

EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS RELATED TO SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 FOR THE
2020 LA RIVER MASTER PLAN PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

SCH# 2020070128

LEAD AGENCY: LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Contents

Contents	i
Chapter 1 Purpose of Findings.....	1-1
Chapter 2 Overview of the Proposed Project.....	2-1
2.1 2020 LA River Master Plan Objectives	2-1
2.2 Proposed Project—2020 LA River Master Plan	2-1
Chapter 3 CEQA Review and Public Participation	3-1
3.1 Notice of Preparation	3-1
3.2 Draft PEIR	3-1
3.3 Public Meetings, Newspaper Ads, and E-mails.....	3-2
Chapter 4 Findings Required under CEQA.....	4-1
Chapter 5 No Environmental Impacts.....	5-1
Chapter 6 Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts (Without Mitigation)	6-1
Chapter 7 Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)/ Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts (Not Carried Out by the County).....	7-1
7.1 Aesthetics.....	7-1
7.2 Air Quality	7-9
7.3 Biological Resources	7-12
7.4 Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources.....	7-50
7.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	7-65
7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	7-72
7.7 Hydrology and Water Quality	7-84
7.8 Land Use and Planning.....	7-89
7.9 Noise	7-92
7.10 Public Services.....	7-101
7.11 Recreation.....	7-104
7.12 Transportation	7-168
7.13 Utilities/Service Systems.....	7-175
7.14 Wildfire	7-177
Chapter 8 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County).....	8-1
8.1 Aesthetics.....	8-1
8.2 Air Quality	8-3
8.3 Cultural Resources	8-9
8.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	8-24
8.5 Land Use and Planning.....	8-30

8.6 Noise 8-36

8.7 Public Services..... 8-40

8.8 Recreation..... 8-43

8.9 Transportation 8-72

8.10 Tribal Cultural Resources 8-75

8.11 Utilities/Service Systems..... 8-79

8.12 Wildfire 8-86

Chapter 9 Findings on Cumulative Impacts..... 9-1

9.1 Less-than-Significant Cumulative Impacts 9-1

9.1.1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials..... 9-1

9.1.2 Energy..... 9-2

9.1.3 Land Use and Planning 9-2

9.1.4 Mineral Resources 9-3

9.1.5 Population and Housing 9-4

9.1.6 Recreation 9-4

9.2 Less-than-Significant Cumulative Impacts with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)/ Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts (Not Carried Out by the County) 9-5

9.2.1 Aesthetics 9-6

9.2.2 Biological Resources 9-8

9.2.3 Geology, Soils, and Paleontology 9-10

9.2.4 Hydrology and Water Quality..... 9-13

9.2.5 Noise..... 9-15

9.2.6 Transportation..... 9-17

9.3 Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County) 9-19

9.3.1 Air Quality..... 9-20

9.3.2 Cultural Resources..... 9-22

9.3.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 9-23

9.3.4 Public Services 9-25

9.3.5 Tribal Cultural Resources..... 9-26

9.3.6 Utilities 9-27

9.3.7 Wildfire 9-29

Chapter 10 Findings Regarding Project Alternatives in the PEIR..... 10-1

10.1 Alternatives Considered in the PEIR 10-1

10.1.1 Alternative A—No Project 10-1

10.1.2 Alternative B—Channel Avoidance Alternative 10-3

Chapter 1

Purpose of Findings

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more written findings for each such impact (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21081 and Section 15091). According to Section 21081,

no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

- (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following possible findings with respect to each significant effect:
 - 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
 - 2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
 - 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.
- (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

CEQA also requires public agencies to adopt a monitoring and reporting program for assessing and ensuring the implementation of proposed mitigation measures (Section 21081.6). The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* (Project), which is provided under separate cover, are those identified within this Findings of Fact (Findings) document and the Statement of Overriding Considerations. Pursuant to Section 21081.6, public agencies are required to provide that measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

2.1 2020 LA River Master Plan Objectives

The proposed Project has the following nine objectives (referred to as “goals” in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*), which are summarized in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR):

1. Reduce flood risk and improve resiliency.
2. Provide equitable, inclusive, and safe parks, open space, and trails.
3. Support healthy connected ecosystems.
4. Enhance opportunities for equitable access to the river corridor.
5. Embrace and enhance opportunities for arts and culture.
6. Address potential adverse impacts on housing affordability and people experiencing homelessness.¹
7. Foster opportunities for continued community engagement, development, and education.
8. Improve local water supply reliability.
9. Promote healthy, safe, clean water.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* is based on a goal-driven framework that ensures that the plan’s recommendations are closely tied to their potential to achieve the broader *2020 LA River Master Plan’s* nine objectives. This was achieved through a comprehensive evaluation of criteria identified in the plan’s existing conditions inventory and analysis for assessing each goal along the 51 miles of the Los Angeles River (LA River), subsequently identifying areas of general to very high need relative to that goal. The plan’s strategic directions are a framework built around the plan’s nine goals, each of which is an active priority for the future of the river and is explained by rationale that weaves together analysis and community input gathered throughout the *2020 LA River Master Plan* process.

2.2 Proposed Project—2020 LA River Master Plan

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* is intended to be a visionary and practical document for all 18 local jurisdictions within the study area. The *2020 LA River Master Plan’s* framework begins with community needs and aims to provide guidance and resources for jurisdictions to implement subsequent projects in the study area. Rather than requiring one set of fixed solutions for all 51

¹ The aim of the *2020 LA River Master Plan’s* objective 6, “Address potential adverse impacts on housing affordability and people experiencing homelessness,” is to maintain strategies for supporting continuing housing affordability in LA River-adjacent communities. Therefore, the use of “impacts” in objective 6 is distinct from the use of “impacts” under CEQA where, per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15358 (b), impacts analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change in the environment.

miles, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* allows for a consistent approach throughout the study area but with frame-specific identity within the greater whole. Ecology, habitat, and art reflect the physiography and culture of an individual frame of the river. Other elements, such as signage, access points, and lighting, were developed to ensure a consistent approach to connectivity, wayfinding, and equitable access. In all cases, improvements along the river corridor would have the appropriate scale and feel for the adjacent communities and neighborhoods.

In addition to common elements that projects need to include to achieve the nine objectives, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* proposes six categories of project improvements, or “kit of parts” (KOP), consisting of infrastructure and urban river design typologies that illustrate the range of possible strategies that the proponents of subsequent projects, including Los Angeles County (County), can use along the river. The six KOP categories are:

- Trails and Access Gateways
- Channel Modifications
- Crossings and Platforms
- Diversions
- Floodplain Reclamation
- Off-Channel Land Assets

Each of these six KOP categories includes a recommended collection of design components and can be implemented individually or in any combination as subsequent projects, as driven by the area’s needs, funding, and local jurisdiction’s policy decisions.

In addition to the KOP categories with related design components, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* includes a series of smaller common elements that include site furnishings, amenities, and facilities. These include consistent lighting, drinking fountains, places to sit along the river, river pavilions, and cafés that are intended to contribute to habitability of the river environs; promote safety, accessibility, and legibility; and build a cohesive identity of the river corridor.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* also includes Design Guidelines that have been developed as a framework to support the development of specific design and technical solutions for subsequent projects to be implemented under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* while presenting a unified, cohesive identity along the 51-mile connected open space corridor and promoting best practices and resiliency. The County intends to adopt these *2020 LA River Master Plan* Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines; as described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft PEIR and included in Appendix B of the Draft PEIR), along with the *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

To inform decision-making in a comprehensive manner, the PEIR includes the analysis of the potential environmental impacts from implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* based on the following groupings:

- Two “typical projects” that have been identified based on the availability of construction and operations scenario assumptions from Los Angeles County Public Works (Public Works) along with relatively detailed design concepts for these projects being described in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*:
 - Common Elements Typical Project

- Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project
- Six KOP categories
- Overall implementation, which examines the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* that would be implemented over a 25-year horizon period

The two Typical Projects are analyzed in greater detail in the PEIR than the other elements. The six KOP categories and related design components—as well as the *2020 LA River Master Plan* in its entirety—are analyzed qualitatively at a program level.

3.1 Notice of Preparation

The County, in accordance with CEQA, prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP), which was released to the public and filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2020070128) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on July 7, 2020.

The NOP, which was provided in English and Spanish, provided notice to the public and public agencies that a PEIR would be prepared, described the proposed Project that would be evaluated in detail in the PEIR, listed the probable environmental effects of the proposed Project, and identified the date, time, and location for an online scoping meeting, which was held on July 29, 2020. Following Governor Newsom's Executive Order (EO) N-28-20 relating to the threat of COVID-19, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors announced that all Los Angeles County facilities were closed to members of the public beginning March 16, 2020. Since then, Public Works has closed all public buildings and in-person services and only recently reopened the public counters to the public for in-person visits on October 4, 2021. Due to EO N-28-20, the scoping meeting on July 29, 2020 was held online.

The NOP was distributed to public agencies and interested parties for a 30-day public review period, which began on July 7, 2020, and ended on August 6, 2020. Copies of the NOP, in English and Spanish, are included in Appendix A of the Draft PEIR, along with written comments provided by the public and public agencies on the NOP. These comments were considered during preparation of the Draft PEIR.

3.2 Draft PEIR

The Draft *2020 LA River Master Plan* was released to the public on January 13, 2021, for review and comment. The proposed Project is along a 51-mile-long, approximately 2-mile-wide (i.e., 1 mile on each side) corridor of the LA River in Los Angeles County and spans 18 jurisdictions (17 cities and unincorporated County areas). The river encompasses an 834-square-mile watershed and flows from its headwaters at river mile 51.0 in Canoga Park within the City of Los Angeles to river mile 0.0 in Long Beach, where the river meets the Pacific Ocean. The LA River was channelized between the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries to protect lives and property from flooding as the Los Angeles region rapidly grew and transformed to a largely urbanized area. Today, nearly 1 million people live within 1 mile of the river.

Design information for the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan* is at a conceptual level; therefore, the environmental impact analysis is presented at a programmatic level and does not include project-specific or site-specific analysis.

Notification of the availability of the Draft PEIR was provided in English and Spanish and was sent to the public and interested or affected agencies for review. Release of the Draft PEIR to the public began a minimum 45-day comment period, extending from February 1, 2021, to March 18, 2021. Per an announcement via e-mail on March 4, 2021, the comment period was extended through April 2,

2021. A second extension was announced via e-mail on March 8, 2021, and the comment period was further extended through May 13, 2021. Notice of the extension of the comment period was also published in newspapers. During public review, members of the public and public agencies were asked to review the Draft PEIR and provide comments on the document, including adequacy of the impact analyses. A total of 202 individual written comment letters and oral comments were received on the Draft PEIR during the comment period.

Section 15088 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons and agencies that reviewed the Draft PEIR and prepare a written response to comments raising significant environmental issues. The responses to comments received during the comment period are contained in Chapter 2, *Response to Comments*, of the Final PEIR. A copy of each comment letter or oral comment and a response to each comment are provided in Appendix A and Chapter 2 of the Final PEIR, respectively.

3.3 Public Meetings, Newspaper Ads, and E-mails

The Draft PEIR was available for review on Public Works' website (pw.lacounty.gov/go/larmpceqa). Following Governor Newsom's EO N-28-20 relating to the threat of COVID-19, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors announced that all Los Angeles County facilities would be closed to members of the public beginning March 16, 2020, and Public Works only recently reopened the public counters to the public for in-person services on October 4, 2021. Since then, Public Works has closed all public buildings and in-person services. Additionally, the County, City of Los Angeles, and City of Long Beach library locations have been closed to the public since March 2020 and only select locations have been offering curbside pickup.

The County held one community meeting on March 3, 2021, to discuss the Draft PEIR analysis and alternatives. The public meeting was held virtually and took place from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. as follows:

- Virtual Public Meeting 1 (Zoom webinar [<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82209339229>] or by phone at (877) 853-5247). A recording of the meeting is available at the Public Works' website (pw.lacounty.gov/go/larmpceqa).

Spanish translation was provided during the public meeting, and a Spanish translation of the meeting presentation, fact sheet, and frequently asked questions were made available on Public Works' website (pw.lacounty.gov/go/larmpceqa) before the meeting. The general topics of oral public comments made at these meetings were transcribed and presented in Chapter 2 of the Final PEIR. As the lead agency under CEQA, the County provided responses to the comments received on the Draft PEIR.

Public notice of the availability of the Draft PEIR was provided in the following publications:

- *Glendale Independent*
- *Grunion Gazette*
- *L.A. Watts Times*
- *Long Beach Press Telegram*
- *Los Angeles Times*
- *The Canyon News*
- *The Downey Patriot*
- *The Signal Tribune*
- *Monterey Park Press*
- *Los Angeles Daily News*
- *Paramount Journal*
- *South Bay Daily Breeze*

Public notice of the availability of the Draft PEIR was provided in Spanish in the following publications:

- *Excelsior LA*
- *Noticias Los Angeles*
- *Los Angeles Times en Español (Hoy Los Angeles)*
- *La Opinion*

Public notice of the availability of the Draft PEIR was provided by e-mail on the following dates:

- Monday, February 1, 2021: notification of availability of Draft PEIR for 45-day comment period ending on March 18, 2021
- Tuesday, February 16, 2021: reminder for availability of Draft PEIR and Draft PEIR Public Meeting Announcement
- Tuesday, March 2, 2021: reminder for availability of Draft PEIR and Draft PEIR Public Meeting Announcement
- Wednesday, March 3, 2021: reminder for Draft PEIR Public Meeting
- Thursday, March 4, 2021: announcement for comment period extension to April 2, 2021
- Monday, March 8, 2021: announcement for second comment period extension to May 13, 2021, and availability of Draft PEIR Public Meeting recording on website
- Tuesday, March 9, 2021: reminder for comments on the Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Tuesday, March 30, 2021: reminder for comments on the Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Friday, May 7, 2021: reminder for comments on the Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Wednesday, May 13, 2021: reminder for comments on the Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021

Public notice of the availability of the Draft PEIR was provided on social media through Twitter and Facebook on the following dates:

- Monday, February 2, 2021: notification of availability of Draft PEIR for 45-day comment period ending on March 18, 2021
- Wednesday, February 17, 2021: notification of availability of Draft PEIR and Draft PEIR March 3, 2021, Public Meeting Announcement
- Tuesday, March 2, 2021: reminder for Draft PEIR Public Meeting on March 3, 2021
- Monday, March 8, 2021: announcement for comment period extension for LA River Master Plan and Draft PEIR to May 13, 2021
- Tuesday, March 30, 2021: reminder for comments on the LA River Master Plan and Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Tuesday, May 4, 2021: reminder for comments on the LA River Master Plan and Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Friday, May 7, 2021: reminder for comments on the LA River Master Plan and Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021
- Thursday, May 13, 2021: reminder for comments on the LA River Master Plan and Draft PEIR due May 13, 2021

Chapter 4

Findings Required under CEQA

California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21002 states:

...public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. The Legislature further finds and declares that in the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.

The mandate and principles presented in PRC Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt Findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required (PRC Section 21081(a); State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)). For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written Finding accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each Finding. The possible Findings in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

The following sections set forth the County's Findings from the PEIR's determinations regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address the significant impacts associated with the proposed Project. Although State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and PRC Section 21081 only require Findings to address significant environmental effects, Findings often address impacts that were found to be less than significant; therefore, these Findings will account for all effects identified in the PEIR.

These Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the County regarding the environmental impacts of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the mitigation measures included as part of the Final PEIR and adopted by the County as part of the proposed Project, and the alternatives that have been rejected as infeasible. Because the County agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the Final PEIR, which include the analyses provided in the Draft PEIR, these Findings do not repeat the analyses and conclusions of the Final PEIR, but instead incorporate them by reference and rely upon them as substantial evidence supporting these Findings.

