Park;
2. A storm drain diversion system with a maximum intake of 30 cubic feet per second (cfs), including a rubber dam or a drop inlet structure and diversion pipelines;
3. Pretreatment devices, such as hydrodynamic separators or nutrient baffle boxes to remove gross solids;
4. A dewatering system to the sanitary sewer for further treatment at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) at a maximum nightly discharge rate of 20 cfs, including a pump station and a discharge pipeline, and
5. A return pipeline back to the existing downstream storm drain.

The Project will require a maximum excavation area of 1.5 acre to a depth of 28 feet and maximum removal of approximately 35,000 cubic yards of soil from the park to accommodate construction of the stormwater collection system.

Findings: The project will not have a significant effect on the environment. On the basis of the whole record, the City finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that this Negative Declaration reflects the judgment of the City of Carson.

Initial Study: An Initial Study of this project was undertaken and prepared in accordance with the Local Procedures Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as adopted by the City of Carson for the purpose of ascertaining whether this project might have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the Initial Study is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The Initial Study documents the reasons supporting the above findings.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures have been included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

No mitigation measures are required for this project.

Date: 4.19.2017


Julio Gonzalez
Senior Engineering Technician
Engineering Services Division



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of Project: Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project

Project Location: The project the premises of Carriage Crest Park, located at 23800 Figueroa Street in the City of Carson.

Entity or Person

Undertaking Project: City of Carson, Public Works Department, 701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745

Project Description: The Project proposes to capture all dry-weather runoff from a nearby storm drain, County Project No. 1201, and the first flush of stormwater to reduce the transport of pollutants downstream in Wilmington Drain and Machado Lake. The proposed project includes the following components:

1. An underground stormwater storage facility with a maximum capacity of 17 acre-feet at the Carriage Crest Park;
2. A storm drain diversion system with a maximum intake of 30 cubic feet per second (cfs), including a rubber dam or a drop inlet structure and diversion pipelines;
3. Pretreatment devices, such as hydrodynamic separators or nutrient baffle boxes to remove gross solids;
4. A dewatering system to the sanitary sewer for further treatment at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) at a maximum nightly discharge rate of 20 cfs, including a pump station and a discharge pipeline, and
5. A return pipeline back to the existing downstream storm drain.

The Project will require a maximum excavation area of 1.5 acre to a depth of 28 feet and maximum removal of approximately 35,000 cubic yards of soil from the park to accommodate construction of the stormwater collection system.

Staff Determination: The City of Carson's staff, relying on the Initial Study of this project prepared by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County on behalf of the City, in accordance with the Local Procedures Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as adopted by the City of Carson for the purpose of ascertaining whether the proposed project might have a significant effect on the environment, has reached the following conclusion:

- 1. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, a Negative Declaration should be prepared.
- 2. The project, modified in accordance with certain mitigation measures set forth in the Initial Study, will not have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be prepared.
- 3. The project may have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared.

Date: 4.19.2017.


Julio Gonzalez
Senior Engineering Technician
Engineering Services Division



INITIAL STUDY

- 1. Project Title** **Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project**

- 2. Description of Project**

The Project proposes to capture all dry-weather runoff from a nearby storm drain, County Project No. 1201, and the first flush of stormwater to reduce the transport of pollutants downstream in Wilmington Drain and Machado Lake. The proposed project includes the following components:

 1. An underground stormwater storage facility with a maximum capacity of 17 acre-feet at the Carriage Crest Park;
 2. A storm drain diversion system with a maximum intake of 30 cubic feet per second (cfs), including a rubber dam or a drop inlet structure and diversion pipelines;
 3. Pretreatment devices, such as hydrodynamic separators or nutrient baffle boxes to remove gross solids;
 4. A dewatering system to the sanitary sewer for further treatment at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) at a maximum nightly discharge rate of 20 cfs, including a pump station and a discharge pipeline, and
 5. A return pipeline back to the existing downstream storm drain.

The Project will require a maximum excavation area of 1.5 acre to a depth of 28 feet and maximum removal of approximately 35,000 cubic yards of soil from the park to accommodate construction of the stormwater collection system.

- 3. Lead Agency Name and Address**

City of Carson
Public Works Department
701 E. Carson Street Carson, CA 90745

- 4. Contact Person and Phone Number**

Julio Gonzalez, Senior Engineering Technician
(310) 952-1761, extension 1822, JGonzale@carson.ca.us

- 5. Zoning**

The project is consistent with local zoning and general plans of the area.

- 6. Project Location**

The project is located at Carriage Crest Park, 23800 Figueroa Street in the City of Carson. Figure 1 shows the proposed project location and boundary.

- 7. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**

The project is located in an urban area.

- 8. Public Agencies Which Must Approve or Give a Permit for the Project**

Los Angeles County Flood Control District, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, South Coast Air Quality Management District, California Department of Transportation, and City of Carson

9. *Other Organizations for Distribution or Review*

State Clearinghouse, State of California Toxic Substances Control Department, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Watershed Management Division



Figure 1. Proposed Project Location and Boundary

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below 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"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this Initial Study:

- The proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- 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.
- The proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- The proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed on the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date: 4.19.2017.


Julio Gonzalez
Senior Engineering Technician
Engineering Services Division

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

CLASSIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Potentially Significant Impact: There is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. An Environmental Impact Report is required. Significant effect on the environment means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself is not considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. (§15382 CEQA Guidelines)

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: This classification applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact."

Less Than Significant Impact: Less Than Significant effect on the environment means an effect which is not significant as defined by §15382 of the CEQA Guidelines.

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

EXPLANATION:

- a-b. The project is not located near any scenic vistas or scenic resources. Moreover, the surrounding area is relatively flat and wholly urbanized with commercial, residential and institutional uses. The proposed project would not create above-ground structures that would obstruct views. Therefore, the proposed project will have no adverse impact upon a scenic vista or scenic resources.
- c. The project site comprises the southern portion of Carriage Crest Park, and is located on a commercial corridor bordered by a mix of retail, restaurants, and other commercial uses as well as single-family residences within an urban environment characterized mostly by low to mid-rise development. There are no formally designated scenic resources or historic buildings near the project site. The proposed project would require temporary disruption of the park and portions of the streetscape along Figueroa Street, including maximum excavation of approximately 35,000 cubic yards of soil for installation of infiltration vaults, removal of trees, and reconstruction of ballfields and landscaping. Any trees removed during construction will be replaced at a minimum ratio of 1:1. Any areas disturbed due to construction will be restored to pre-construction conditions. Therefore, the result of the project will have a less than significant impact on the Carriage Crest Park and surrounding areas.
- d. No light or glare impacts will occur as a result of the project or of its construction, which will be restricted to daytime hours.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model 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:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The project site is located along a heavily traveled street and transportation corridor (Sepulveda Boulevard) and is surrounded by residences, commercial properties and other urban land uses. No agricultural uses or related activities currently occur on the site or within the surrounding area. Prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance as defined in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) are lands identified by appropriate state or local government agencies as containing valuable farmland soils. Urban areas are excluded from FPPA as described in 7 CFR 9 Part 658. The project will not result in conversion of any farmland to a non-agricultural use, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation. The project site and surrounding areas are committed to urban development and are not unique or prime farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance.
- b–e. Since there are no agricultural crops, commercial timber stands, or prime, unique, or other farmlands of State or local importance in the vicinity of the project site, there is no conflict with the Williamson Act or any existing agricultural use. There is no forest land or timberland production in the City of Carson. There would be no impact to forest land resulting from the project.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The proposed project, constructing a stormwater diversion and treatment system would comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) (2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)) because except for the construction process, the project would use only electric-powered pumps and controls, and would not generate emissions directly. The 2012 AQMP focuses on reducing fine particulate matter (PM2.5), as generated by pollutants such as nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur oxides (SOx), volatile organic compounds (VOC), directly-emitted PM2.5 (from diesel engines, etc.), and ammonia. Measures to implement the plan include controlling point-source emissions (from power plants, industrial sources, etc.), combustion sources (fireplaces, restaurant charbroilers, open burning) and indirect sources (emissions related to harbor and port activities). Both stationary and mobile emission sources are regulated under the Plan.

Generally, a project would be considered compliant with the AQMP if its emissions did not exceed applicable thresholds, or if it generated no emissions at all. The proposed project would generate direct emissions only during the construction phase, from off-road diesel-powered equipment and workers' vehicles. As explained in (b-c) below, all construction emissions are predicted to remain well under the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. As explained in Section VII *Greenhouse Gas Emissions* below, the energy consumption of the project's controls and pumps (and off-site greenhouse gas emissions from electric power generation) is also not anticipated to be significant. Accordingly, with both construction and operations emissions below thresholds, the proposed project would not conflict with the AQMP or affect its implementation.

- b-c. The proposed project is not expected to result in a measurable long-term increase in air pollutant emissions, since most of the project's emissions would be related to construction, and would cease at the end of the construction phase. Such emissions would be generated primarily from off-road diesel-powered equipment, as well as workers' passenger vehicles and light trucks, including respirable particulate matter (PM10), fine particulate matter (PM2.5), ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), reactive organic gasses (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

The California Emissions Model (CalEEMod) was used to estimate emissions. The technical report, which includes output tables from this model, is included in Appendix A of this Initial Study and the overall results are shown in Table AQ-1 below. Construction of the proposed project would involve clearing and grubbing, excavation and grading, installing stormwater capture vaults, treatment system and pumps, restoring the finish grade, and aboveground improvements.