Chapter 5

No Environmental Impacts

The Draft PEIR identifies certain activities that would result in no environmental impact and includes the following:

- Biological Resources (Section 3.3)
 - Conservation Plan
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources (Section 3.6)
 - Use of Septic Tanks or Alternative Waste Disposal Systems
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 3.8)
 - Safety Hazard or Excessive Noise within or near Airport
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 3.9)
 - Water Quality Standards
 - KOP Category 4 (Operations)
 - Groundwater Management Plan
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Land Use (Section 3.10)
 - Divide Established Community

- Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
- KOP Categories 1 through 3 (Operations)
- Utilities/Service Systems (Section 3.18)
 - Water Supplies
 - KOP Category 4 (Operations)
 - Adequate Capacity for Wastewater Treatment Provider
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction)

Chapter 6

Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts (Without Mitigation)

The Draft PEIR identifies certain activities that would result in less-than-significant impacts and includes the following:

- Aesthetics (Section 3.1)
 - Scenic Vista
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Operations)
 - Scenic Resources
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - Visual Character
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
 - Light and Glare
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction)
- Air Quality (Section 3.2)
 - Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - Violate Air Quality Standard

- Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
- Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
- Objectionable Odors
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Category 1 (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 2 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction)
- Energy (Section 3.5)
 - Consumption of Energy
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - State or Local Plans
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources (Section 3.6)
 - Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - On- or Offsite Landslide, Lateral Spreading, Subsidence, Liquefaction, or Collapse
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Expansive Soil
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Section 3.8)
 - Routine Transport
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)

- KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
- Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Upset and Accident Conditions
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
- Hazards to Schools
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
- Hazardous Materials Sites
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
- Emergency Response
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Section 3.9)
 - Water Quality Standards
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - Groundwater Supplies
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)

- Inundation
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Land Use and Planning (Section 3.10)
 - Divide Established Community
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 4 and 5 (Operations)
 - Conflict with Applicable Plans and Policies
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 and 2 (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 3, 4, and 5 (Construction and Operations)
- Mineral Resources (Section 3.11)
 - Locally Important Mineral Resource
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Noise (Section 3.12)
 - Temporary or Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels in Excess of Standards
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - Groundborne Vibration or Groundborne Noise Levels
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Airstrip
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)

- Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Population and Housing (Section 3.13)
 - Population Growth
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
 - Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing Units
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Public Services (Section 3.14)
 - Police and Fire Services, Schools, and Parks
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
- Recreation (Section 3.15)
 - Increased Use of Existing Parks
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
- Transportation (Section 3.16)
 - Conflict with Circulation System Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
 - State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - Increase Hazards due to Geometric Design Feature or Result in Inadequate Emergency Access
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)

- Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
- KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)
- Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Operations)
- Utilities/Service Systems (Section 3.18)
 - Exceed Water or Wastewater Treatment Stormwater Drainage, Electric Power, Natural Gas, or Telecommunications Facilities
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)
 - Water Supplies
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 3 and 5 (Operations)
 - Adequate Capacity for Wastewater Treatment Provider
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Operations)
 - Generation of Waste
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction and Operations)
 - Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operations)
 - Overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* Implementation (Construction and Operations)
- Wildfire (Section 3.19)
 - Emergency Response Plan
 - Common Elements Typical Project (Operations)
 - Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Operations)
 - KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)

Less-than-Significant Environmental Impacts with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)/ Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts (Not Carried Out by the County)

The County will adopt the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR and will implement or require implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR for later activities or subsequent projects that are carried out by the County (i.e., the County is directly undertaking the project). Other agencies may use the PEIR as the basis upon which to tier future project environmental analyses under CEQA. In those situations, as provided in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), other agencies could rely on and implement the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR.

Because some of the later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County and could be carried out by one of the 17 cities, other public agencies, or private parties in the project study area, the County does not have the legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the mitigation measures would be incorporated in all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Therefore, where the PEIR concludes a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated, the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable when these activities are not carried out by the County.

The sections below present findings for less-than-significant impacts with mitigation (carried out by the County) and findings for significant and unavoidable impacts (not carried out by the County).

7.1 Aesthetics

Impact 3.1(a) Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities would be temporary and the placement of construction equipment and staging areas in the right-of-way (ROW) would reduce the possibility that the view of a scenic vista is substantially blocked or obstructed. The location, design details, and specific construction phasing of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project are not known; therefore, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar, as would construction equipment. The larger projects would involve the use of cranes and jackhammers to break concrete. Staging areas for construction equipment would be located in the ROW or on appropriate vacant areas for in-channel or off-channel projects. Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 could include more complex amenities and thus generally require a longer duration of construction activities than for the Typical Projects with additional construction equipment. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 through 6 are not known, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved, e.g., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, and generators. As noted, some projects would be larger than others and include a wide variety of project components. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures, if adopted by a non-County agency, would also reduce potential impacts to less than significant. However, because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the mitigation measures would be adopted by a non-County agency, the impact would be significant and unavoidable for non-County-led later activities.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Install Construction Fencing for Screening and Security for Construction Lasting Longer than 30 Days.

For construction of a project component lasting longer than 30 days, the implementing agency will require contractors 1) to install solid green or blue fabric perimeter fencing of a minimum height of 6 feet around construction areas to screen and provide security to pedestrians and other trail and park users and reduce views of construction staging areas, grading, and site disturbance, and 2) to conduct regular visual inspections of fencing to ensure fencing is in good working order and any visual breaks are repaired.

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure REC-1: Minimize Disruption of Recreational Uses during Construction. (See Section 7.11, *Recreation*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1, wherein Mitigation Measure AES-1 will minimize obstruction of views of scenic resources by requiring the installation of construction fencing, Mitigation Measure LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows, and Mitigation Measure REC-1 will minimize disruption of recreational uses and continue to allow opportunities for viewing scenic resources. These mitigation measures will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies undertaking the later activities and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Impact 3.1(c) In non-urbanized areas, would the proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the Project is in an urbanized area, would it conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could temporarily introduce new visual elements in the forms of construction equipment, staging areas, and other visual elements that could be incompatible with the surrounding visual environment, and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar to those discussed for the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects. Similar construction equipment and activities would be used and occur, mainly differentiated by size of the site. Larger

projects such as bridges would likely involve the use of larger cranes and other equipment. As the specific locations of these project components are not known, it is possible that construction activities could be visible and could conflict with zoning or other design standards governing scenic quality. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. As the specific locations of these project components are not known, it is possible that construction activities could be visible and could conflict with zoning or other design standards governing scenic quality. Construction of the proposed Project could introduce new temporary visual elements in the forms of construction equipment, staging areas, and other visual elements that could be incompatible with the surrounding visual environment, and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Install Construction Fencing for Screening and Security for Construction Lasting Longer than 30 Days. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure REC-1: Minimize Disruption of Recreational Uses during Construction. (See Section 7.11, *Recreation*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1, wherein Mitigation Measure AES-1 will minimize obstruction of views of scenic resources by requiring the installation of construction fencing, Mitigation Measure LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows, and Mitigation Measure REC-1 will minimize disruption of recreational uses and continue to allow opportunities for viewing scenic resources. These mitigation measures will ensure that the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site, and it would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the

mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Impact 3.1(d) Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would follow Chapter 6 of the Design Guidelines, which includes requirements for lighting along the LA River. Nevertheless, operation of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, KOP category components could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

All of the projects envisioned in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects would follow the Design Guidelines, although *2020 LA River Master Plan* project components could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure AES-3a: Design Exterior Lighting to Minimize Nighttime Illumination Spillover.

Exterior lighting will be designed to shield and direct illumination to the subsequent project sites and minimize light spillover to any adjacent residential uses.

Mitigation Measure AES-3b: Design Exterior Structures to Minimize Glare.

The exterior of the proposed buildings/structures will be constructed of materials such as high-performance, tinted, non-mirrored glass; painted metal panels; and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following finding is made for operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b, wherein under Mitigation Measure AES-3a exterior lighting will be designed to shield and direct illumination to the subsequent project sites and minimize light spillover to any adjacent residential uses; and Mitigation Measure AES-3b will minimize glare by requiring that the exterior of the proposed buildings/structures be constructed of materials such as high-performance, tinted, non-mirrored glass; painted metal panels; and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, project construction would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following findings are made for operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics for operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

7.2 Air Quality

Impact 3.2(d): Would the proposed Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 1 (Operation)

Operation of KOP Category 1 includes an equestrian facilities design component, which has been identified as being similar to the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) identified agricultural uses, composting areas, and dairies, and has the potential to generate nuisance odors during operations due to manure and soiled bedding generated and stockpiled on site. Improper handling and storage of manure, along with odor migration, may lead to offsite

nuisance violations. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AQ-5) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

According to SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting areas, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. As part of the design component of KOP Category 1, equestrian facilities, similar to agricultural uses, composting areas, or dairies, have the potential to generate nuisance odors due to manure and soiled bedding generated and stockpiled on site. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AQ-5) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Implement Equestrian Manure Management.

Equestrian activities may generate odors due to improper handling of manure and soiled bedding. The implementing agency will comply with the following measures:

- The facility, including animal stalls and warmup and training areas, will be cleaned at least once per day, including the removal of manure and soiled bedding.
- Manure and soiled bedding will either be incorporated into composting by the end of the day or temporarily stockpiled prior to incorporation into the composting system.
- Stockpiled material in containment vessels will be covered with a lid or tarp. Containment vessels will be located at the farthest feasible distance from nearby residents and/or sensitive receptors.

This mitigation measure will be implemented on a project-by-project basis, only where the design components of KOP Category 1 include an equestrian facility.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on air quality, the following finding is made for operation of the KOP Category 1 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on air quality due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Category 1 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would require cleaning of equestrian facilities at least once per day. As well as composting manure and soiled bedding and covering stockpiled material with a lid or tarp at the furthest feasible distance from residents and/or sensitive receptors. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would ensure that manure is properly handled or composted to reduce offsite nuisance violations. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts associated with project operations would be reduced to less than significant.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on air quality, the following findings are is made for operation of KOP Category 1 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on air quality due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if this mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure AQ-5 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because

it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

7.3 Biological Resources

Impact 3.3(a): Would the proposed Project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The construction of the Typical Projects could have a substantial adverse impact—either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications—on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fishes, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of the Typical Projects could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-3f, BIO-9, and BIO-12 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction-related direct and indirect impacts on special-status reptiles and amphibians due to the construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 would be generally as described for the Typical Projects.

The construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS.

Recreational use along the LA River may substantially increase due to implementation of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5. Additional indirect recreational impacts on special-status reptiles and amphibians may include impacts from human use, such as hiking, walking, biking, and use of the river, on behaviors such as foraging and predator avoidance. Other indirect effects may include increases in invasive species from activities such as foot traffic, equestrian uses, hiking, and biking, which would also increase soil compaction. Direct effects may include mortality due to collisions with horses, humans, and bicycles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-12, BIO-15, BIO-17, and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The construction of KOP Category 2 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Category 2 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-15 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The construction of KOP Category 6 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of KOP Category 6 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-14, and BIO-16 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects and the KOP categories discussions above, construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or

regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Similar to the Typical Projects and the KOP categories discussion above, operations under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-14, and BIO-16 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys.

The purpose of BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. BIO-1 is the first step, and in some cases, the final step, in reaching the goal of a no impact, less-than-significant impact, or significant impact determination for each of the six biological thresholds of significance (see Section 3.3.3.2, Criteria for Determining Significance).

During the design of individual subsequent projects and prior to construction, the implementing agency will employ a qualified biologist to review the proposed subsequent project. The qualified biologist will conduct a site-specific literature review, which will consider, at a minimum, the proposed subsequent project, site location, GIS information, and known sensitive biological resources. If appropriate, the literature review will include a review of the California State Wildlife Action Plan, focusing on Chapter 5.5, South Coast Province, and Chapter 6, Anadromous Fish (CDFW 2015), and the City of Los Angeles Department of Sanitation 2020 Biodiversity Report (LASAN 2020). The review will assess the site for special-status plants and/or wildlife, aquatic resources, sensitive natural communities, wildlife corridors or nurseries, biological resources protected by local ordinances policies such as protected trees, or other regulated biological resources pursuant to CEQA, FESA, or CESA could be affected by the project. In some cases, a literature review will be sufficient for the biologist to make a no impact and/or a less-than-significant impact determination for all six of the thresholds of significance (Section 3.3.3.2) of biological resources. In this case, no further work will be required, and a summary report stating the basis for these findings, identifying each threshold of significance with a CEQA finding, will be the only requirement.

If, during the literature review, it is determined that potential biological resources exist in the individual subsequent project area that could be affected, then a habitat assessment survey will be required unless a qualified biologist determines that a field review/habitat assessment is not needed. If needed, this survey will consist of a site visit conducted by a qualified biologist, where the proposed subsequent project and adjacent buffer (as appropriate for the target species relative to the potential project direct and indirect impacts) will be assessed for candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants and/or wildlife, aquatic resources, sensitive natural

communities, wildlife corridors or nurseries, biological resources protected by local ordinances policies, such as protected trees or other regulated biological resources, while identifying and mapping all vegetation communities and land-cover types (initial study). If suitable habitat is present for candidate, sensitive, or special-status plants or animals and could not be avoided, then focused protocol surveys may be required, as determined by a qualified biologist, with appropriate reporting.

To determine presence/absence or to accurately identify rare plants, a qualified botanist shall conduct multiple rare plant surveys throughout the growing season for any given year, as needed. Surveys shall occur during the time of year when rare plants are more likely to be visually detectable. Rare plant surveys performed during a low precipitation year shall be supplemented with one or two additional rare plant surveys over a number of years, depending on the rare plant species, annual weather patterns, and whether the project area was recently disturbed (e.g., fire).

If aquatic resources are present and could not be avoided, a jurisdictional delineation per Mitigation Measure BIO-21a may be required. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will include an analysis of all of the biological resources identified in the thresholds of significance, with a determination made regarding significance for each threshold. Reporting will include regulatory assessment, construction and operation impact analyses, and identification and implementation of appropriate measures based on the presence of biological resources. Impact analyses will also include appropriate assessment of project-specific disturbances (e.g., recreational effects, night lighting, noise).

If, following the literature review and project surveys, it is determined that the project will not directly or indirectly affect any species listed as endangered, threatened, or candidate by CDFW or USFWS, then the impact will be less than significant for listed species, and no further mitigation for listed species will be required. If, however, it is determined that impacts on federally or State-listed plant or animal species will occur and therefore will be considered significant, then Mitigation Measure BIO-2 will be required and implemented to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Federally or State-Listed Species, Consult with Wildlife Agencies, and Implement Permit Requirements.

The implementing agency will avoid “take” of species, if applicable/occurring, within the action area (i.e., project area and buffer for species that USFWS and CDFW list as endangered, threatened, or candidate). The *action area* is a FESA term that refers to the area directly and indirectly affected by the proposed action and is based on the range of impacts (e.g., ground disturbance, water quality, air quality, lighting, noise). If avoidance of take is not possible, then the implementing agency will initiate the process of consultation with the wildlife agencies (i.e., USFWS, NMFS and/or CDFW, as appropriate based on species habitat present).

During informal consultation, it may be determined that the proposed action is not likely to affect any federally listed species or critical habitat in the project area, with no requirement to consult formally with the USFWS, this will complete the consultation process. If the proposed action may affect listed species or critical habitat, and the action has a federal nexus, then Section 7 of the FESA process applies. Under FESA Section 7, the project proponent will need to prepare a Biological Assessment (BA) to assist the USFWS in its determination of the project’s

effect on species and/or critical habitat. If the action is likely to adversely affect a listed species, then a request for formal consultation is submitted. Pursuant to FESA, formal consultation may last up to 90 days, after which the USFWS has 45 days to prepare a Biological Opinion (BO). These timelines may be extended through a request from USFWS. The conclusion of the BO will state whether or not the proposed action is likely to:

1. Jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species; and/or
2. Result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat as a whole for the conservation of the listed species.

If the action is reasonably certain not to jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species or diminish the value of critical habitat as a whole for the species, then the BO will include an incidental take statement with the BO. *Incidental take* is subject to the terms and conditions provided in the incidental take statement. Examples of terms and conditions included within a typical BO are included below.

FESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) consultation occurs for non-federal actions. An HCP is prepared by the project proponent and accompanies the application for an ITP. The USFWS prepares the ITP and a BO. The elements of the HCP are made binding through the ITP. The timelines for HCP completion are project-specific.

If a species is listed by both FESA and CESA, Fish and Game Code Section 2080.1 allows an applicant who has obtained a federal incidental take statement (FESA Section 7 consultation) or a federal ITP (FESA § 10(a)(1)(B)) to request that the Director of CDFW find the federal documents consistent with CESA. If the federal documents are consistent with CESA, a consistency determination is issued, and no further authorization or approval is necessary under CESA.

For species that are listed by CDFW, but not the USFWS, as endangered, threatened, candidate, or a rare plant, and where take would occur, the project proponent will apply for a State ITP under Section 2081(b) of the Fish and Game Code. CDFW typically requires that the project proponent seek a 2081(b) ITP rather than a 2080.1 consistency determination because of inconsistencies between FESA and CESA, particularly conditions of approval. For example, FESA does not prohibit the take of listed plants on private lands, whereas CESA does. When the 2081(b) ITP is issued, terms and conditions will be specified by CDFW within the 2081(b) ITP, and these terms and conditions will ensure that the items 1 through 5 below are met.

1. The authorized take must be incidental to an otherwise lawful activity.
2. The impacts of the authorized take must be minimized and fully mitigated.
3. The measures required to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts of the authorized take:
 - a. Are roughly proportional in extent to the impact of the taking on the species;
 - b. Maintain the applicant's objective to the greatest extent possible; and
 - c. May be successfully implemented by the applicant.
4. Adequate funding is provided to implement the required minimization and mitigation measures and monitor compliance with the effectiveness of the measures.