TABLE AQ-1. Construction Emissions as Shown in Appendix A

2018	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5
	lbs/day					
Total	4.16	40.23	34.25	0.05	12.13	3.31
Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Over (Under)	(71)	(60)	(516)	(150)	(138)	(52)
Exceed Threshold (Yes or No)	No	No	No	No	No	No
Localized Construction Emissions Thresholds		87	1,611		37	13
Over (Under)		(47)	(1,577)		(25)	(10)
Exceed Threshold (Yes or No)		No	No		No	No

Emissions estimates indicate that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds for any regulated pollutant. Given the low volume of air pollutants that the project would generate, the temporary nature of such pollutant emissions, the proposed project would not cause or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, would not generate pollutants in excess of standards, and would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

- d. Certain residents, such as the very young, the elderly and those suffering from certain illnesses or disabilities, are particularly sensitive to air pollution and are considered sensitive receptors. In addition, active park users, such as participants in sporting events, can be sensitive air pollutant receptors due to increased respiratory rates. Land uses where sensitive air pollutant receptors congregate include homes, medical facilities, rest homes, convalescent care facilities, schools, day care centers, parks, and recreational areas. Residents of homes and long-term care facilities may be subject to both long-term/chronic and short-term/acute exposures to poor air quality, whereas park users are primarily at risk from acute exposure to air quality.

The proposed project is located in a City park, which is bordered by single-family homes on one side. However, as noted above in Table AQ-1, the project would generate relatively low emissions during construction, and would not be likely to affect sensitive receptors over the long-term. Given this low amount and the short-term nature of such pollutant generation, the primary concern for surrounding properties would be the nuisance caused by construction dust. APCD Rule 402 (Fugitive Dust) requires that dust generation be reduced with control measures, such as using water trucks to moisten exposed soils. Because project construction must comply with air quality regulations, including Rule 402, impacts on surrounding land uses are anticipated to be less than significant.

- e. Project construction equipment and activities, including diesel exhaust emissions, would generate odors. There may be situations where construction activity odors would be noticeable by persons at nearby uses, but these odors would not be unfamiliar or necessarily objectionable. In addition, these odors would be temporary and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. Long-term odors, which would be associated with operation of vehicles on the roadway, would be the same as for the existing conditions; their impacts would be less than significant.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a-c. There are no special status plants or animals at the project site. The closest sighting of a special status plant or animal is approximately 3000 feet. One of the objectives of this project is to improve the quality of Machado Lake. Therefore, this project will have a positive effect on any plant or animal species that frequent the lake.
- d. The project will not interfere with any migratory movement or corridor, nor will it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e-f. Any trees removed during construction will be replaced at the ratio of 1:1. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, nor will it conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

a-d. A cultural resources study conducted by Paleo Solutions has determined that no historic structures are located on the project site itself. All workers involved in the performance or supervision of subsurface excavation at the project site will be trained to identify archaeological and paleontological resources. Should any historical or archaeological resources be discovered during construction activities, procedures outlined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines will be implemented by the contractor. The project is located in areas that have already undergone significant disturbance and development. Therefore, the likelihood that any previously unknown archaeological or other cultural resources will be discovered on the site is remote.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The proposed project would have no significant impact on the topography or ground surface relief features of the project area. There will be only temporary change (during excavation and construction) of the topography of the park to create the subsurface space needed for the stormwater capture facility. Once the improvements are installed, the original topography of the area of the proposed project will be restored to its previous condition. No significant amount of grading is expected to occur as a result of the project.
 - i) According to the City of Carson Hazard Mitigation Plan, several major active faults exist in Los Angeles County, including the San Andres, Newport Inglewood, Elsinore, San Jacinto, Whittier, and Norwalk. The Newport Inglewood Fault and the Palos Verdes Fault are considered to be the greatest potential threat to Carson, due to their proximity to the City.

The Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone is approximately five miles northwest of the City Carson and is expressed at the surface as a series of low, elongated hills extending from Newport to Beverly Hills, including Signal and Dominguez Hills. The Palos Verdes Fault, which traverses the southern portion of the south bay has two branches, the Cabrillo Fault and the Redondo Canyon Fault, which join the main fault at different points along the route. The Cabrillo Fault and the Redondo Canyon Fault are within two miles southeast and northwest of the City of Carson, respectively.

The length of the Newport-Inglewood fault zone is approximately 44 miles. Subsurface movement along the fault resulted in the 1933, magnitude 6.3, Long Beach earthquake, which caused significant damage to the City of Long Beach. Nevertheless, based on current available geologic information, no active faults are known to exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Because there are no known active faults located on the project site, the potential for fault rupture on the site is low.
 - ii) As is typical of all of southern California, the project site is located in a seismically active region and is potentially subject to severe ground shaking generated by high seismic activity. However, as discussed previously, ground shaking caused by severe seismic activity is considered to be low due to the distant locations of active faults and the absence of the seismic activity from local faults according to historical data and other documented evidence.
 - iii) There are no above-ground proposed structures included as part of the proposed improvements. It is not anticipated that the project will result in unstable earth surfaces or increase the exposure of people or property to geologic or seismic hazards as no fill or significant structure is proposed.
 - iv) The City of Carson is relatively flat and so is the project site. Consequently, hazards such as slope instability, mudslides and landslides are not considered to be likely threats. The project is not located in an area susceptible to landslide or slope failure.

- b. The City of Carson is relatively flat and so is the project site. Consequently, hazards such as slope instability, mudslides and landslides are not considered to be likely threats. The project is not located in an area susceptible to landslide or slope failure. During project construction, the exposure of soils in open or excavated areas will temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion. Soil erosion could be caused either by water or wind, a situation which could be exacerbated during the rainy season (November 1 through April 1). Required compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) would reduce erosion due to wind to a less than significant level. Implementation of the required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would reduce erosion due to water to a less than significant level. Construction Plans shall specify measures for controlling erosion at the project site.
- c. Construction activities could potentially cause erosion and soil loss from excavation, stockpiling, and other earthmoving activities. The City would be required to prepare an implement an SWPPP and an associated erosion control plan to ensure that construction of the proposed project would not result in significant soil erosion. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would also be implemented by the contractor during construction to limit soil erosion. In addition, after construction is completed, the existing surface conditions would be restored. Therefore, impact would be less than significant.
- d. The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.
- e. The project does not involve construction of any dwellings where wastewater would be generated. Consequently, there is no need for septic tanks due to the project. The project involves construction of a stormwater capture system which will ultimately place the water into a local sewer to be treated at the JWPCP.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

“Greenhouse gases” (so called because of their role in trapping heat near the surface of the earth) emitted by human activity are implicated in global climate change, commonly referred to as “global warming.” These greenhouse gases contribute to an increase in the temperature of the earth by allowing incoming short wavelength visible sunlight to penetrate the atmosphere, while restricting outgoing terrestrial long-wavelength heat radiation from exiting the atmosphere. The principal greenhouse gases (GHGs) include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Collectively, GHGs are measured as carbon dioxide “equivalents” (CO₂e); mass emissions of CO₂ are typically expressed in metric tons (MT).

Fossil-fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) is the largest source of GHG emissions, accounting for approximately half of GHG emissions globally. Industrial and commercial sources are the second-largest contributors of GHG emissions with about one-fourth of total emissions. According to climate scientists, California and the rest of the developed world would have to cut emissions by 80 percent from today’s levels to stabilize the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere and prevent the most severe effects of global climate change.

California has passed several bills and the Governor has signed at least three executive orders regarding greenhouse gases. GHG statues and executive orders (EO) include Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Senate Bill (SB) 1368, Executive Order (EO) S-03-05, EO S-20-06 and EO S-01-07. Of these, AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, mandates that California’s GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and tasks the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with regulating GHG emissions as well as coordinating with other state agencies to implement AB 32’s reduction goals. Executive Order S-3-05 provides a more long-range goal and requires an 80 percent reduction of GHGs from 1990 levels by 2050. On a per-capita basis, that means reducing annual emissions of 14 MTs of CO2 equivalent for every person in California down to approximately 10 MTs per person by 2020.

The CARB’s 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan explains that reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels means cutting approximately 30 percent from business-as-usual emissions levels projected for 2020, or about 15 percent from today’s levels. “Business as usual” generally describes a GHG emissions scenario that reflects the levels that would result if land development proceeded without implementing GHG-reduction measures. The Scoping Plan, and updates – the most recent in 2014 – set forth an array of strategies for reducing GHG emissions, categorized by economic sector. These strategies include policies and programs to be adopted by local agencies; however, they do not set numeric “bright-line” GHG thresholds.