5. Issuance of the permit will not jeopardize the continued existence of the CESA-listed species.

As a part of the above described processes, examples of mitigation for impacts on listed species through the following pathways are included below:

- If suitable habitat for listed species is present within the action area, the project will be designed to avoid impacts (direct and indirect). Through the avoidance of impacts on listed species, the project proponent will avoid the FESA/CESA permitting process.
 - Informal consultation with the wildlife agencies may be required to complete the process.
- For impacts on federally listed species and a federal permit or federal funding is involved, Section 7 consultation (if available through federal nexus) will be required. This may include consistency determination from CDFW for State-listed species.
 - A “May Affect and Is Likely to Adversely Affect” BA will be prepared and submitted to USFWS, and initiation of formal consultation will be requested. The BA will include applicant proposed mitigation measures that are often included in the required Terms and Conditions in the BO. These conditions depend on the species under consideration, as well as severity of the project impacts, but typically include avoidance and minimization measures, as well as compensatory mitigation to reduce take to the extent feasible.
 - Conservation measures or similar requirements may be required within the BO that specify conservation, minimization, and compensation measures to avoid, minimize, or offset effects to listed species. Examples include:
 - Biological monitoring
 - Worker environmental awareness program (WEAP) training
 - Minimization of construction-related impacts
 - Preconstruction clearance surveys
 - Weed management surveys
 - Compensation for loss of habitat
 - Protection of lands in perpetuity
 - Mitigation ratios for impacts (e.g., 1:1 mitigation for suitable habitat, 3:1 for riparian habitat, 5:1 for critical habitat)
 - Permanent protection and management of compensation lands
 - Costs to acquire and manage lands
 - Financial assurances
 - Terms and Conditions within the Incidental Take Statement in the BO will include mitigation measures for listed species. Examples include:

- Immediate notification of wildlife agencies in the event of the permit's listed species being killed or injured as a result of project activities
- Re-initiation of consultation if more than a specified number of listed species are killed or injured as a result of project activities
- Reporting requirements
- For impacts on federally listed species for which no federal permit or federal funding is involved, Section 10(a)(1)(B)) consultation (if no federal nexus) will be required. This may include consistency determination from CDFW for State-listed species.
 - Applicant-prepared HCP that includes mitigation measures:
 - Preservation (via acquisition or conservation easement) of existing habitat
 - Enhancement or restoration of degraded or former habitat
 - Creation of new habitat
 - Establishment of buffer areas around existing habitats
 - Restrictions to access
 - The USFWS then issues an ITP and prepares a BO, and the HCP mitigation measures become legally binding. USFWS ITP measures will be similar to those described above for Section 7.
- For impacts on State-listed species, a 2081 (b) ITP will be issued. The BO conservation measures are often included in the BO in order to meet CESA requirements and allow CDFW to make a consistency determination. For this reason, the 2081 (b) ITP requirements are often similar to the BO conservation measures and may include other measures, such as:
 - CNDDDB Observations (reporting of any CNDDDB species)
 - Traffic speed limits
 - Habitat acquisition, permanent protection, and perpetual management of compensatory habitat

In addition to the measures listed above, additional measures may be required through agency consultations and/or permits that are deemed necessary for the recovery of a listed species.

As outlined in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that there is suitable habitat present for special-status species of nesting birds, raptors, or eagles, or if construction involves non-incident take of migratory birds that are not special-status, and if construction is to occur during the nesting season within suitable habitat, then the following mitigation measures will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys.

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity, including vegetation removal or structure disturbance/demolition, during the bird breeding season (February 1 to August 31), a qualified biologist will conduct nesting bird surveys within 7 days prior to construction for any activities that could disturb nesting birds within the subsequent project area and its 500-foot buffer area for nesting

birds and active nests (i.e., nests with eggs or young) of non-raptor species listed under the MBTA or CFGC.

If active bird nests are observed, the biologist will establish an appropriate ESA buffer based on the species, work activities, and the tolerance of the species to disturbance. No entry or work will occur within the ESA nest buffer unless approved by the qualified biologist. The ESA nest buffer will be maintained until nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest or parental care for survival, or the biologist determines that the nest has been abandoned. A minimum 0.5-mile no-disturbance buffer around each nest of California fully protected bird species—American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, California brown pelican, and California least tern—will be required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Conduct Preconstruction Raptor Nest Surveys.

If construction is scheduled to occur during the breeding season for raptors (January 1 to September 1), then no more than 7 days before the start of the activities, a qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting raptors in areas where suitable habitat is present within the project area and up to a 500-foot buffer, as determined by a qualified biologist. If active raptor nests are found, then the biologist will delineate an ESA buffer of sufficient size or utilize a buffer as determined by regulatory authorizations for species listed under the FESA or CESA, around the nest. The ESA buffer will be maintained until the young have fledged from the nest and are no longer reliant on the nest or parental care for survival or until such time as the biologist determines that the nest has been abandoned. A minimum 0.5 mile no-disturbance buffer around each nest of California fully protected bird species will be required.

Mitigation Measure BIO 3c: Active Eagle Nest Avoidance Measures.

If an occupied nest (as defined by Pagel et al. 2010) is detected within 4 miles of the work areas, the implementing agency will notify USFWS and CDFW and will follow the specified line-of-sight and no line-of-sight no-work buffer requirements during the breeding season to ensure that construction activities do not result in injury or disturbance to eagles. A minimum 0.5-mile no-disturbance buffer around bald eagle nests (California fully protected bird species) will be required. The implementing agency in coordination with the project biologist, will coordinate with the USFWS regarding any modifications to these proposed buffers. It is not anticipated that activities during operations would disturb eagle nesting, but should operations activities have the potential to disturb eagle nesting, then this measure will be required.

- The no-work buffer will be maintained throughout the breeding season or until the young have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest or parental care that includes nest use for survival.
- Buffers around occupied nests may be reduced if a qualified biologist determines that smaller buffers would be sufficient to avoid impacts on nesting eagles.

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that suitable habitat is present for burrowing owls, then then the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(i): Conduct Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys.

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity or any activity that could disturb burrowing owl burrows or nesting, a qualified biologist will conduct protocol-level surveys for burrowing owl within suitable habitat located in the work area or extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. Surveys will be conducted in accordance with guidelines in the *CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012).

If occupied burrowing owl burrows are detected and cannot be avoided, then the following two mitigation measures will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(ii): Implement Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Relocation Measures.

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity or activities that could disturb burrowing owls, CDFW will be contacted. Avoidance of occupied burrowing owl burrows (with an appropriate buffer) is the preferred minimization measure. However, if avoidance is not possible, burrowing owls may be excluded by a qualified burrowing owl biologist with experience conducting burrowing owl passive relocations. In coordination with CDFW, the biologist will prepare a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan. Burrowing owl exclusions will only occur during the non-nesting season and only after a qualified biologist has determined that burrowing owls are not nesting. The plan will be submitted to approval by CDFW prior to implementation. The Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan will be prepared in accordance with guidelines in the *CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012).

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(iii): Implement Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity or activities that could disturb burrowing owls, a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan will be prepared and approved by CDFW. The Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan will be prepared by a qualified biologist and will be prepared in accordance with guidelines in the *CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012).

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that suitable habitat is present for bats, then the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented to avoid potentially significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3e: Conduct Preconstruction Special-Status Bat Surveys.

No earlier than 30 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities or activities that could disturb bat roost sites in a work area, a qualified bat biologist will conduct a visual and acoustic survey (over the course of one day and one evening at a minimum) for roosting bats in the work area and extending a distance deemed appropriate by the qualified biologist from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. Such surveys will be conducted only in those areas in which bridges, abandoned structures, or trees with large cavities or dense foliage are present. The qualified bat biologist will also visually inspect for crevice dwelling birds (e.g., nesting, overwintering swifts) and note any observations.

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if bat roost sites are identified and could be disturbed, then the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3f: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures.

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity or activities that could disturb bat roost sites, a qualified bat biologist will survey for active bat colonies, such as hibernacula or maternity roosts. If active hibernacula or maternity roosts are identified in the work area or in the buffer area (as defined by the qualified bat biologist, based on site conditions, planned work, and anticipated indirect impacts on bats), they will be avoided. If avoidance is not feasible, then a qualified bat biologist with experience conducting bat evictions, exclusion, and mitigation will prepare a mitigation plan detailing the eviction, exclusion, and relocation of the bat colony and will provide for construction of an alternative bat roosting habitat outside of the work area. Alternative bat habitat may be required to be constructed and installed up to 2 years prior to any bat eviction and exclusion and must be approved by CDFW.

The qualified bat biologist will implement the mitigation plan for a period of time determined by the qualified bat biologist to be sufficient for the bats to adjust to the disturbance before the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities that would occur within the buffer area of the hibernacula. All bat colony and roost management will be conducted in accordance with accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques. If non-breeding or non-hibernating individuals or groups of bats are found roosting within the work area, cannot be avoided, and would be affected by the proposed Project, then the following will be implemented:

- **Implement Bat Exclusion and Deterrence Measures.** A qualified biologist will facilitate the eviction of the bats by either opening the roosting area to change the lighting and airflow conditions or installing one-way doors or other appropriate methods. To the extent feasible, the roosts will remain undisturbed by project activities for a minimum of 1 week after implementing eviction and exclusion activities. Evictions will not occur to active maternity or hibernacula.

If it is determined that suitable habitat is present for American badgers, and impacts on badgers could not be avoided and would therefore be significant, then the following mitigation measure will be implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3g: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger.

Prior to ground disturbance, the implementing agency will require a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for American badger den sites within suitable habitat located within the project site. These surveys will be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in the project site. As required by CDFW, the biologist will establish a no-work buffer around occupied maternity dens throughout the pup-rearing season (February 15 through July 1) and an ESA buffer around occupied dens during other times of the year. If non-maternity dens are found and cannot be avoided during construction activities, they will be monitored for badger activity. If the biologist determines that dens may be occupied, passive den exclusion measures (outside the pupping season) will be implemented for 3 to 5 days to discourage the use of these dens prior to disturbance activities.

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, nest sites) is present, and the impacts of the Project have been determined to be potentially significant, then the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

Prior to any ground-disturbing activity, the implementing agency will require the construction area, including access roads and staging areas, to be delineated through the use of construction flagging and signage under the supervision of a qualified biologist. To prevent the inadvertent disturbance of habitat, vehicle traffic and construction personnel will be restricted to established roads, construction areas, and other designated areas. Any ESAs, such as wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, and/or nest sites, will be delineated, and no access will be allowed into these areas. Delineation of ESAs will include fencing, flagging, and other methods of demarcation sufficient to prevent entry into the ESA. Prohibited materials shall include, but are not limited to, spikes, glass, razor, or barbed wire. Use of chain link and steel stake fence shall be avoided or minimized. Fences shall not have any slack that may cause wildlife entanglement. No grading or fill activity of any type will be permitted within the ESA. No grading or fill activity of any type will be permitted within ESAs. In addition, no construction activities, materials, or equipment will be allowed within ESAs. All construction equipment will be operated in a manner to prevent accidental damage to nearby preserved areas. Construction personnel will strictly limit their activities, vehicles, equipment, and construction materials to the limits of disturbance and designated staging areas and routes of travel. Silt fence barriers will be installed at the ESA boundary to prevent accidental deposition of fill material in areas where vegetation is immediately adjacent to planned grading activities. ESA fencing and exclusion fencing will remain in place and be maintained until project construction is completed. If, during the project phase, wildlife becomes entangled in construction fencing, work must immediately stop, a qualified biologist notified, and dead or injured wildlife documented immediately. If injury or mortality involves a special-status species, the qualified biologist will notify CDFW and USFWS within three calendar days of the incident or finding. Work in the immediate area will only resume once the proper notifications have been made and additional mitigation measures have been identified to prevent additional injury or mortality.

Equipment storage, fueling, and staging areas will be located on upland sites with minimal risks of direct drainage into riparian areas or other sensitive natural communities. These designated areas will be located in such a manner as to prevent any runoff from entering sensitive habitat. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the release of cement or other toxic substances into surface waters. Project-related spills of hazardous materials will be reported to appropriate regulating entities including, but not limited to, the applicable jurisdictional city and RWQCB and will be cleaned up immediately and contaminated soils removed to approved disposal areas.

If sensitive biological resources are identified within the project footprint or surrounding buffer, but will not be affected by the proposed Project, then those resources must be marked clearly with permanent signage to promote avoidance of the resource by the public and operations and maintenance staff.

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if there is ground disturbance that could result in the establishment of invasive plant species, and this impact has been determined to be potentially significant, then the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan.

Prior to construction on all projects, a weed abatement plan will be prepared and implemented by the project proponent to minimize the spread and importation of nonnative plant material during and after construction and will include the following:

- Any exotic species removed during construction will be properly handled to prevent sprouting or regrowth. Methods will be developed to avoid spreading exotic plant seeds during plant removal and ensure plants will be removed prior to flowering, if feasible.
- An herbicide use protocol will be included within the weed abatement plan. Anyone using herbicides will be required to complete a "Report of Chemical Spray Form" per the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works BMP Manual (Public Works 2010). Hazardous waste management practices will apply to the use of all herbicides. The application of all herbicides will be performed by a licensed applicator. A qualified biologist will review the herbicide use protocol referencing the Cal-IPC's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Wildland Stewardship (Cal-IPC 2015).
- Construction equipment will be cleaned of mud or other debris that may contain invasive plants and/or seeds and inspected to reduce the potential of spreading noxious weeds before mobilizing to the site and before leaving the site or at the nearest staging area during the course of construction. Cleaning of equipment will occur in a designated area distant from ESA fencing.
- Trucks carrying loads of vegetation removed from the project footprint will be covered and disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Only certified weed-free straw, mulch, and/or fiber rolls will be used for erosion control. Fill material will be obtained from weed-free sources.
- After construction, any disturbed areas remaining as bare ground will be returned to original grade (unless the design incorporated permanent grade changes), soils will be decompacted, and areas will be revegetated with native hydroseed and/or container plantings to match existing sensitive habitats as detailed in design plans or a project-specific restoration plan. All revegetated areas will avoid the use of species listed in Cal-IPC's California Invasive Plant Inventory.

As described in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees have the potential to be present at the project site, then the following mitigation measures will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction.

In sensitive areas or adjacent to special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, protected trees, a biological monitor will be required to monitor construction activities for the duration of construction activities to ensure that practicable measures are being employed to avoid incidental disturbance of habitat and special-status species outside of the project footprint.

Biological monitoring will include items such as monitoring activities associated with the installation of protective barriers (e.g., ESAs fencing, silt fencing, sandbags, fencing); ensuring

that the removal of vegetation near sensitive biological resources is limited to the proposed disturbance area; monitoring of active bird nests; ensuring that all food related trash items are enclosed in sealed containers and removed from the site; ensuring that construction employees strictly limit their activities, vehicles, equipment and construction materials to the proposed project footprint, designated staging areas, and approved routes of travel, with construction areas being the minimal area necessary to complete the proposed Project as specified in construction plans; ensuring that equipment storage, fueling, and staging is located in upland sites to protect riparian habitats and other sensitive habitats; ensuring that brush, loose soils, and other debris materials will not be stockpiled within stream channels or on banks; checking potential wildlife pitfalls; contacting CDFW (and USFWS as appropriate) regarding any dead or injured federally or State-listed wildlife; and disposal of road-killed animals.

The biological monitor will conduct WEAP training to train construction contractors and other site personnel. The purpose of WEAP training is to provide training regarding the avoidance and minimization measures for biological resources, the laws and regulations related to biological resources, and the fines and penalties for violating those laws.

The biological monitor will monitor construction within the vicinity of any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural community areas prior to and during vegetation removal to ensure that vegetation removal, best management practices (BMPs), ESAs, and all avoidance and minimization measures are properly implemented. ESA fencing will be inspected by the biological monitor at a frequency necessary to ensure that it is in place and properly maintained.

Where impacts on special-status wildlife are unavoidable, the biological monitor will protect special-status wildlife and allow special-status wildlife to move away on its own if possible. If not possible, special-status wildlife will be relocated to adjacent appropriate habitat on site or to suitable habitat adjacent habitat. If relocation of special-status wildlife is to occur, species specific relocation plans and handling permits may be required. Special-status wildlife will only be captured by a qualified biologist with appropriate handling permits (as required).

As part of this effort, the biological monitor will document compliance with applicable avoidance and minimization measures, including measures set forth in regulatory authorizations.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife.

During construction, the biological monitor will ensure that intentional killing or collection of any plant or animal species unrelated to lawful construction activities does not occur. Construction crews will attend WEAP training (as specified in BIO-1), where field crews will be educated regarding biological resources and the avoidance of impacts on these resources, including the prohibition of collecting and killing of plant and animals. The fines and penalties for the collection and killing of special-status species and nesting birds will be explained in the WEAP training and will be enforced. In addition, purposeful collection and killing of plants and animals unrelated to lawful construction could result in a construction noncompliance and/or a stop work order.

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage.

The biological monitor, under the direction of the Resident Engineer or Construction Inspector, has the authority to stop work to protect biological resources, including but not limited to, aquatic resources, special-status wildlife and plants, and protected trees.

If aquatic resources or protected trees are identified in the work area and are not adequately protected, the biological monitor will have the authority to halt work in the area to prevent impacts on the resource. Any such work stoppage will be limited to the area necessary to protect the resource. Work will be resumed as quickly as possible once the appropriate the course of action has been determined.

In the event that any special-status plant or wildlife species is found in a work area, the biological monitor will have the authority to halt construction to prevent the death or injury to the species. Any such work stoppage will be limited to the area necessary to protect the species and work may be resumed once the biologist determines that individuals have moved out of harm's way or the biologist has relocated them out of the work area.

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan.**Construction BMPs**

The implementing agency will require all construction contractors to prepare and implement a construction BMP plan and stipulate the requirement in construction bid documents. The construction BMP plan will include, at a minimum, the following measures.

- All construction contractors and all construction personnel will be responsible for promptly cleaning up any fuel or other hazardous materials spills, and any leaks from equipment will be stopped and repaired immediately. Vehicle and equipment fluids that are no longer in use will be transported to an appropriate offsite disposal location. Fuel and lubricant storage and dispensing locations will be constructed to fully contain spilled materials until disposal can occur. Hazardous waste, including used motor oil, hydraulic fluid, and coolant, will be stored and transferred in a manner consistent with applicable regulations and guidelines.
- Dust-control measures will be implemented by the contractor to reduce excessive dust emissions. Dust-control measures will be carried out during periods of grading or other activities that will disturb soils and may include wetting work areas, using soil binders on dirt roads, and wetting or covering stockpiles.
- Fire-suppression capability, including extinguishers, shovels, and water tankers, will be available on site whenever construction occurs during the fire season (as determined by the Los Angeles County fire department) to help minimize the chance of human-caused wildfires. Activities that may produce sparks, including welding or grinding, will use protective gear, such as shields and protective mats, to reduce fire risks.
- Available ESA data and information will be reviewed prior to placement of deposition and stockpiling of any material, such as erodible materials, vegetation, loose soils, or other debris material. No erodible materials will be deposited into aquatic features (e.g., rivers, channels, drainages, ditches, drains, ponds, lakes) or areas demarcated.

- Construction and maintenance activities will be timed during sensitive periods with ESA fencing, and materials will not be stockpiled within such areas.

Operations Recreation Plan

The Operations Recreation Plan will include requirements for the following measures (as applicable) to be implemented for areas of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* where recreational opportunities will be created:

- Signage requiring pets to be on leash
- Pet dropping/waste bag dispensers and disposal stations
- Foot-wiping stations with signage explaining the purpose of the station (to prevent the spread of invasive weeds that degrade natural habitats that species depend on)
- Wildlife-proof waste bins
- Educational interpretive kiosks/signage (e.g., how to respect wildlife and habitats, stay on trail signs, identifying sensitive areas, pick up trash and fishing line, pick up after pets; opportunities to view wildlife)
- Incorporation of signage to avoid ESAs around sensitive wildlife/habitat features
- Sensitive wildlife and habitat features
 - Trail design – where avoidance is not feasible and where necessary, a project could incorporate into design the modification of trails, spatial arrangement of trails, trail dimensions, access points, and recreational structures to avoid and minimize impacts on sensitive wildlife and/or habitat features
 - Setbacks and restrictions – where avoidance is not feasible and where necessary, a project could incorporate into design setbacks that consider alert and flight initiation distances for sensitive wildlife with respect to the type and intensity of proposed recreational uses, could include restrictions of the size of gathering areas at pavilions, etc.
- Seasonal closures during sensitive periods (will occur if there were a significant biological impact that could not be mitigated except through avoidance)
- Improvement (i.e., restoration) of affected habitat areas
- Seasonal restrictions on certain uses (e.g., no kayaking during least Bell's vireo nesting if vireo are present)
- Prevention of fertilizer runoff
- Management of unauthorized uses through coordination with local resources
- Proper handling of any exotic plant species removed during operations and maintenance activities to prevent sprouting or regrowth; development of methods to ensure that exotic plant seeds are not spread during plant removal and that plants will be removed prior to flowering, if feasible

As outlined in BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that there is the potential for special-status wildlife, including special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians, that could become entrapped in

construction materials or excavations, then Mitigation Measure BIO-10 or BIO-11 will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Prevent Entrapment in Construction Materials and Excavations.

Any excavated steep-sided holes, pits, or trenches more than 12 inches deep with sidewalls steeper than 45 degrees will be covered with plywood or similar materials at the end of the day or have escape ramps, with at least one ramp per 100 feet of trenching, and slopes of escape ramps of no greater than 3:1. All construction pipe, culverts, or other structures with a diameter of 3 inches or greater that are stored overnight will either be elevated at least 1 foot above the ground, screened, or covered each night.

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Restrict Monofilament Materials.

The implementing agency will restrict the use of monofilament materials. Plastic monofilament netting (i.e., erosion control wattles or matting) or similar material will be prohibited as part of erosion-control activities. Alternative materials that could be used include, but are not limited to, geotextiles, fiber rolls, geomembranes, tackified hydroseeding compounds, loose-weave mesh, such as jute, hemp, and coconut (i.e., coir) fiber, and rice straw wattles (biodegradable, photodegradable, burlap).

As outlined in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that special-status birds (or those protected by the MBTA and CFGC) and special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians have the potential to occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-12 will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Best Practices for Night Lighting.

Construction and/or facility lighting will be designed to minimize or lessen the attraction of birds, bats, or their prey to the project site. Best practices for lighting for avian species conflict with those for bats. Best practices for avian species include using non-steady burning lights (e.g., red, dual red, and white strobe-like flashing lights) using motion or heat sensors and switches to reduce the time when lights are illuminated, using appropriate shielding to reduce horizontal or skyward illumination, and avoiding the use of high-intensity lights (e.g., sodium vapor, quartz, halogen). Best practices for lighting for bat species include avoiding green and red lights, as these interfere with migration patterns. White lighting tends to attract prey species and increase foraging. Lighting adjacent to wildlife areas should be limited to an upper limit of 3,000 on the Kelvin color temperature scale and shielded to prevent light from entering the wildlife area.

Night lighting will be designed for best practices for both avian and bat species, while also considering special-status reptiles and amphibians. Some design measures could include construction and facility lighting designed to prevent casting light toward surrounding wildlife habitats and the riverbed and using non-steady burning lights and avoiding green and red lights.

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Avoid Bird and Bat Entrapment in Poles.

Biological monitors will ensure that any installed poles, whether temporary or permanent, will not have openings that could entrap birds or bats. Construction contractors will be required to seal and cap all openings in poles or provide for escape routes (i.e., openings accommodating

escape for various species). Installation of poles will not begin until it is demonstrated that the poles can be adequately capped and/or sealed on installation.

As outlined in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if it is determined that special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles could occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-14 will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Minimize Noise Disturbance of Wildlife.

The implementing agency will incorporate setbacks, berms, walls, or similar noise-attenuating method to avoid and minimize the effects of noise on special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles in noise-generating activities affecting areas where special-status wildlife has been identified. Wildlife habitat areas occupied by sensitive species will not be subject to noise that will exceed residential noise standards as specified in Section 3.12, *Noise*. If the biological monitor determines that noise generation by construction activities may affect nesting, the biological monitor may require the monitoring of noise by a qualified technician, if attenuation is not possible. Setbacks or other structures will be sufficient to ensure noise attenuates adequately to avoid disturbance of special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles. If noise standards cannot be met, other measures may be incorporated, such as delaying construction until nesting is completed (for nesting birds) or until special-status species are no longer present or until a take permit for special-status species is obtained.

Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Use Wildlife-Proof Trash Canisters.

The implementing agency will require that all installed trash canisters will be wildlife proof/animal tamper resistant. The design will ensure that the trash will be securely stored to keep wildlife from being attracted to the project site. Trash containers must be resistant to mountain lions.

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Use Wildlife Safety Glass.

The implementing agency will require that glass used in the design of buildings and other facilities is bird safe. Bird-safe glass is designed specifically for making glass a visible obstacle to birds, while still being transparent to humans.

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Prepare and Implement Pest Management Plan.

The implementing agency will require that a pest management plan be developed by a qualified biologist. To prevent the inadvertent poisoning of raptors and non-target animals during operations, pest-control measures will prohibit the use of rodenticides. Other methods of rodent control, such as resetting lethal rat traps, will be used. As a part of the pest-management plan, the use of neonicotinoid pesticides will be prohibited, as these are known to be harmful to bumble bees.

To avoid the spread of invasive species and encourage the use of native plant species, the following mitigation measure will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Prohibit Use of Invasive Species during Operations.

The implementing agency will require landscape plans to prioritize the use of native plant species and will prohibit the use of invasive, nonnative plant species. The invasive plant species on the California Invasive Plant Council (CAL-IPC) list (<https://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory>) will be prohibited within or adjacent to the LA River or within wildlife corridors or sensitive habitat.

Mitigation Measure BIO-19: Implement Habitat Reclamation Efforts.

Where habitat reclamation opportunities exist (e.g. floodplain reclamation, creation of naturalized banks, braided channels, habitat blocks for crossing and platforms, wetlands through diversions, wetland terraces and planting trays), restoration BMPs will be used. These will include the following:

- Planting of invasive species will be prohibited, as specified in Mitigation Measure BIO-18, Invasive Species, Operations.
- The plant palette for restoration will be composed of native species that will be expected within the project area.
- If special-status plant species were removed prior to reclamation efforts, where feasible, these will be replanted within the reclamation site.
- A qualified biologist will assist in the design of habitat reclamation efforts. The biological goal of each reclamation site may differ (e.g., one site may function mainly as a wildlife corridor, whereas another may provide foraging habitat for special-status mammals), but given the limited amount of reclamation opportunities in the LA River, the wildlife and botanical goals that each reclamation site can achieve will be maximized.
- Upstream hydrological regimes and conditions and their impacts on the project area will be assessed.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires the implementing agency to avoid “take” of species, if applicable/occurring, within the action area. Mitigation Measures BIO-3a through BIO-3g avoid or reduce potential construction impacts on birds and mammals, including burrowing owls, bats, and American badgers. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 would avoid or reduce potential impacts on sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, nest sites) if present. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9 would reduce or avoid potential construction-related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measures BIO-10 and BIO-11 would be implemented if there is potential for special-status wildlife, including special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians, that could become entrapped in construction materials or excavations. If special-status birds (or those protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act [MBTA] and California Fish and Game Control [CFG]) and special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians have the potential to occur, then Mitigation Measures BIO-12 and BIO-13 would be implemented. If special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles could occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-14 would be implemented to avoid or reduce construction-related impacts. Mitigation Measures BIO-15 through BIO-17 would avoid or minimize direct and indirect impacts on invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and raptors. Mitigation Measure BIO-18 would avoid the spread of invasive species and encourage the use of native plant species. Lastly, for where opportunities for habitat reclamation efforts exist, Mitigation Measure BIO-19 would be implemented to ensure restoration BMPs are used.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (BIO-1 through BIO-19) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(b): Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities are present within Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 of the study areas. Permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts could occur on these sensitive natural communities should the Typical Projects be located within the portions of Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 that contain these habitats. The Common Elements Typical Project and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project could result in permanent and temporary impacts on sensitive natural communities as a result of construction activities should the project(s) be located within an area that supports sensitive communities. Permanent impacts from construction activities could include the removal of existing vegetation and encroachment into the sensitive natural communities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts could include incidental disturbances within and adjacent to construction areas and clearing and grubbing for equipment staging and temporary construction access routes.

Temporary indirect impacts on riparian habitat, essential fish habitat (EFH), habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs), or other sensitive natural communities adjacent to the Common

Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects' limits of disturbance may be caused by construction activities (e.g., soil compaction, introduction of invasive species, dust, increased fire risk, chemical spills, sedimentation), which could lead to the degradation of native habitats and floodplains. The movement of heavy equipment and supplies during construction could compact the soil, affecting vegetation germination and growth. Construction activities could also have adverse effects on sensitive natural communities and native plants as a result of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species through construction activities throughout the project footprint and surrounding area. Accidental release of contaminants during construction, such as an inadvertent spill of gasoline, oil, or lubricants when fueling or storing construction equipment, could affect plant growth and survival. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities that are located within the LA River ROW of Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 could be affected by Common Elements Typical Project and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project operation activities, such as recreation and maintenance. Indirect disturbances, such as dust and introduction of invasive species, could degrade riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities located in the LA River ROW that are within or adjacent to project operation activities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Category 1 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities. In addition, construction of KOP Category 1 could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on any riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities located within the study area, and would be similar to those described for the Typical Projects above. Unlike the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project described above, implementation of KOP Category 1 could include in-channel work as well as off-channel work. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area potentially could be affected by KOP Category 1 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 1. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities, should they be present within the proposed project area, as a result of construction of KOP components. Construction of KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area, particularly on riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks, should they be present within the proposed project area. Impacts would be similar to those described for the Typical Projects; see the above subsection for details. However, implementation of

proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area could be affected by KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, or 6. Maintenance of vegetation within and adjacent to KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, or 6 components, including landscaping and vegetation removal and trimming, could reduce in size or disturb sensitive natural communities that are located within or adjacent to a KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, or 6, particularly with in-channel operations. The modification of the channel as part of KOP Category 2, the creation of crossings and platforms as a part of KOP Category 3, and off-channel land assets as a part of KOP Category 6 may substantially increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities during operations. Should channel modifications, such as flood-management functions, associated with KOP Category 2, or diversions, such as side channels, underground galleries, and diversion tunnels, associated with KOP Category 4, affect the current flow or water level of the LA River, there could be a potential for adverse impacts associated with physiological stress or plant mortality. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 5 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities, should they be present within the proposed project area, as a result of construction of KOP Category 5 components, including widening the channel, fields, storage, and side channels. Direct impacts as a result of construction of KOP Category 5 components would primarily be temporary because reclamation areas would be restored or reestablished with riparian and wetland habitats. However, there could be some permanent loss of sensitive vegetation communities from construction of proposed recreation facilities (e.g., Farmer's Markets, boardwalks), should sensitive vegetation communities be present within the proposed project area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area could potentially be adversely affected by KOP Category 5 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 5 component. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the discussion above for Typical Projects and KOP Categories, construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing vegetation and encroachment into plant communities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, and temporary construction access routes. Construction activities under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in temporary indirect effects, such as dust, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion,

sedimentation, and pollutants, that could degrade riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Implementation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* may substantially increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities during operations, including trampling of native vegetation and increased introduction of invasive plant species from visitors straying off of designated trails. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-20a: Avoid Riparian and Sensitive Natural Communities.

Prior to construction, mapped riparian and sensitive natural communities will be delineated using ESA staking in the field and removal or disturbance of riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities will be avoided.

Mitigation Measure BIO-20b: Protect Against Tree Diseases, Pests, and Pathogens.

To protect sensitive natural communities and native trees, when deemed necessary by a qualified biologist or arborist, prior to tree removal, a certified arborist will evaluate trees for infectious tree diseases such as sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*), thousand canker fungus (*Geosmithia morbida*), polyphagous shot hole borer (*Euwallacea* spp.), and goldspotted oak borer (*Agilus auroguttatus*).

If a certified arborist determines that trees are affected by infectious pests or diseases, the arborist will prepare an Infectious Tree Disease Management Plan or develop a list of preventative measures to be implemented. A plan/list will provide measures relevant for each tree pest or disease observed. To avoid the spread of infectious tree pests and diseases, infected trees will not be transported from a project area without first being treated using best available management practices described in the Infectious Tree Disease Management Plan or list of preventative measures.

If possible, and as much as possible, all tree material, especially infected tree material, will be left on site (e.g., the material could be chipped for use as ground cover or mulch).

During all tree removal activities, pruning and power tools will be cleaned and disinfected prior to use to prevent introducing pathogens from known infested areas, and after use to prevent the spread of pathogens to new areas.

As outlined in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, if the proposed Project cannot avoid direct impacts on either riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, then Mitigation Measure BIO-20c will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-20c: Implement Riparian Mitigation and Restoration.

Prior to start of construction, the implementing agency will mitigate permanent impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities at a ratio the resource agencies determine, through payment into an agency-approved in-lieu fee mitigation program, applicant-sponsored mitigation site, or other approved mitigation method as determined during the project-specific environmental document or permitting phase. Onsite restoration of temporarily affected riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities will occur in-kind at their current locations on completion of construction and will consist of returning affected areas to original contour grades, decompacting the soil, and replanting with a plant palette composed of native species found onsite prior to disturbance.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 would avoid or reduce potential impacts on sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, nest sites) if present. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 would reduce or avoid potential construction related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measure BIO-20a requires that riparian and sensitive natural communities be mapped prior to construction. If the proposed Project cannot avoid direct impacts on either riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, then Mitigation Measure BIO-20c should be implemented to mitigate riparian habitats and sensitive communities.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (BIO-1, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) are adopted by the agency undertaking

the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(c): Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally or State-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could directly affect wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that have a potential to occur within Frames 1 and 7 through 9 through permanent and temporary construction activities, should they be present beyond the top of bank in the landside portion of the LA River ROW. Direct effects on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources could result during project construction, including grading, excavating, soil stockpiling, or other earth-disturbing activities. Permanent and temporary disturbances from construction activities could result in indirect impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources present in the area surrounding the project site. Indirect impacts could include the introduction of nonnative species, erosion, sedimentation, chemical spills, and alteration of downstream hydrological conditions.

Direct impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources are not anticipated as a result of Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project construction within Frames 2 through 6. Wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that have the potential to occur adjacent to or near the project footprint could potentially be affected indirectly by permanent and/or temporary disturbances from nearby construction activities on the top of bank and landside portion of the LA River ROW. Indirect impacts could include the introduction of nonnative species, erosion, sedimentation, chemical spills, and alteration of downstream hydrological conditions. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that are located beyond the top of bank and within the landside LA River ROW of Frames 1 through 9, as described above, could be affected by operations and maintenance activities. Maintenance of vegetation, including vegetation removal and trimming, could affect wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that

are located beyond the top of bank within the landside portion of the LA River ROW. Project operation will increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and jurisdictional aquatic resources during operations, including trampling or damaging of native vegetation from visitors and pets straying off of designated trails. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 could take place outside or within the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resources and, therefore, could result in potentially significant impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources. Construction could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include encroachment into, or removal of, wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, and temporary construction access routes. Temporary indirect effects from construction-related activities, such as dust, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion, sedimentation, and pollutants, could degrade any wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources.