A late-2015 California Supreme Court decision, *Center for Biological Diversity, et al. v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*, (2015) 62 Cal 4th 204, reh’g. den. Feb. 17, 2016), addressed the Newhall Ranch (Los Angeles County) project’s use of the “business-as-usual” method of determining greenhouse gas impact significance, where that EIR had used the Scoping Plan’s 29% reduction goal as a project-level threshold. The Court criticized the document for failing to explain how a quantitative statewide goal, based on one set of underlying land-use assumptions, could be directly applied to an individual project, at a particular location, where underlying land use assumptions might be different. Stating that “[t]he analytical gap left by the EIR’s failure to establish, through substantial evidence and reasoned explanation, a quantitative equivalence between the Scoping Plan’ statewide comparison, and the EIR’s own project-level comparison deprived the EIR of its ‘sufficiency as an informative document,’” the Court opined that if an EIR uses the Scoping Plan’s statewide measure of emissions reduction, it must fully substantiate its rationale for doing so. Specifically, the Court held that this method not be used to set a hypothetical environmental baseline, and then to compare a proposed project’s emissions to that baseline. Further, the Court stated that agencies may determine whether a project is consistent with AB 32’s goals by evaluating whether a project complies with relevant regulations or regulatory programs, including local Climate Action Plans, which are designed to reduce GHG emissions. Agencies may also set numeric thresholds similar to those established for other air pollutants.

Water management is one of the economic sectors targeted by the Scoping Plan:

California’s 2009 Water Conservation Act (Senate Bill x7-7) specifically addresses urban and agricultural water conservation. The Act’s key urban provision established an aggressive statewide goal to reduce per capita water use by 20 percent by 2020. To date, 400 urban water agencies have prepared water management plans, which cover close to 80 percent of California’s population. The State has also set ambitious goals for development of alternative water sources such as recycled water and stormwater.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted recycled water and stormwater goals through a stakeholder-driven process. Recycled water usage is to be increased above the 2002 usage levels by at least one million acre-feet per year by 2020 and by at least two million acre feet per year by 2030. *Stormwater usage is to increase above the 2007 usage levels by at least 500,000 acre-feet per year by 2020 and by at least one million acre-feet per year by 2030 (emphasis added)*. Grant and loan programs have provided over \$1.15 billion for recycling and stormwater capture infrastructure, and projects are coming online.

The SCAQMD sets forth a GHG threshold only for industrial facilities (10,000 MT CO2eq per year), but neither it nor the City of Carson have adopted specific GHG emission thresholds for GHG emissions for other sources.

EXPLANATION:

- a–b. **Construction Phase.** Project construction would generate approximately 997 MTs of CO2 emissions from the use of construction equipment and from worker commute trips. As shown in Appendix A, the highest

net increase in temporary GHG emissions from on-road mobile source emissions and on-site construction equipment relative to the threshold would be below 10,000 metric tons per year. The GHG emissions from the project construction phase are less than significant.

Operational Phase. The proposed project would use two to three electric pumps for transferring stormwater to JWPCP. Under the two pump configuration, the annual emissions will be 13.30 MT CO₂. The three pump configuration would emit 6.65 MT CO₂. Under either configuration the amount of GHG produced is less than the GHG threshold of 10,000MT CO₂. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. Soil sampling results, as shown in Appendix C, found the presence of pesticides at some sample sites at a depth of up to 8 feet exceeding the California Total Threshold Limit Concentration. Any soil excavated as part of any construction activities at the subject site shall be tested for pesticides in accordance with the waste profiling and removed per a soils management plan, and disposed of at an appropriate landfill. All other construction-related materials, including construction debris/waste, would be transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable codes and regulations. During project operation, the proposed project would include the storage and disposal of accumulated trash and debris collected as part of the project's pretreatment captured runoff. However, the collected materials would not pose a particular hazard nor require hazardous waste disposal to be performed as part of routine maintenance of these stormwater pretreatment devices.
- b. The project site is currently occupied as Carriage Crest Park, a community park. The project, which includes the installation of a passive stormwater capture and retention facility does not involve the use or storage of hazardous materials. As stated above, all construction-related materials including any contaminated soils would be transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable codes and regulations. To minimize potential damage to any existing utilities, the contractor would not be allowed to excavate until all utility owners are notified, and all substructures are clearly identified. As the proposed project would capture and store runoff and reduce the transport of pollutants downstream, operation would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment involving the release of hazardous materials. No reasonable foreseeable upset or accident conditions that could involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment are anticipated.
- c. 232nd Place Elementary School is approximately ½ mile northeast of the project. As discussed in the Air Quality section above, operation of construction equipment creates air contaminant emissions. However, none of these emissions would be generated at levels that are considered hazardous. Construction of the proposed project would involve the excavation and transport of earth and other construction-related materials (e.g. concrete, piping, project components, and equipment). All such materials, including construction debris/waste, would be transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable codes and regulations. As noted previously, operation of the proposed project would not involve hazardous emissions or materials. The proposed project would capture and store runoff and operate passively. As such, no hazardous materials impacts to schools are anticipated.
- d. The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- e-f. The project is not located near an airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Torrance Airport which is approximately 5 miles from the project site. The site is not located in either the Clear Zone or the Approach Safety Zone. Therefore, the project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- g. The proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or a local, state, or federal agency's emergency evacuation plan, except possibly for short-term periods during construction of the proposed project. As mentioned above, all construction activities would be carried out in accordance with all City and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) emergency access requirements and access would be maintained during construction activities. As such, no significant emergency access impacts are expected. Once operational, the proposed project would operate passively underground, and therefore its operation would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans.
- h. The proposed project would not of itself expose significant numbers of people or structures to wildland fire risk because the project area is located in an urban environment and not near fire-prone wildland.

		POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because (and as explained in more detail below):
 - (1) The project is intended to capture, not discharge pollutants (particularly metals and organic compounds); and
 - (2) All construction work would be subject to federal and state regulations protecting water quality, and thus be required to incorporate water-quality-protection best management practices (BMPs) that would minimize construction-related pollutant runoff (see below for examples).

Specifically, the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) assigns jurisdiction to federal, state, and local agencies over specific activities that could affect stream channels, wetlands, and other water bodies. CWA Section 402(p) sets forth the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting program, administered by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (RWQCB) under delegation by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Where projects would affect an area larger than one acre, the project proponent must prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which details the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) for reducing or eliminating pollutant discharge from the construction area. BMPs for the construction phase of the project would include, but not be limited to:

 1. Good housekeeping: implementing proper storage and containment and properly cleaning all leaks from equipment and vehicles;
 2. Non-stormwater management: properly washing vehicles in contained areas and minimizing irrigation runoff;
 3. Inspection, maintenance and repair of BMPs to ensure continued efficacy.
- b. The project is designed to capture stormwater runoff. Therefore, the project will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.
- c. The proposed project would not adversely affect the existing drainage pattern of the area nor cause siltation or erosion, although it would divert a portion of stormwater flows from an existing storm drain into a capture facility. The local drainage pattern would essentially remain as it exists now, since the project would not construct new drainage channels. The project consists primarily of augmenting existing stormwater facilities within a fully-developed urban setting, where water flowing into storm drains does not flow over erosion-prone undeveloped land. As such, significant siltation or erosion would not be expected to occur.
- d. The proposed stormwater capture project would not substantially affect the area's existing drainage pattern or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, causing flooding on or off-site, because any detained water would be stored in a retention basin prior to sewer discharge.
- e. The proposed project would not contribute substantial amounts of runoff water exceeding stormwater drainage system capacity, simply because the project itself is designed to capture stormwater inflows, moderating the amount of stormwater that the drainage system conveys now. Construction runoff would be controlled as described in the project's SWPPP and would not be expected to contribute polluted runoff to the storm drain system.
- f. The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, primarily because the BMPs would minimize runoff water contamination during project construction.
- g-h. The proposed project would not construct house or other structures, thus would not directly subject housing or structures to flood hazards.
 - i. The project would not be expected to expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding since the area of the project is at a very low risk for flooding generally, and the project itself would not impede flood flows through the stormwater conveyance system.
 - j. The proposed project would not directly expose people or structures to inundation by seiche or tsunami because 1) there are no large bodies of water nearby to generate a seiche and the project would not create such a water body; and 2) the project site is 6 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. The project would not expose people or structures to mudflow, since the project site is located within a relatively flat urban environment.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a-b. The project involves construction of a stormwater capture system underground an existing park, which will ultimately place the water into a local sewer to be treated at JWPCP. As all pre-project conditions will be restored upon completion, the project will not have any impacts on land use, zoning, or the physical arrangement of the community.
- c. No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan applies to the site.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a-b. The project would not involve the use or depletion of any mineral resources in the area.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XII. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. Noise impacts resulting from the project can be considered either short-term construction related or long-term operational related. Short-term construction noise would be regulated by noise control provisions in the City's Municipal Code while operational noise impacts are considered less than significant since both pumps and motors will be installed below grade.
- b. The stormwater runoff and capture facility is a below-ground facility and does not include operational aspects that will generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- c. Operation noise impacts could result from the proposed pumping system chosen for the project. One of the recommended systems and the one which would potentially produce the most noise, includes a 3-pump configuration in which the pump station will have three duty pumps, each capable of pumping 50 percent of the peak design flow. However, to minimize noise from pump operations while providing for security, pumps and motors will be installed below grade within a secure wet well. Consequently, noise from pumping operations will be less than significant.
- d. Temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity will occur as a result of construction activities. However, provisions in the City's municipal code regulate the permitted hours of construction activities. Conformance with these regulations will reduce periodic increases in ambient noise levels to less than significant.
- e-f. The project is not located near an airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Torrance Airport which is approximately 5 miles from the project site. Therefore, the project would not result expose people to excessive noise areas in the vicinity of an airport.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

EXPLANATION:

- a. The project involves water quality infrastructure improvements. This action would not directly increase the population or housing of the City of Carson.
- b-c. The project involves a stormwater runoff capture facility. As such, the project would not result in the loss of residential units. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace any residents and would have no associated impact.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

EXPLANATION:

- a.i Construction of the proposed project could have the potential to reduce access for emergency vehicles near construction activities. However, all construction activities would be carried out in accordance with all applicable City and/or LACFD emergency access standards. Emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout the construction period. Operation of the proposed project would be passive and largely underground, and therefore would not require additional fire protection services, facilities, or

equipment. Once the improvements are installed, the original topography of the area of the proposed project will be restored to its previous condition. No adverse physical impacts would occur to fire services.