Unlike the Typical Projects described above, implementation of KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 could include in-channel work and off-channel work. Should in-channel work take place in areas containing wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources—primarily Frames 1 and 6, where wetlands are present, but also in any frame where aquatic resources may be present—then permanent and/or temporary direct impacts could occur within the LA River channel, in addition to the wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring outside of the river channel. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the project area potentially could be affected by KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 1, 3, or 6 component. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 are expected to take place within the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resources or to connect to the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resource. Therefore, construction of KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 could result in potentially significant impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the study area could be affected by KOP Categories 2, 4, or 5 operations and maintenance activities, as KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 could take place within a jurisdictional aquatic resource, including wetlands, or potentially be connected to one, if it exists in the study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation

(Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and/or other jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the LA River frames. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources or activities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, temporary and permanent diversions, and temporary construction access routes. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Similar to the discussion for the Typical Projects and KOP categories above, operations activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could potentially impact wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the LA River frames. Maintenance of vegetation, including landscaping and vegetation removal and trimming, could reduce in size or disturb wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources that are located within or adjacent to the proposed Project. Indirect disturbances, such as dust and introduction of invasive species, could degrade wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is provided in full above under Impact 3.3(a).

Mitigation Measure BIO-21a: Conduct a Jurisdictional Delineation.

Prior to the start of project construction with aquatic resources present within or directly adjacent to the limits of disturbance, a formal jurisdictional delineation will be performed within the proposed project footprint and appropriate surrounding buffer to identify and map all wetlands and jurisdictional aquatic resources subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, SWRCB or RWQCB, CDFW, and, if the project footprint is within the Coastal Zone, the CCC or appropriate city or county. A desktop review and/or field review may be sufficient to determine if a formal delineation is needed.

As outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-21a, if any wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources are identified, then Mitigation Measure BIO-21b, c, d, or e will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-21b: Flag Wetland ESA.

If wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources are identified within the project footprint, but will not be affected by the project, then those resources must be clearly marked for avoidance using flagging, fencing, or other appropriate avoidance method prior to project implementation.

Mitigation Measure BIO-21c: Obtain Wetland Permits.

If wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources are identified within the project footprint and would be affected by construction of the project, the appropriate permits will be obtained from the USACE, SWRCB or RWQCB, CDFW, and/or the CCC, as required. The permittee will implement all measures and conditions included in those permits.

Mitigation Measure BIO-21d: Restore Temporary Wetland Impacts.

Immediately following completion of construction, temporary impacts on wetlands and jurisdictional aquatic resources will be restored to preconstruction elevation and conditions, or as specified by the aquatic resource permits.

Mitigation Measure BIO-21e: Implement Mitigation for Permanent Loss of Wetlands or Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources.

Prior to the start of construction, impacts that result in a permanent loss of jurisdictional aquatic resources within a concrete channel or bank will be mitigated as specified in the aquatic resource permits. Impacts that result in a permanent loss of jurisdictional aquatic resources within an earthen channel, bank, or associated riparian will be mitigated at a minimum 2:1 ratio, or as specified in the aquatic resource permits.

Mitigation Measure BIO-22a: Implement Permanent Wetlands Signage.

If wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources are identified within the project footprint or surrounding buffer, but will not be affected by the proposed Project, then those resources must be clearly marked with permanent signage to promote avoidance of the resource, including by the public and operations and maintenance staff.

Mitigation Measure BIO-22b: Obtain Wetland Permits for Operations.

If wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources are identified within the project footprint or surrounding buffer and would be affected by the proposed Project, then operations activities, including any recreational activities that could temporarily or permanently affect aquatic resources, will be included in the appropriate permits to be obtained from the USACE, SWRCB or RWQCB, CDFW, and/or the CCC, as required for construction. If operations activities are not covered by the appropriate permits issued for construction, separate permits will be obtained from the USACE, SWRCB or RWQCB, CDFW, and/or the CCC, as required. The permittee will implement all measures and conditions included in those permits.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-21a through BIO-21e would avoid or reduce impacts on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b would avoid or reduce impacts on wetlands during project operations.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential

later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (BIO-1, BIO-21a through BIO-21e, and BIO-22a through b) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(d): Would the proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

In addition to the Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas located within all frames, EFH also occurs in Frame 1 within marine and estuarine waters for finfish, coastal pelagic species, and groundfish, and the estuary habitat is considered an HAPC, which are high priority conservation areas due to their important and fragile ecosystem function (NOAA 2020c). Construction impacts are the same for all frames, with the exception that EFH and HAPCs are not present within Frames 3 through 9.

Construction of Typical Projects would occur directly adjacent to the riverbanks, between the top of bank and the fence line. Construction equipment use and storage, activities, and personnel may result in temporary and permanent impacts that could adversely affect habitat connectivity, species movement, and reproduction. Indirect construction impacts may include effects from noise, vibration, light, dust, human encroachment, chemical spills, or other construction-related indirect disturbances, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion, sedimentation, and pollutants. These impacts may also degrade habitats like riverine waters, wetlands, EFH, and HAPCs, or interfere with habitat availability, habitat connectivity, and species movement and behavior, all of which may disrupt or preclude the reproduction of fish and wildlife. All of these impacts could degrade habitats and interfere with or prohibit species movement and/or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any resources supporting the movement, migration, or reproduction of fish and/or wildlife species that are located within the LA River ROW of Frames 1 through 9 could be affected by Typical Projects operations and maintenance activities. The operation of Typical Projects could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery

and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. Such activities could result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction-related direct and indirect impacts on wildlife connectivity and nursery sites due to the construction of KOP Category 1 would be generally as described for the Typical Projects. The construction of KOP Category 1 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat removal, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. Such activities could result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Category 1 would be similar in scope and type as to the operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project and, therefore, would have similar impacts. Habitat corridors, planted vegetated buffers, and connections between large habitat blocks would provide beneficial effects for biological resources. Additionally, recreational use along the LA River may substantially increase due to implementation of KOP Category 1, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on habitats and species, such as trampling of vegetation, species disturbance, species habitat avoidance, and increased introduction of invasive plant species and pet droppings. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 will entail in-channel modifications and impacts and have potential to impact the same in-channel resources throughout Frames 1 through 9 in a similar way. The construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of habitats and nursery sites, imposed habitat fragmentation, and disruption and/or obstruction of connectivity as a result of construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 components, including pumps, diversion pipes/tunnels/channels, overflow weirs, underground galleries, side channels, and storm drain interceptors. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of some of the design components under KOP Category 2 could potentially have deleterious effects on fish and wildlife connectivity and reproduction, such as loss of habitat and

habitat access due to potentially obstructive check dams and deployable barriers, levees, armored channels/vertical walls, added concrete, and bridge pier modifications. Operation of some of the design components under KOP Categories 2 and 4 could potentially have deleterious effects for wildlife connectivity and reproduction, such as loss of habitat and habitat access due to potentially obstructive diversions. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 3 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of wildlife connectivity and nursery sites as a result of construction of KOP Category 3 components, including platforms, crossings, path ramps, structural walls, bridges, and cantilevers. Construction of KOP Category 3 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on habitats occurring within the study area, particularly on the aquatic and riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Wildlife connectivity and nursery sites occurring within the LA River potentially could be affected by KOP Category 3 operations and maintenance activities. The operation of KOP Category 3 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Category 5 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on habitats and connectivity areas occurring within the LA River, particularly on riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Wildlife connectivity and nursery sites occurring within the LA River potentially could be affected by KOP Category 5 operations and maintenance activities. Maintenance activities within and adjacent to KOP Category 5 components, including landscaping, vegetation removal and trimming, and human encroachment, could disturb and/or remove habitats. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 6 could result in potentially significant impacts on wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites associated with the permanent and temporary loss of habitats. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing habitat, encroachment into habitat, habitat fragmentation, and establishing barriers to wildlife movement. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any habitat or landscape features supporting wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites occurring within the study area potentially could be affected by KOP Category 6 operations and maintenance activities. The operation of KOP Category 6 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction activities under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in temporary indirect effects, such as noise, vibration, light, dust, human encroachment, introduction of invasive species, construction disturbances, equipment staging/storage, and temporary construction access routes, chemical spills or other construction-related indirect disturbances that may degrade habitats like riverine waters, wetlands, EFH and HAPCs, interfere with habitat availability, habitat connectivity, and species movement and behavior, and/or which may disrupt or preclude the reproduction of fish and wildlife. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* operations and maintenance activities could affect habitat or landscape features supporting wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites occurring within the study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-19 are provided in full above under Impact 3.3(a).

Mitigation Measure BIO-23: Maintain Connectivity in Subsequent Project Design, Construction, and Operation.

All subsequent projects will be planned in coordination with a qualified biologist with demonstrated expertise in wildlife connectivity and wildlife crossing design in order to ensure that all projects, during design, construction, operations, and maintenance, at a minimum maintain current existing ecological connectivity function and value and prevent unintended deleterious consequences to wildlife species, connectivity, and nursery sites. The qualified biologist will provide recommendations and design alternatives that can be implemented to avoid impacts on connectivity and nursery sites, prevent wildlife-human conflicts, and avoid other effects on connectivity and nursery site function and value. If project components are intended to have ecological function and/or maintain wildlife connectivity, then the qualified biologist will participate in their planning and design. The biologist will review all proposed temporary and permanent project elements—such as fencing, gates, and guardrails—for potential impacts on wildlife through trapping, entanglement, collisions, etc., and as potential barriers to connectivity and movement.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. Mitigation Measure BIO-9 would reduce or avoid potential construction related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measures BIO-10 and BIO-11 would be implemented if there is potential for special-status wildlife, including special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians, that could become entrapped in construction materials or excavations. If special-status birds (or those protected by the MBTA and CFGC) and special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians have the potential to occur then Mitigation Measures BIO-12 and BIO-13 would be implemented. If special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles could occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-14 would be implemented to avoid or reduce construction related impacts. Mitigation Measures BIO-15 through BIO-17 would avoid or minimize direct and indirect impacts on invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and raptors. Mitigation Measure BIO-18 would avoid the spread of invasive species and encourage the use of native plant species. Lastly, for where opportunities for habitat reclamation efforts exist, Mitigation Measure BIO-19 would be implemented to ensure restoration BMPs are used. Lastly, Mitigation Measure BIO-23 ensures that all projects, during design, construction, operations, and maintenance, at a minimum maintain current existing ecological connectivity function and value and prevent unintended deleterious consequences to wildlife species, connectivity, and nursery sites.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-19 and BIO-23) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(e): Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions. The construction and operations could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological

resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-24) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Categories 1 through 6 could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions. The construction and operations of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could be expected to have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-24) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions as a result of tree trimming and/or tree removal. Construction and operations impacts under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be the same as those identified for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6. Construction and operations under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could be expected to have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-24: Implement Avoidance, Transplantation, and Compensatory Mitigation Measures for Protected Trees.

During the conceptual design of each individual subsequent project, all applicable local policies and ordinances, including tree preservation policies, will be followed, and protected trees will be avoided where possible.

If protected trees have been identified and their removal cannot be avoided, then prior to ground-disturbing activities, where local tree policies exist and trees are present in the work area, a qualified biologist or arborist will conduct surveys in the work area to identify protected trees.

The biologist or arborist will establish ESAs around protected trees that have the potential to be affected by construction activities, but do not require removal. ESAs will be based on local government ordinances, policies, and regulations.

Compensatory mitigation for impacts on protected trees will be required, including impacts associated with removing or trimming a protected tree, based on requirements set out in applicable local government ordinances, policies, and regulations. Compensatory mitigation based on these local ordinances, policies, and regulations may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Transplantation of protected trees to areas outside of the work area

- Replacement of protected trees onsite or offsite, based on the number of protected trees affected, at a ratio required by local government ordinances or regulations

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. Mitigation Measure BIO-24 requires that where tree removals cannot be avoided, then compensatory mitigation must be provided for protected trees.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on biological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on biological resources for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if this mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure BIO-24) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

7.4 Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

Impact 3.6(a): Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- **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?**
- **Strong seismic ground shaking?**
- **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
- **Landslides?**

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The LA River is in a seismically active area due to the various active and potentially active faults in the region. Consequently, it is possible that the Typical Projects could be affected by strong ground shaking. In addition to being subject to strong seismic shaking, fault zone and landslide prone areas exist along the LA River. If the Typical Projects are to be constructed within fault zones, they would be subject to fault zone regulations, wherein, prior to a new project being permitted in a fault zone, cities and counties require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed structures will not be constructed on active faults. If any Typical Projects are to be constructed within a liquefaction zone, they could be subject to liquefaction zone mitigation recommendations.

Unlike Frames 1 through 4 (see Section 3.6.3 of the Draft PEIR), portions of Frames 5 through 9 are also in areas designated as landslide hazard areas (these are areas with variation in topography adjacent to the Santa Monica Mountains). Although construction of the Typical Projects would adhere to the prevailing building codes and relevant regulations and permits, which would help minimize risk from seismic activity, and would be subject to fault zone, liquefaction, and landslide hazard regulations if constructed in these zones, there is still potential for substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic shaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, and landslides.

Implementation of the Typical Projects would attract visitors to the study area (the Common Elements Typical Project would attract up to 500 visitors and the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would attract up to 1,000 visitors); as such, visitors could be exposed to strong seismic shaking, fault rupture, and secondary seismic phenomena such as liquefaction and landslides. There could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exists throughout the project footprint, in the case of strong seismic shaking, and in areas that exhibit specific conditions conducive of other seismic hazards (such as fault, liquefactions, and landslide zones). Thus, for both construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6, there could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exists throughout the footprint, in the case of strong seismic shaking, and in areas that exhibit specific conditions conducive of other seismic hazards (such as fault, liquefactions, and landslide zones). There could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed

mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing² Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities.

Prior to final design of subsequent projects that would feature load-bearing structures (e.g., Tier III pavilions), the implementing agency will ensure that a licensed geologist and engineer will prepare a design-level geotechnical investigation prior to construction.

The investigation will include subsurface soil sampling, laboratory analysis of samples collected to determine soil characteristics and properties (including identifying and defining the limits of unstable, compressible, and collapsible soils), and an evaluation of the laboratory testing. Recommendations based on the results will be used in the design specifications for the proposed subsequent projects. The report will include recommendations to avoid potential risks associated with seismic hazards (including ground shaking and fault rupture, seismically induced landslides, liquefaction, and the other seismic effects described in this section), in accordance with the specifications of CGS's Special Publication 117A, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*, and the requirements of the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. The geotechnical study will provide detailed project-specific recommendations for design and construction, and implementation of those recommendations will be required during construction of relevant projects. Mitigation to address potential fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards can include (but are not limited to) the following:

- **Fault rupture:** Studies will evaluate the location and relative activity of potentially active fault splays at the project site and the feasibility of locating future site improvements will be conducted by geologic consultants as part of the geotechnical study. Fault investigations will be conducted by a California State Certified Engineering Geologist and submitted to CGS. Appropriate building setback zones will be established in locations deemed not feasible for construction of occupied structures.
- **Seismic ground shaking:** Structural elements of subsequent projects will be designed to resist or accommodate appropriate site-specific ground motions and conform to current seismic design standards, including those set forth by prevailing building codes.
- **Liquefaction/ground failure:** Assessment of liquefaction potential at subsequent project sites will be conducted as part of the geotechnical study. Structural design will be developed to reduce the potential impacts of liquefaction, including the incorporation of techniques such as structural design, in-situ ground modification, or supporting foundations with piles at depths designed specifically for seismically induced settlement.

² Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

- **Landslides:** Where applicable, assessment for landslide potential and/or potential for surficial failure will be performed as part of the geotechnical study with measures to be incorporated into the design, as appropriate. Mitigation measures in areas subject to a landslide hazard could include the following measures: excavation of potentially unstable material for a more stable slope configuration; reduction of landslide-driving forces by removal of earth materials at the top of the landslide; construction of a buttress and/or stabilization fills; construction of retaining walls installation of rock bolts on a slope face, and/or installation of protective wire mesh on a slope face; construction of debris impact walls at the toe of the slope to contain rock fall debris, or other such measures.

The following measures could be recommended in the site-specific geotechnical study to mitigate the potential effects of unstable and/or expansive soils:

- **Groundwater:** Excavations for improvements in areas with shallow perched groundwater may need to be cased, shored, and/or dewatered to maintain stability of the excavations and adjacent improvements and provide access for construction.
- **Collapsible soils/settlement:** Assessment of soil settlement will be performed as part of the geotechnical study and techniques will be recommended, as appropriate, to reduce impacts related to settlement. Assessment of settlement potential of onsite natural soils and undocumented fill will include drilling of exploratory borings or test pits and laboratory testing of soils. Possible mitigation measures for soils with the potential for settlement could include removal of the compressible/collapsible soil layers and replacement with compacted fill, surcharging to induce settlement prior to construction of improvements, allowing for a settlement period after or during construction of new fills, and utilization of specialized foundation design, including the use of deep foundation systems, to support structures. Various in-situ soil improvement techniques are also available, such as dynamic compaction (i.e., heavy tamping) or compaction grouting.
- **Expansive soils:** Assessment of the potential for expansive soils will be performed as part of the geotechnical study, and mitigation techniques, such as over-excavation and replacement with non-expansive soils, soil treatment, moisture management, and/or specific structural design for expansive soil conditions, will be developed, as appropriate.

The implementing agency will apply the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical study to minimize risks related to potential fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides.

Finding: Less-than-significant with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to geologic resources for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards during construction and operation. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquification hazards.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquification hazards, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquification hazards for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned

mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(c): Would the proposed Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Urban Land typically consists of soils in areas of high population density in the largely built environment (which is the most common description of the land surrounding the LA River). These soils can be significantly changed human-transported materials, human-altered materials, or minimally altered or intact "native" soils. Due to the lack of site-specific details, there remains a potential for presence of potentially unstable soils in the project study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exist throughout the project footprint, including areas that exhibit specific conditions potentially subject to seismic hazards such as liquefaction and seismically induced landsliding. In addition, the majority of soil components surrounding the LA River are classified as Urban Land by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. These soils can be significantly changed human-transported materials, human-altered materials, or minimally altered or intact "native" soils. Soils in urban areas can exhibit a wide variety of conditions and properties, increasing the potential for soil instability. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce construction and operation impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, all projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would require evaluation if constructed

in State-designated geologic hazard areas and fault zones. Additionally, all *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects would adhere to all building code and permitting requirements, including geotechnical evaluations where appropriate. Although complying with building code and permitting requirements would assist in mitigating potential impacts from unstable soils, the potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse still exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing³ Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, and construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse during construction of the Typical Projects and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, and construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential unstable soils, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse during construction. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

³ Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse during construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(d): Would the proposed Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Soil components along and adjacent to the LA River are composed primarily of soils classified as Urban Land and can exhibit a wide variety of conditions and properties, including expansive potential. Urban soils could contain fine-grained soils (silts and clays), which contain variable amounts of expansive minerals—that is, soils that expand when they get wet and shrink as they dry out. Upward pressure can increase when these expansive soils swell, which may result in detrimental effects on structures and surface improvements if not properly mitigated. Due to the presence of expansive soils in the project study area, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Categories 1 through 6 constructed as part of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would adhere to all current building codes and required permitting requirements. As projects would be implemented following proper engineering methods and building code requirements, it is expected that none of the activities associated with the construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 would cause or exacerbate expansive characteristics in soils. Nevertheless, due to the presence of expansive soils in the study area, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, all projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would adhere to all building code and permitting requirements, along with implementing recommendations from site-specific geotechnical studies, when deemed necessary. Complying with building code and permitting requirements would partially address potential impacts from expansive soils; however, a potentially significant impact could still occur. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing⁴ Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to expansive soils, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to expansive soils during construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential unstable soils, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse during construction. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects from expansive soils.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to expansive soils, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

⁴ Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to expansive soils for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(f): Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Thirty-two previously recorded and as-yet-unrecorded paleontological localities have been identified in seven of the nine frames of the study area. All nine frames contain deposits considered sensitive for containing significant unrecorded paleontological vertebrate fossils. Construction of the Typical Projects could destroy, remove, disturb, and alter surface-exposed and buried paleontological resources, resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource.

However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation activities related to the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could include new single-story structures, such as pavilions, cafés, or restrooms, or lower-profile infrastructure, such as multi-use trails, signs, lighting, benches, and other associated recreational facilities, which may introduce activities that could directly affect significant paleontological resources. Operation elements, such as potentially increased erosion, even though not substantial, along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas could result from increased public use. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users to new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near an area with exposed deposits that are sensitive for significant paleontological resources could directly affect any undiscovered resources through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance and increased public use. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOP categories would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in an adverse effect on significant paleontological resources. Impacts may be direct, through proposed ground disturbance, which could destroy, remove, disturb, or alter surface-exposed and buried paleontological resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of the KOP categories could result in significant impacts on sensitive geologic deposits with the potential for containing undiscovered significant paleontological resources; these impacts would result from increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas from increased public use and increased potential for disturbance. Such activities could result in the exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of previously unrecorded significant paleontological resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

It is possible that construction activities of the 107 projects in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in an adverse change to a significant paleontological resource, resulting in a significant impact. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operations impacts of the 107 projects in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to those of the KOP categories, which could result in significant impacts on sensitive geologic deposits with the potential for containing undiscovered significant paleontological resources, including increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas from increased public use and increased potential for removal and disturbance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Conduct Paleontological Resources Investigations.

During design of individual subsequent projects and prior to construction, the implementing agency will conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with SVP Guidelines. This process will include:

- Conducting a paleontological records search through the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum to identify previously recorded paleontological localities and the presence of sensitive deposits in the proposed project study area
- Reviewing project design and maximum depths and extents of project ground disturbance components
- Reviewing publicly available geotechnical reports for information concerning subsurface deposits and deposit depths across the project area
- Identifying the potential for sensitive paleontological deposits underlying the proposed Project that project implementation could affect
- Determining whether impacts on sensitive deposits, if present, would be significant

If no sensitive deposits are identified or if they are sufficiently deeper than the proposed Project excavations and would not be encountered during construction, no further steps will be required.

If sensitive deposits are identified during implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 and could be affected by the proposed Project, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Avoid Paleontological Resources or Conduct Monitoring.

The implementing agency will redesign the subsequent project to avoid sensitive paleontological resources and deposits that could potentially contain these resources. If avoidance and/or project redesign is not feasible, then paleontological monitoring will be implemented and will include the following implementation steps:

- The implementing agency will retain a qualified paleontologist, who will attend the preconstruction meeting(s) to consult with the grading and excavation contractors or subcontractors concerning excavation schedules, paleontological field techniques, and safety issues. A *qualified paleontologist* is defined as an individual (1) who has an MS or PhD in paleontology or geology; (2) who also has demonstrated familiarity with paleontological procedures and techniques; (3) who is knowledgeable in the geology and paleontology of the County; and (4) who has worked as a paleontological mitigation project supervisor in the County for at least 1 year.
- A paleontological monitor or a qualified paleontologist will be on site on a full-time basis during excavation and ground-disturbing activities that occur in any undisturbed deposits below ground surface, to inspect exposures for contained fossils. The paleontological monitor will work under the direction of the proposed Project's qualified paleontologist. A

paleontological monitor is defined as an individual selected by the qualified paleontologist who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials.

- If fossils are discovered on a development site, the qualified paleontologist will recover them and temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains.
- The qualified paleontologist will be responsible for the cleaning, repairing, sorting, and cataloguing of fossil remains collected during the monitoring and salvage portion of the mitigation program.
- Prepared fossils, along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photos, and maps, will be deposited (as a donation) at a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections, such as the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum. Donation of the fossils will be accompanied by financial support for initial specimen storage, paid for by the project proponent.
- Within 30 days after the completion of excavation and ground-disturbing activities, the qualified paleontologist will prepare and submit to the implementing agency a paleontological resource recovery report that documents the results of the mitigation program. This report will include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphic section(s) exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils.

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: Avoid/Minimize Impacts on Paleontological Resources During Operations.

If significant paleontological resources and sensitive deposits with the potential to contain significant paleontological resources are identified within a project area during design/planning of individual projects (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3), and deposits that are sensitive for significant paleontological resources remain exposed at or near the ground surface or become exposed during project operations, then an avoidance and minimization plan will be prepared to avoid/minimize potential impacts during operations. This plan may include, but not be limited to:

- Securing sensitive deposits from accessibility through the development of Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Preparing an operations and maintenance plan to minimize degradation and exposure of sensitive deposits
- Designing and developing interpretive exhibits to provide education and understanding of the importance of avoiding and protecting sensitive deposits and paleontological resources

If significant impacts on a newly exposed or existing significant paleontological resource cannot be avoided, then Mitigation Measure GEO-3 will to be required and implemented.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring Mitigation Measure GEO-2, which will require implementing agencies to conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) Guidelines and to identify and determine potential sensitive paleontological resources. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on unique paleontological resources and unique geologic features. Mitigation Measure GEO-3 requires that implementing agencies either redesign the subsequent project to avoid sensitive paleontological resources or provide paleontological monitoring. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GEO-4 requires that an avoidance and minimization plan be prepared to avoid/minimize potential impacts on paleontological resources during operations.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's paleontological impacts.

7.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 3.7(a): Would the proposed Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Significant Effect

Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. In accordance with SCAQMD guidance, the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project's construction emissions are amortized over a 30-year period, and the resulting annual emissions are combined with the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project's annual operational GHG emissions. As such, the annual construction GHG emissions associated with the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would decrease with time and are likely to be lower than assumed herein.

While emissions from the land use and mobile sector would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, emissions from the area, water, and waste sectors would be potentially inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and applicable regulatory programs.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1b, the Design Guidelines related to water and waste would be required for all new construction. Mitigation would also require electrified landscaping equipment. Consequently, emissions from the area, land use, water, mobile, and waste sectors would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan. Therefore, construction and operation emissions associated with the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would be less than significant with mitigation for later activities when carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Implement Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies Specific to Emission Sources of Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways.

Implementing agencies will require implementation of the following GHG emissions reduction strategies:

- **Area**
 - **Electric Landscaping Equipment.** Maintenance and operations activities that use landscaping equipment (e.g., lawn mowers, trimmers) for new construction will employ electric landscaping equipment.
- **Water Use**
 - **Water Conservation and Efficiency.** New construction will implement one or more of the Design Guidelines related to indoor and outdoor water conservation and efficiency.
 - Install systems for on-site water retention, detention, and filtration.
 - Capture 100 percent of on-site rainfall for the 85 percent rain event.
 - Reuse rainwater and greywater.
 - Install low-flow water fixtures that exceed the requirements of codes and ordinances:
 - Rotating sprinkler nozzles for landscape irrigation 0.5 to 1.0 gallons per minute, or
 - Drip/subsurface irrigation (i.e., micro-irrigation)
- **Wastewater Generation**
 - **Waste Reductions.** New construction will implement one or more of the Design Guidelines related to minimization and recycling of waste generation.
 - Use locally sourced, recycled, and recyclable materials with low-embodied energy.
 - Recycle construction waste.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on GHG, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHG due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure GHG-1b will implement operations GHG emission reduction strategies specific to emission sources of multi-use trails and access gateways. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on GHG.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on GHG, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHG due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if this mitigation (Mitigation Measure GHG-1b) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG emissions impacts.

Impact 3.7(b): Would the proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

For all planning frames, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, Senate Bill (SB) 375, the 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and other State regulations (e.g., low carbon fuel standard [LCFS], Title 24 standards, Short-Lived Climate Pollutants [SLCP] Reduction Strategy). For future development of the Common Elements Typical Project within the City of Long Beach in either Frame 1 or 2, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the City of Long Beach Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). For future development in the City of Carson in Frame 2, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the City of Carson Climate Action Plan (CAP). For future development in the City of Burbank in Frame 7, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the *Burbank2035 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan* GGRP.

However, for all planning frames, the Common Elements Typical Project would be potentially inconsistent with the 2008 Scoping Plan and First Update, SB 32, EO S-3-05, 2020 CCAP, Los Angeles County CAP, and the County Sustainability Plan. While the County would encourage implementation of the Design Guidelines, there is no guarantee that all of these measures will be incorporated into the design of the Common Elements Typical Project by project proponents in subsequent projects, given that they are not required. Furthermore, the 2020 CCAP measure LUT-12 and Los Angeles County CAP measure T29 related to electrified landscaping and construction equipment are not addressed by the Design Guidelines best practices for the proposed Project. Therefore, construction and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project would potentially conflict with or obstruct

implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and would therefore result in a potentially significant impact.

The Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project also includes these emission sources, excluding energy. Given the similarity between the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project and the Common Elements Typical Project in terms of the types of emission sources associated with operation (e.g., construction, water, waste), GHG impacts from the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would be similar to those of the Common Elements Typical Project described above. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and GHG-2) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies.

Implementing agencies will require implementation of the following GHG emissions reduction strategies:

- **Energy**
 - **Energy-efficient Appliances in Buildings.** New construction will use only ENERGY STAR rated appliances for appliance types that are offered ENERGY STAR ratings.
 - **Electric Space and Water Heating for Buildings.** New construction will employ electric and water heating. Where natural gas appliances need to be installed, these appliances will be an ENERGY STAR certified gas water heater) or be powered by renewable natural gas.
 - **Building Energy.** New construction will implement one or more of the Design Guidelines related to building energy consumption.
 - Use renewable energy sources (solar, wind, water, and renewable natural gas).
 - Optimize building orientation for solar exposure, diffused daylight, and passive ventilation.
 - Optimize high thermal performance.
 - Use high-albedo roof and paving materials to mitigate heat gain.
 - Use green roof and pervious paving.
 - Implement building energy best practices from the following standards: United States Green Building Council's LEED, United States Department of Energy Better Buildings Initiative, ENERGY STAR, Dark Sky, Cradle-to-Cradle, and Green Globes.
- **Area**
 - **Electric Landscaping Equipment.** Maintenance and operations activities that use landscaping equipment (e.g., lawn mowers, trimmers) for new construction will employ electric landscaping equipment.

- **Water Use**
 - **Water Conservation and Efficiency.** New construction will implement one or more of the Design Guidelines related to indoor and outdoor water conservation and efficiency.
 - Install systems for on-site water retention, detention, and filtration.
 - Capture 100 percent of on-site rainfall for the 85 percent rain event.
 - Reuse rainwater and greywater.
 - Create bioswales or treatment basins to collect stormwater runoff.
 - Install low-flow water fixtures that exceed the requirements of codes and ordinances.
 - Public bathroom faucet aerators with a flow rate of 0.4 gallon per minute
 - Rotating sprinkler nozzles for landscape irrigation 0.5 to 1.0 gallons per minute, or
 - Drip/subsurface irrigation (i.e., micro-irrigation)
- **Wastewater Generation**
 - **Waste Reductions.** New construction will implement one or more of the Design Guidelines related to minimization and recycling of waste generation.
 - Use locally sourced, recycled, and recyclable materials with low-embodied energy.
 - Use green cleaning products and integrated building management.
 - Regularly monitor building systems and optimize usage.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Implement Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies Specific to Emission Sources of Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies.

Implementing agencies will require applicants of future development to implement the following GHG emissions-reduction strategies where feasible.

- Zero-emission and near-zero-emission construction equipment will be used, to the extent feasible.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on GHG, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHG due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and GHG-2. Mitigation Measure GHG-1a will require implementing agencies to implement GHG emission strategies to reduce GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure GHG-1b will implement operations GHG emission reduction strategies specific to emission sources of multi-use trails and access gateways. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GHG-2 will minimize waste by encouraging waste reductions. These mitigation measures will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on GHG.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on GHG, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHG due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and GHG-2) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control

of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG emissions impacts.

7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 3.8(b): Would the proposed Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities have the potential to expose construction personnel, the public, and/or the environment to contaminated media and/or hazardous building materials. However, prior to construction, any activities involving ground disturbance will require the implementing agency to retain a professional hazardous materials specialist specializing in hazardous materials impact assessment to conduct a project-level analysis to verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials conditions (including Cortese List sites) in the vicinity of the construction site and determine if there is potential for existing hazardous materials conditions to affect construction activities.

The type and extent of the contamination will dictate the appropriate response and remediation for the site and the agencies to be notified. Although these regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from the construction of the Typical Projects could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

The specific location and design for KOP Categories 1 through 6 have not yet been determined and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Potential impacts from construction of the design components under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. KOP categories would likely be larger than Typical Projects. As with the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects, contaminated sites associated with KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be remediated/addressed in coordination with and under oversight of the applicable oversight federal, State, and/or local agency (e.g., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], State Water Resources Control Board [SWRCB], Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC], or local

environmental health or fire department). Although these regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from the construction of KOPs could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved. As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, although regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from construction under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures.

To avoid exposure of construction personnel, the public, or the environment to contaminated media and/or hazardous building materials, prior to construction activities associated with any subsequent project involving ground disturbance, the implementing agency will be required to retain a professional hazardous materials specialist specializing in hazardous materials impact assessment to conduct a project-level analysis to verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials conditions (including Cortese List sites) in the vicinity of the construction site and if there is potential for existing hazardous materials conditions to affect construction activities.

This assessment will consist of a search for environment-related information present in publicly accessible databases. The information will be reviewed to determine if the construction footprint or adjacent properties are listed in the aforementioned databases.

If the construction footprint or adjacent properties are listed in the databases, the professional hazardous materials specialist will determine the potential risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment from construction activities (to be documented in a technical memo). The determination of risk would consider, among other factors, regulatory status, the type of project, type of contaminated property, distance and direction to the project, and appropriate measures. If the hazardous materials specialist concludes that the subsequent project would not 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, then no further action would be required.