- a.ii Construction of the proposed project could have the potential to reduce access for emergency vehicles near construction areas. However, as explained above, all construction activities would be carried out in accordance with all applicable City and/or Carson Station Sheriff's Department emergency access standards, and emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout construction. Operation of the proposed project would be passive and would not require additional police protection. No adverse physical impacts would occur relative to police services.
- a.iii The project does not involve the development of residences and would not significantly induce growth. Consequently, the amount of people served by the local school system would not increase as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would have no impact to schools.
- a.iv The project would not introduce any new population that would create additional demands on existing or planned park facilities. However, the project would temporarily displace a portion of Carriage Crest Park from recreational use during construction. The stormwater capture facility would be installed at the southern portion of the park temporarily removing approximately 114,000 square feet of park open space. After construction, the existing park use and park amenities would be restored since new landscaping consisting mostly of turf will be installed over the project facility. Hence, temporary construction activities would result in less than significant impacts related to the short term loss of recreational use within a portion of the Carriage Crest Park.
- a.v The project would involve periodic inspection and/or maintenance of facilities at the park site. However, no substantial increase in City services would be required above and beyond those already provided by the City. The City will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the diversion structure within the channel and will comply with permit requirements from the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) to ensure LACFCD's operation and maintenance flood control facilities will not be impeded.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XV. RECREATION.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

EXPLANATION:

- The proposed project includes the construction and operation of an underground stormwater capture facility, which would not result in a measurable demand for parks and recreation services. As such, implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to cause an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, and thus, no impact to parks and recreational facilities would result from the proposed project.
- The proposed project would restrict recreational use within a portion of Carriage Crest Park during construction of the project. With completion of the construction phase, the proposed project will operate passively with only minimal maintenance occurring on-site at Carriage Crest Park. Park use will resume as before the project, functioning mostly as recreational open space landscaped with turf and accommodating such park amenities as walkways and athletic fields. As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study, the development of these project features would not result in a physical adverse effect on the surrounding environment. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to recreational facilities.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standard and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The proposed project would result in temporary traffic and circulation impacts during construction activities as shown in Appendix B. Construction worker vehicle trips to and from the project site, as well as delivery truck trips of modular components to and from the project site, would increase traffic levels on surrounding streets in the area. The project construction in total will generate approximately 5,000 one-way truck trips. The planned hauling is approximately 40 days, operated with 8 trucks and 6 hours each day. The planned mobilization and demolition is approximately 173 days. During peak of the project construction, there will be approximately 48 crew/trips at the site. The additional trips will not significantly affect the intersections level of service (LOS), which will be maintained at the City required minimum LOS "D". In addition, construction trucks will not be using the intersection (Figueroa Street and Sepulveda Boulevard) during peak hours, to worsen level of service. However, given the relatively short duration of the hauling phase, combined with the nature and intensity of the proposed worker vehicle and delivery truck traffic, project construction traffic is not anticipated to be substantial, and would cease at the completion of construction activities. All vehicles would park at the Carriage Crest Park parking lot or job site, so there would be no change in street parking due to construction activities. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be coordinated with the responsible agencies. Such a management plan would comply with local ordinances and policies for performance of the circulation system and standards of the City and county when applicable. Alternate access to adjoining properties will be maintained at all times. Pre-construction conditions will be restored and impacts will be temporary (only during construction). If any proposed transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials requires use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, a transportation permit from California Department of Transportation will be obtained. Therefore, transportation-related impacts will be less than significant.
- b. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) is a state-mandated program enacted by the State legislature to address impacts that urban congestion has on local communities and the region as a whole. New projects located in the City must comply with the requirements set forth in the CMP. These requirements include the provision that all freeway segments where a project could add 150 or more trips in each direction during peak hours must be evaluated. The guidelines also require evaluation of all designated CMP roadway intersections where a project could add 50 or more trips during peak hours. The proposed project would not result in a net increase of more than 30 trips during with either the A.M. or P.M. peak hours. Thus, the project would not generate 150 or more trips to a freeway segment or 50

trips to a CMP roadway intersection. Accordingly, less than significant impact to CMP designated facilities would occur with project implementation.