If a site is considered a risk to construction workers, the public, or the environment, implementing agency will implement measures to reduce risk, including one or more of the following:

- Implement engineering controls and best management practices (BMPs) during construction to minimize human exposure to potentially contaminated soils during construction. Engineering controls and construction BMPs could include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Contractor employees working on site handling potentially contaminated media will be certified in the Occupational Health and Safety Administration's 40-hour Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response training.
 - Contractors will water or mist soil as it is being excavated and stockpiled or loaded onto transportation trucks.
 - Contractors will place any stockpiled soil in areas shielded from prevailing winds or cover stockpiles with staked and/or anchored sheeting.
- Conduct a soil and/or groundwater sampling program to determine the type and extent of contaminants. The sampling program could include:
 - A scope of work for preparation of a health and safety plan that specifies pre-field activity marking of boring locations and obtaining utility clearance, and field activities, such as identifying appropriate sampling procedures, health and safety measures, chemical testing methods, and quality assurance/quality control procedures
 - Necessary permits for well installation and/or boring advancement
 - A soil sampling and analysis plan in accordance with the scope of work
 - Laboratory analyses conducted by a State-certified laboratory
 - Disposal processes, including transport by a State-certified hazardous material hauler to a State-certified disposal or recycling facility licensed to accept and treat hazardous waste
- Implement a soil management plan. The purpose of a soil management plan is to provide administrative, procedural, and analytical guidance to expedite and clarify decisions and actions if contaminated soils are encountered. Typically, procedures and protocols are included to ensure that contaminated soil is excavated properly and efficiently, and that unacceptable risks are not posed to human health or the environment from contaminated soils. Additionally, the soil management plan would contain procedures for handling, stockpiling, screening, and disposing of the excavated soil. The soil management plan is a site-specific technical plan that could be required depending on other screening activities conducted (listed above) and is not included as part of this EIR.
- If dewatering would be necessary in areas where contaminated groundwater exists, then dewatering procedures could be subject to permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Discharges of treated or untreated groundwater generated from dewatering operations or other applicable wastewater discharges not specifically covered in other general or individual NPDES permits are currently regulated under a regional general permit, General Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of

Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-095, NPDES No. CAG994004)

- Conduct an asbestos and lead-based paint survey for any structures built prior to 1980 (the use of asbestos in buildings and structures was common prior to 1980) and planned for demolition as part of subsequent projects. An asbestos survey would be conducted in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (Rule 1403), Cal OSHA (CCR, Title 8, Section 1529), and the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Asbestos Surveys (40 CFR Part 61, Subpart M). CCR, Title 8, Section 1532.1, "Lead," and Cal OSHA requirements should be followed when handling materials containing lead.

With the implementation of the above measures and coordination with the appropriate oversight agency (as necessary), the potential upset and accident conditions associated with construction activities would be reduced.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which requires project-level hazardous materials sites assessment for construction of subsequent projects. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from hazards and hazardous waste.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(c): Would the proposed Project emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

There are several schools throughout the project study area, including school sites in every frame. Construction activities associated with the Typical Projects would involve routine handling of hazardous materials such as solvents, paints, oils, and grease and materials that are typical for construction projects. Consequently, there is potential that these materials would be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. As Typical Projects can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a hazardous materials site. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Additionally, structures built prior to 1980 to be demolished as part of the Typical Projects could contain hazardous building materials. Consequently, affected media or hazardous building materials could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

As with the Typical Projects, there are several schools throughout the project study area. Consequently, there is potential that materials used in construction—such as solvents, paints, oils, and grease and materials that are typical for construction projects—would be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Consequently, the affected media potentially could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, there are several schools throughout the project study area. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Consequently, the affected media potentially could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which requires project-level hazardous materials sites assessment for construction of subsequent projects. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from hazards and hazardous waste.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(d): Would the proposed Project 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?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

As the Typical Projects can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a site that is on the Cortese List, Government Code Section 65962.5. If this the case, it is possible that excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Although the smaller footprint projects (e.g., access stairs, ramps, benches, hygiene facilities, restrooms, trash and recycling, drinking fountains) would not require as much media disturbance and would present a smaller risk of exposure to contaminated media, the potential for any of the Typical Projects to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation

Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

As with the Typical Projects, hazardous materials sites, including leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites (which meet Cortese List requirements), exist within the project study area in all cities and frames. As KOP categories can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a site that is on the Cortese List, Government Code Section 65962.5. If this the case, it is possible that excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil, and the potential for any of the KOPs to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, hazardous materials sites, including LUST sites (which meet Cortese List requirements), exist within the project study area in all cities and frames. It is possible that potential excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil, and the potential for projects under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which requires project-level hazardous materials sites assessment for construction of subsequent projects. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from hazards and hazardous waste.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is

feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(g): Would the proposed Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Frames 5 through 9 are within Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) (Frame 5) and High Fire Hazard areas (Frames 6 through 9). When conducted at sites within a VHFHSZ, construction activities would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk. Heat or sparks from construction equipment or vehicles, as well as the use of flammable materials, have the potential to ignite adjacent vegetation. Construction activities could introduce new potential ignition sources in the form of building materials (e.g., wood), vegetation for landscaping, and other materials for construction that are considered flammable. Subsequent projects within High Fire Hazard zones in Frames 5 through 9 would be subject to applicable city and County building codes, but the potential to exacerbate wildfire risks exists during operations activities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The six KOP categories include a variety of construction activities that could occur anywhere in the study area. Therefore, subsequent projects under the KOP categories could be located in a VHFHSZ (in Frames 5 through 9).

Subsequent projects under the six KOP categories within High Fire Hazard zones would be subject to applicable city or County building codes, but impacts would be potentially significant if located in or near areas designated as VHFHSZ. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, none of the projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are expected to result in a significant risk of exposure to wildfires, but, impacts would be potentially significant if they are located in or near areas designated as VHFHSZ. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 8.12, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3, which require that a Construction Fire Protection Plan and a Fire Protection Plan be prepared.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous waste due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Finding (Not carried out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

7.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 3.9(c): Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site; 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; or impede or redirect flood flows?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction—Frames 5 through 9

Construction impacts related to substantially altering the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in erosion or flooding or contributing runoff that would exceed the capacity of drainage systems would be similar to the impacts described above under Frames 1 through 4.

Several reaches in the LA River in Frames 5 through 9 do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity (Geosyntec and Olin 2018). As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff that may occur due to construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in these frames could exceed the system capacity. Thus, during construction, the proposed Project could create or contribute surface water runoff in Frames 5 through 9 that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

With implementation of the NPDES Construction General Permit, and Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b, project construction would not result in an exceedance of drainage system capacities because it would not impede or redirect flood flows and would minimize exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

Operation—Frames 5 through 9

Operation of the Common Elements Typical Project in Frames 5 through 9 would not result in substantial erosion or increased surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site, or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. However, due to existing flood capacity deficiencies, the Common Elements Typical Project could contribute runoff water that would exceed the existing or planned drainage system, provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows.

There are several regions within Frames 6 and 7 along the river that are hydraulically unstable, which may result in large and unstable surface waves. Effects of these waves are often alleviated by increasing channel and levee height to contain the waves and/or constructing channel side-slopes with rough cobble material to reduce wave run-up. River reaches throughout Frames 5 through 9 also have capacity constraints for the 1 percent storm event (100-year) flood, and could exceed the capacity of the channel in a large storm event.

During operation, the Common Elements Typical Project and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project could create or contribute surface water runoff in Frames 5 through 9 that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Stormwater drainage patterns could be temporarily altered during construction. In addition, several reaches in the LA River do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity. As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. In a large

storm event, flows could exceed the system capacity. Thus, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with creating or contributing water that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

Until strategies to reduce flood risks are implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could create or contribute stormwater flows that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff could exceed the drainage system capacity. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Existing flood conveyance deficiencies would continue similar to existing conditions. Until strategies to reduce flood risks are implemented, construction of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could create or contribute stormwater flows that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

Operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* must occur within the constraints of managing flood risk. However, several reaches in the LA River channel do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity. As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff could exceed the system capacity. Thus, operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could create or contribute stormwater flows that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Require Site-Specific Drainage Studies to Address Stormwater Management.

As part of site design for all new developments, the applicants will prepare Drainage Report(s) for the appropriate implementing agency review and approval prior to issuance of a grading, building, site development, or any construction permits. All development, including interim conditions during construction and interim conditions with temporary improvements, within the project site is required to address stormwater management and implement stormwater control measures. Drainage report(s) will include, at a minimum, all of the following:

- Verification of existing stormwater and flood conveyance facilities, including size, elevation, material, capacity, and condition, including the existing stormwater collection system in the project area.
- Hydrologic analysis of construction-period conditions and implementation of all temporary facilities necessary during construction to avoid increases in peak flows.
- Hydrologic analysis of existing and proposed operational peak flows that accounts for all areas that will be disturbed by new development.
- Hydraulic analysis for evaluating pipe capacity and sizing of new pipes. The capacity of existing pipes that are proposed for reuse and new pipes will be sized in accordance with

the County's methodology, as noted in the County Hydrology Manual or local municipal code, or otherwise approved by the County or City Engineer.

- Applicants will implement all permanent facilities necessary. such as channel refurbishment and a bypass tunnel, as included in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to avoid increases in operational peak flows.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b: Require Stormwater Control Measures.

Based on the results of the drainage report(s) in Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a, measures during construction and operation may be required to ensure flood flows are not impeded and to minimize redirected flood flows. The measures will identify site-specific drainage facilities necessary to avoid flows exceeding the existing system during construction and implement the necessary flood-reduction strategies and capacity improvements. Performance standards for stormwater control measures will be based on the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Stormwater Best Management Practice Design and Maintenance Manual, California Stormwater Quality Association's BMP handbooks, and other similar guidance documents. Specific measures include:

- If an extreme storm event is anticipated, then temporary stormwater control measures will be implemented to avoid increases in peak flows. Stormwater control measures include but are not limited to interim onsite detention facilities, capture and reuse measures, and/or other measures approved by the County, designed to maintain or reduce current, pre-development, surface runoff, and stormwater discharge to the public storm drain system.
- Necessary flood-reduction strategies and capacity improvements will be implemented.

A qualified hydrologist or equally qualified specialist will conduct a final review and approval of performance standards for stormwater control measures to ensure that impacts on stormwater are avoided or reduced.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on hydrology and water quality, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on hydrology and water quality for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b would require site-specific drainage studies and stormwater control measures for construction and operations of the Common Elements Typical Project; Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project; KOP Categories 1 through 6, Frames 5 through 9; and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on hydrology or water quality.

References

Section 3.9.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hydrology and water quality impacts.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on hydrology and water quality, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on public services for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later

activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.9.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hydrology and water quality impacts.

7.8 Land Use and Planning

Impact 3.10(a): Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Category 6 could occur within established neighborhoods considering they would be located off-channel and occur outside of the ROW. As the location and extent of subsequent projects that could operate under KOP Category 6 are unknown, in the absence of specific details (e.g., type of project, detailed design, location, size), it cannot be stated with certainty whether there would be physical division of an established community. Permanent road closures or other barriers such as walls could physically divide a community if alternative connectivity is not provided. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-2 and LU-3) would reduce operational impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

All of the projects envisioned in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would improve connectivity across the river, providing gateways and additional recreational uses and trails. Many of the projects include bridges and overcrossings that would connect both sides of the river. These projects would reduce the effects of the physical barrier the LA River presents and would not further divide an established community; rather, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact with the exception of projects under KOP Category 6. Depending on the size and extent of projects under KOP Category 6, there could be a significant impact with respect to division of an established community without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-2 and LU-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation.

During the site selection process, the implementing agency will consult with the applicable municipality to determine whether the site is suitable for the proposed development and whether the project would physically divide an established community. This will be determined through aerial or site reconnaissance and comparison with the jurisdiction's planned and existing land uses in the project area, which will then be confirmed, in writing, by the applicable jurisdiction. If it is determined that a significant impact could result, the implementing agency will take one or more of the following actions:

- Select an alternate site that is more appropriate for the proposed use and not likely to result in a significant impact.
- Revise the project features to avoid the impact.

Mitigation Measure LU-3: Alternative Connectivity.

During the subsequent project design process, determination will be made whether the project design would result in a physical barrier to the community in the form of road closures, walls, or other project features that could disrupt connectivity within the community. If it is determined that physical barriers would result, the implementing entity or person shall meet with the jurisdiction having authority of the site and will do one or more of the following:

- Redesign the project to avoid the impact.
- Provide alternative connections that maintain connections across the community. This may include constructing off-site street connections, including alleys and other roadways, that maintain community connectivity and access.

Finding: Less-than-significant with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on land use and planning, the following finding is made for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on land use and planning due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures LU-2 and LU-3. Mitigation Measure LU-2 would require the implementing agency to consult with the applicable municipality to determine if the site proposed for development would divide a community. Mitigation Measure LU-3 would require the implementing agency to redesign the proposed Project to avoid affecting community connectivity or provide alternative connections during the subsequent design process. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on community connectivity.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on land use and planning, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on land use and planning due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under KOP Category 6 and construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures LU-2 and LU-3) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant

impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

7.9 Noise

Impact 3.12(a): Would the proposed Project result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects – Common Elements (City of Maywood) (Construction and Operation)

Noise-sensitive land uses within Frame 4 in the City of Maywood are residential land uses approximately 200 feet from the boundary of the LA River. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 4 is ST12 along the LA River within the City of Bell, which is representative of the land uses within the City of Maywood. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 58 A-Weighted Sound Level (dBA) Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}).

Construction noise levels associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would be 87 dBA L_{eq} during the noisiest phase of construction. As construction noise would exceed the City of Maywood's 70 dBA standard, impacts would be potentially significant without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Typical Projects – Common Elements (City of Los Angeles) (Construction and Operation)

Noise-sensitive land uses within Frame 6 in the City of Los Angeles are varied but include residential land uses that front the LA River. Residential land uses are generally within 50 feet of the LA River right-of-way. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 6 is ST8 within the City of Los Angeles. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 64 dBA L_{eq} .

Construction associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would occur during the prescribed hours outlined in the City of Los Angeles's municipal code and CEQA guidelines. However, the City of Los Angeles's CEQA guidelines state that a significant impact may occur if construction activities lasting more than 1 day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use or if construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a 3-month period would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use.

As shown in Table 3.12-9 in Section 3.12, *Noise*, of the Draft PEIR, noise levels could be as high as 87 dBA L_{eq} , which would exceed the existing ambient level by more than 20 decibels (dB). Therefore, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Typical Projects – Common Elements (County; Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank) (Construction and Operation)

The Common Elements Typical Project would generally encompass no more than 3 acres and typically could include a variety of development types. The anticipated average daily patronage at the Common Elements Typical Project is up to 500 visitors per day, or 33 visitors per hour (based on the typical 7:00 a.m. through 10:00 p.m. Day/Night Noise Level [L_{dn}] daytime frame). The average raised male and female voice at 1 meter (3.28 feet) is 65 and 62 dBA, respectively. Therefore, if 50 percent of visitors were speaking at one time (equally split amongst men and women) the noise from visitors speaking would be approximately 53 dBA L_{eq} at a distance of 50 feet.

Noise from heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems would likely exceed both the daytime unadjusted and adjusted sound level limits in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, impacts associated with the Common Elements Typical Project could be significant in the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require a focused noise study and implementation of its findings to reduce HVAC noise. Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study during the final design of the Common Elements Typical Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction)

KOP Categories 1 through 5 would have similar construction components. The specific location (in-channel or off-channel) and design for these design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Considering the various development components that could be included in each individual KOP, construction impacts cannot be directly quantified until the specific locations (in-channel vs off-channel) are known. Based on the jurisdiction these projects occur in, construction would result in potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of mitigation (Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. Considering the uncertainty associated with the location, surrounding potential land uses, and general activity for some other recreational projects that could occur as they relate to noise, quantification of these types of impacts is not possible at this time and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-6 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Prepare Construction Noise Work and Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

During final design the implementing agency will prepare a focused noise analysis for any project within the city, which identifies nearby noise sensitive receptors that could be affected, predicts anticipated construction-related noise levels, and identifies measures that will be implemented by the construction contractor in order to comply with the city's standard.

Measures that could be implemented include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Using equipment that generates lower noise levels than those outlined in Table 3.12-9
- Locating construction equipment far enough from noise-sensitive land uses such that noise attenuates to below the city's standard
- Designing and installing temporary sound barriers, which would provide attenuation below the city's dBA standard

The implementing agency will also require noise monitoring during all phases of construction to confirm that the mitigation measures identified by the construction noise work plan and implemented by the construction contractor reduce construction noise to below the city's threshold.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Obtain Conditional Use Permit and Implement its Requirements during Construction Activities.

Prior to any construction within the City of Vernon, the implementing agency will apply for and obtain a conditional use permit, which will allow the Project to exceed the City of Vernon's noise standard of 65 dBA.

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Require Noise-Reducing Practices Be Incorporated into Construction Activities.

Prior to any construction within the City of Los Angeles, the implementing agency will require the contractor to include the following noise-reducing practices:

- Use noise control devices, such as equipment mufflers, enclosures, and barriers. Natural and artificial barriers such as ground elevation changes and existing buildings can shield construction noise. Stage construction operations as far from noise-sensitive uses as possible.
- Avoid residential areas when planning haul truck routes.
- Maintain all sound-reducing devices and restrictions throughout the construction period.
- Replace noisy equipment with quieter equipment (for example, use a vibratory pile driver instead of a conventional pile driver and rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment).
- Change the timing and/or sequence of the noisiest construction operations to avoid sensitive times of the day.

Mitigation Measure NOI-4: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings to Reduce HVAC Noise.

During final design of the Common Elements Typical Project, the implementing agency will design HVAC systems to comply with the applicable city's municipal code standards. This could include but would not be limited to actions such as:

- Prepare a focused noise study to analyze HVAC noise, which will identify a location for HVAC systems at appropriate distances so as to not exceed a 30-minute noise level (within any 1 hour) of 50 dBA at the closest noise sensitive land use.
- Design housings or shielding for HVAC systems that would reduce HVAC noise so as to not exceed a 30-minute noise level (within any 1 hour) of 50 dBA at the closest noise sensitive land use.