- c. The project is not an air traffic-related use and would not result in the disruption or change of air traffic patterns in the area. Thus, no impact would occur in this regard.
- d. The project would not involve the permanent construction or modification of traffic-related improvements. Additionally, the project would not involve the construction of any uses that would be considered incompatible with existing roadways. However, per standard construction traffic procedures, truck ingress and egress would be controlled by a flagman, or other equivalent means determined appropriate by the City, which would minimize the potential for vehicular hazards associated with truck activity on and adjacent to the project site. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.
- e. The proposed project would not hinder emergency access in the area, since peak project-related traffic would be associated with temporary construction and delivery truck trips on Figueroa Street. As mentioned above, all construction activities would be carried out in accordance with all City and LACFD emergency access requirements and access would be maintained during construction activities. As such, no significant emergency access impacts are expected.
- f. During construction, public transit stops may be temporarily moved and bicycle routes and pedestrian traffic may be temporarily diverted to protect rider and pedestrian safety. The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EXPLANATION:

- a. The proposed project would not result in changes to facilities or operations at existing wastewater treatment facilities, as proposed improvements are intended to capture existing stormwater runoff for treatment of contaminants to improve water quality. The captured water would be ultimately treated at the JWPCP, which has capacity to treat the captured flow. No changes to the plant treatment requirements would result. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements, and no impact to wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board would occur.
- b. As stated earlier, the proposed project is the construction of a new stormwater capture and retention facility and does not include the construction of any new developments that would generate wastewater, solid waste, or increase the demand for water supplies. However, the project does capture water that will be discharged to the sewer. The discharge will occur when there is sufficient capacity in the sewer line. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. As such, there will be no impacts.
- c. This area discharges into Wilmington Drain which subsequently discharges into Lake Machado. The objective of this project is to improve the quality of Machado Lake. Construction of the proposed project would not be expected to increase stormwater runoff at the project site, but in fact, reduce stormwater runoff. Stormwater from the capture facility will ultimately be given secondary treatment at the JWPCP and discharged to the Pacific Ocean.
- d. No new or expanded water entitlements would be required with implementation of the project.
- e. The captured stormwater will be treated at JWPCP. JWPCP has capacity to adequately handle the amount of water generated by the project. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the capacity at JWPCP.
- f. Excavated soil from the site will be disposed at an appropriate landfill site. However, the amount of debris generated during project construction is not expected to significantly impact landfill capacities. Additionally, operation of the stormwater capture facility would generate minimal solid waste as part of its pretreatment activities. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact to solid waste disposal.
- g. Disposal of waste materials generated during construction will comply with all local, state, and federal requirements for integrated waste management and solid waste disposal. As stated above, operation of the project will not exceed the standards or capacity of local disposal facilities. Therefore, no impacts related to compliance with solid waste statutes and regulations will occur.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) | Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

EXPLANATION:

- a. There are no sensitive fish or wildlife habitat areas in the vicinity of the proposed project. The project is also located within an area of low biological resource value since the surrounding area is considered urbanized and highly disturbed with little to no native vegetation to support any sensitive species. Therefore, no degradation of the environment or any adverse impacts to any sensitive plant or animal species will result from the project.

The Cultural Resources Assessment prepared for the project notes that Carriage Crest Park has no sensitive for paleontological, archeological, and cultural (including Native American) resources. The area of the proposed project is fully developed with a paved parking lot, concrete walkways, modern buildings, and manicured sports field, yielding no visible native soils. However, prior to the start of any earth-disturbing activities associated with the Project, all workers involved in the performance or supervision of subsurface excavation at the project site will be trained to identify archaeological and paleontological resources. Should any historical or archaeological resources be discovered during construction activities, procedures outlined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines will be implemented by the contractor.

- b. Cumulative impacts are limited to the construction activities (e.g., noise, dust, temporary drainage, traffic detours and temporary access, etc.) for this project, and would be minimized by following the City's noise ordinance; use of BMPs , including the use of water trucks; and following City and LACFD emergency access requirements during all construction activities.

- c. Any potentially adverse effects on human beings associated with the project will be limited to project construction. Short-term exposure to potential noise, air and water pollution associated with heavy construction vehicles may be expected. However, implementation of best management practices and project design features during the construction phase will minimize the potential adverse impacts associated with project construction to a less than significant impact. Appropriate measures and management practices such as limiting construction periods to those permitted by the municipal code, and coordinating construction activities with other service agencies will be employed during construction, as necessary. Otherwise, the project will not have any long-term adverse impacts on human beings. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the project will not present substantial adverse effects on human beings.

MITIGATION

No mitigation measures are required for this project.