Mitigation Measure NOI-5: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings.

During final design of the Common Elements Typical Project, the implementing agency will prepare a focused noise study to determine the existing ambient baseline noise level by which to compare the operational noise level of the Common Elements Typical Project. The focused noise study will analyze the existing baseline noise level against operational noise, and, if it is determined that operational noise levels from the Common Elements would exceed the sound level limit, the implementing agency will provide measures or engineering best management practices to reduce exterior noise below the limit. These measures or best management practices could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Locating the Common Elements Typical Project away from noise-sensitive receptors to reduce operational noise to below the existing baseline
- Designing the Common Elements Typical Project to shield noise-sensitive receptors from noise-producing elements
- Including sound-attenuating features such as soundwalls

Mitigation Measure NOI-6: Prepare a Noise Study.

The implementing agency will prepare a focused noise study that analyzes the operational noise impacts of subsequent projects under the six KOP categories that include noise-producing components, such as, but not limited to, equestrian facilities and under- and overpasses or any other KOP-related project component. The focused noise study will include the quantification of noise-producing activities located on and originating from the subsequent project site. The focused noise study will determine the extent of impacts and whether these impacts would exceed any codified thresholds or guidance associated with the relevant jurisdiction. Should impacts be identified, the implementing agency will provide mitigation to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation could include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Project design that would isolate noise producing features away from noise-sensitive receptors

- Inclusion of noise-attenuating features such as sound walls, berms, acoustical shielding, etc., which would block the line of sight and provide noise reduction to surrounding noise-sensitive land uses

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the following finding is made for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in the Cities of Maywood and Los Angeles; construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5; and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project for the County and the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in the Cities of Maywood and Los Angeles; construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5; and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project for the County and the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will predict anticipated construction-related noise levels and identify measures that will be implemented by the construction contractor in order to comply with the city's standard. If construction would occur in the City of Vernon, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would require the implementing agency to apply for and obtain a conditional use permit. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would require the contractor to implement noise-reducing practices that would reduce impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study and to implement findings to reduce HVAC noise. Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study during the final design of the Common Elements Typical Project. Mitigation Measure NOI-6 would require the implementing agency to conduct a noise study, which would provide mitigation to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels should impacts be identified. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from noise on the nearby community.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, the following findings are made for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in the Cities of Maywood and Los Angeles; construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5; and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project for the County and Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in the Cities of Maywood and Los Angeles; construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5; and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project for the County and the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities from implementation from Common Elements Typical Project in the Cities of Maywood and Los Angeles; construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5; and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project for the County and the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measure NOI-1 through NOI-6) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

Impact 3.12(b): Would the proposed Project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects – Common Elements (Construction)

Construction-related vibration associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would occur and generally be associated with the location of the individual projects throughout the entire 51-mile study area. Because many jurisdictions do not include a codified threshold for vibration, the County's perception threshold (0.01 inch per second [in/sec]) is used unless otherwise noted. Vibration levels from construction equipment would attenuate to below the level of perception at a distance of 200 feet from the source. Based on the locations of the land uses throughout the study area, vibration-sensitive land uses could be as close as 50 feet from construction sites. As such, vibration levels could exceed the County's threshold of 0.01 peak particle velocity (PPV). However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Typical Projects – Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways (Construction)

Similar to the Common Elements Typical Project, because many jurisdictions do not include a codified threshold for vibration, the County's perception threshold (0.01 in/sec) is used unless otherwise noted. Vibration levels from construction equipment would attenuate to below the level of perception at a distance of 400 feet from the source. Based on the locations of the land uses throughout the study area, vibration sensitive land uses could be as close as 50 feet from construction sites. As such, vibration levels could exceed the County's threshold of 0.01 PPV, and impacts would be significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction)

The specific locations (in-channel or off-channel) and designs for KOP Categories 1 through 5 design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Considering the KOP categories include a variety of construction activities ranging from trail modifications to diversion pipe/tunnel/channel, overflow weirs, underground gallery, side channel, storm drain interceptors, and wetlands, taking place anywhere in the study area, construction of the KOP categories could result in potentially significant impacts associated with vibration, as the construction equipment is not known. In-channel construction would likely locate potential high-impact, vibration-intensive construction equipment away from sensitive receptors; however, without knowing where construction would take place or the specific project details quantifying vibration impacts is not possible at this time. Therefore, impacts associated with vibration would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-9 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-7: Locate Project 200 Feet or More from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings.

The implementing agency will locate any development of the Common Elements Typical Project outside of a distance of 200 feet from any occupied structure. If for some reason this is not possible, then during final design the implementing agency will prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration sensitive land uses. If vibration levels are predicted to exceed the County's 0.01 PPV threshold or any applicable city's standards, the implementing agency will prescribe measures to reduce vibration to the greatest extent practical. Measures could include but are not limited to:

- Using less vibration-intensive construction equipment
- Timing construction so that structures would not be occupied when high levels of vibration are expected
- Informing residents of the timing of construction and that vibration may be noticeable during these times

Mitigation Measure NOI-8: Locate Project 400 Feet or More from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings.

The implementing agency will locate any development of a Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Project outside of a distance of 400 feet from any occupied structure (dependent on phase and construction equipment used). If for some reason this is not possible, during final design the implementing agency will prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration sensitive land uses. If vibration levels would exceed the County's 0.01 PPV threshold or any applicable city's standards, the implementing agency will prescribe measures to reduce vibration to the greatest extent practical. Measures could include but are not limited to:

- Using less vibration-intensive construction equipment
- Timing construction so that structures would not be occupied when high levels of vibration are expected
- Informing residents of the timing of construction and that vibration may be noticeable during these times

Mitigation Measure NOI-9: Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings.

The implementing agency will, during final design, prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration sensitive land uses. If vibration levels would exceed the County's 0.01 PPV threshold or any other codified threshold, the implementing agency will prescribe measures to reduce vibration to the greatest extent practical. Measures could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Using less vibration-intensive construction equipment

- Timing construction so that structures would not be occupied when high levels of vibration are expected
- Informing residents of the timing of construction and that vibration may be noticeable during these times

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 5 with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise due to the proposed Project for construction of Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 5 are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures NOI-7, NOI-8, and NOI-9. Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would require the implementing agency to locate any development of the Common Elements Typical Project farther than 200 feet from any occupied structure or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures. Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would require the implementing agency to locate any development of a Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project farther than 400 feet from any occupied structure (dependent on phase and construction equipment used) or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures. In addition, Mitigation Measure NOI-9 would require implementing agencies to prepare a vibration report and create measures relevant for each project.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 5 with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise due to the proposed Project for construction of Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 5 when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures NOI-7, NOI-8, and NOI-9) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

7.10 Public Services

Impact 3.14(a): Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- **Fire protection**
- **Police protection**

- **Schools**
- **Parks**
- **Other Public Facilities**

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Fire and Police Protection

The six KOP categories include a variety of construction activities, ranging from trail modifications to development of facilities, habitat corridors, channel access ramps, channel modifications, off-channel land development, floodplain reclamation, and recreational amenities such as amphitheaters, crossings, and platforms. The presence of some construction workers at a given subsequent project location compared to the overall population would not substantially increase demand for fire or police protection services; however, temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. Considering that the details on construction scenarios for subsequent projects under the six KOP categories are not known yet—including duration, number of construction workers, and phasing, along with the specific size, extent, and location of the KOP categories—there may be localized road closures and detours that could increase response times for emergency services. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on public services, the following finding is made for construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on public services for construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6, are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1 would create temporary lane closures, and construction-related traffic could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. The Construction Management Plan includes consultation with the Fire and Police Departments for a traffic control plan, allowing for emergency vehicles to prepare for alternate routes if needed. This mitigation measure would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on public services.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on public services, the following findings are made for construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on public services from construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plans*. However, if Mitigation Measure LU-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.14.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's public services impacts.

7.11 Recreation

Impact 3.15(a): Would the proposed 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?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of the Common Elements Typical and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could result in a temporary increase in the use of nearby existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities if access to the LA River and existing recreational facilities is disrupted. Existing recreational facilities could be temporarily closed or have restricted access during construction of a Common Elements Typical Project. This could result in additional strain on surrounding recreational facilities as users seek alternative areas to recreate, thereby requiring additional maintenance of these facilities. Temporary closures of trails and access gateways during construction could result in a temporary increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities if access to the LA River Trail is disrupted. During construction, nearby facilities have the potential to experience physical deterioration (e.g., overcrowding, disrepair, increased waste generation, increased noise, worsened air quality, deterioration of aesthetics through lack of maintenance, damaged landscapes and habitats, and vandalism). Although staging areas cannot be determined at this time, it can be reasonably assumed that staging areas for construction equipment would be located primarily in the river properties. This could put a temporary additional strain on surrounding recreational facilities during construction as users seek alternatives, and there may be a need for increased maintenance at these alternate facilities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Potential impacts from construction of the design components under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. Temporary closures of trails and access gateways could occur during construction, and nearby recreational facilities may experience noise, dust, diminished access, and other nuisance impacts during construction. This could result in an increased use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities if access to the LA River Trail is disrupted. It can be reasonably assumed that staging areas would be located either in the LA River ROW or—dependent on the location and project proponent staging areas—on local jurisdiction properties within the study area. As such, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in temporary loss of access to existing recreational resources, including trails, parks, and recreational fields nearby that may result in

increased use of existing nearby recreational facilities. Also, KOP Categories 1 through 6 would likely be larger than Typical Projects and would thus have a longer construction duration with more intensive construction activities, thereby disrupting access and use and likely causing longer temporary closures, which would increase the use of nearby existing facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility may occur or be accelerated, without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation

Construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in an increased use of nearby existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities if access to the LA River and existing recreational facilities is disrupted. Staging areas for the KOP categories could be large, depending on the extent and nature of projects and the equipment involved. Temporary closures of existing recreational facilities could occur during construction, and recreational facilities near a construction site may experience noise, dust, diminished access, and other nuisance impacts during construction. This could result in an increased use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities if access to the LA River Trail is disrupted. Thus, construction activities under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could increase the use of nearby existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities for an extended period such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure REC-1: Minimize Disruption of Recreational Uses During Construction.

As specific subsequent project and location information is identified during detailed design, the implementing agency will confirm the timing, duration, and areal extent of construction activities that would occur. If temporary closures of existing recreational facilities would be necessary for construction, the specific increase in use of other nearby recreational facilities will be evaluated. Factors to be considered in the evaluation include the duration of the closure, acreage and type of facility that would be unavailable due to the closure, and existing usage levels at the relevant nearby recreational facilities.

If there is an increase in 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, the implementing agency will apply measures including, but not limited to, one or more of the following:

- Minimize duration of construction period.
- Modify construction phasing to limit disturbance of existing recreational facilities.
- Avoid construction during peak use periods.
- Post signage informing users of the duration of construction, with additional wayfinding to adjacent facilities with similar amenities.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on recreation, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on recreation from construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measure REC-1, which will minimize disruption of recreational uses and allow for recreational users to find similar resources in the area during construction. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on recreational resources.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on recreation, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on recreation from construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if mitigation measure REC-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for Later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.15.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's recreation impacts.

Impact 3.15(b): Would the proposed Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Significant Effect

Throughout all nine frames, the proposed Project would include the construction and operation of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Construction could require demolition, grading, and excavation activities and the construction of permanent facilities. These activities would result in a temporary increase in noise and an increase in air quality construction-related emissions, and could also have impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, hydrology and water quality, land use, traffic, and utilities. Additionally, the operation of new and expanded recreational facilities may result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Refer to Sections 3.1, *Aesthetics*; 3.2, *Air Quality*; 3.3, *Biological Resources*; 3.4, *Cultural Resources*; 3.5, *Energy*; 3.6, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*; 3.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*; 3.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*; 3.11, *Mineral Resources*; 3.12, *Noise*; 3.13, *Population and Housing*; 3.14, *Public Services*; 3.16, *Transportation*; 3.17, *Tribal Cultural Resources*; 3.18, *Utilities and Service Systems*; and 3.19, *Wildfire*, of the Draft PEIR for detailed descriptions of the proposed Project and potential environmental impacts.

Aesthetics

Impact 3.1(a) Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities would be temporary and the placement of construction equipment and staging areas in the ROW would reduce the possibility that the view of a scenic vista is substantially blocked or obstructed. However, the location, design details, and specific construction phasing of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project is not known; therefore, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar to those discussed for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects, as would construction equipment. The larger projects would involve the use of cranes and jackhammers to break concrete. Staging areas for construction equipment would be located in the ROW or on appropriate vacant areas for in-channel or off-channel projects. Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 could include more complex amenities and thus generally require a longer duration than for the Typical Projects with additional construction equipment. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 through 6 are not known, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved, e.g., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, and generators. As noted, some projects would be larger than others and include a wide variety of project components. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known, it is possible that construction activities could obstruct views of scenic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Install Construction Fencing for Screening and Security for Construction Lasting Longer than 30 Days. (See Section 7.1, *Aesthetics*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure REC-1: Minimize Disruption of Recreational Uses during Construction. (See above for detail.)*References*

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Impact 3.1(c) In non-urbanized areas, would the proposed Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the Project is in an urbanized area, would it conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

*Significant Effect*Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could temporarily introduce new visual elements in the forms of construction equipment, staging areas, and other visual elements that could be incompatible with the surrounding visual environment, and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar to those discussed for the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects. Similar construction equipment and activities would occur, mainly differentiated by size of the site. Larger projects such as bridges would likely involve the use of larger cranes and other equipment. As the specific locations of these project components are not known, it is possible that construction activities could be visible and could conflict with zoning or other design standards governing scenic quality. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. As the specific locations of these project components are not known, it is possible that construction activities could be visible and could conflict with zoning or other design standards governing scenic quality. Construction of *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects could introduce new temporary visual elements in the forms of construction equipment, staging areas, and other visual elements that could be incompatible with the surrounding visual environment, and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-1: Install Construction Fencing for Screening and Security for Construction Lasting Longer than 30 Days. (See Section 7.1, *Aesthetics*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure REC-1: Minimize Disruption of Recreational Uses during Construction. (See above for detail.)

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Impact 3.1-(d) Would the proposed Project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would follow Chapter 6 of the Design Guidelines, which includes requirements for lighting along the LA River. Nevertheless, operation of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, KOP category components could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

All of the projects envisioned in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects would follow the Design Guidelines, although *2020 LA River Master Plan* project components could potentially introduce new sources of light and glare on surrounding light-sensitive land uses, such as residential development, that may adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure AES-3a: Design Exterior Lighting to Minimize Nighttime Illumination Spillover. (See Section 7.1, *Aesthetics*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AES-3b: Design Exterior Structures to Minimize Glare. (See Section 7.1, *Aesthetics*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Air Quality

Impact 3.2(d): Would the proposed Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 1 (Operation)

Operation of KOP Category 1 includes an equestrian facilities design component, which has been identified as being similar to SCAQMD's identified agricultural uses, composting areas, and dairies, and has the potential to generate nuisance odors during operations due to manure and soiled bedding generated and stockpiled on site. Improper handling and storage of manure, along with odor migration, may lead to offsite nuisance violations. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AQ-5) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

According to SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting areas, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. As part of the design component of KOP Category 1, equestrian facilities, similar to agricultural uses, composting areas, or dairies, have the potential to generate nuisance odors due to manure and soiled bedding generated and stockpiled on site. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AQ-5) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Implement Equestrian Manure Management. (See Section 7.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

Biological Resources

Impact 3.3(a): Would the proposed Project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The construction of the Typical Projects could have a substantial adverse impact—either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications—on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fishes, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of the Typical Projects could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-3f, BIO-9, and BIO-12 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction-related direct and indirect impacts on special-status reptiles and amphibians due to the construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 would be generally as described for the Typical Projects.

The construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any sensitive species identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS.

Recreational use along the LA River may substantially increase due to implementation of KOP Categories 1, 3, 4, and 5. Additional indirect recreational impacts on special-status reptiles and amphibians may include impacts from human use, such as hiking, walking, biking, and use of the river, on behaviors such as foraging and predator avoidance. Other indirect effects may include increases in invasive species from activities such as foot traffic, equestrian uses, hiking, and biking, which would also increase soil compaction. Direct effects may include mortality due to collisions with horses, humans, and bikes. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation

Measures BIO-9, BIO-12, BIO-15, BIO-17, and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The construction of KOP Category 2 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Category 2 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, and BIO-15 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The construction of KOP Category 6 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of KOP Category 6 could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on sensitive species, including indirect impacts on marine species, and direct and indirect impacts on plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-14, and BIO-16 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects and the KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-14, and BIO-19) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Similar to the Typical Projects and the KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussion above, operations under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on marine species, plants, invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, raptors, and migratory birds identified as special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-14, and BIO-16 through BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Federally or State-Listed Species, Consult with Wildlife Agencies, and Implement Permit Requirements. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Conduct Preconstruction Raptor Nest Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO 3c: Active Eagle Nest Avoidance Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(i): Conduct Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(ii): Implement Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(iii): Implement Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3e: Conduct Preconstruction Special-Status Bat Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3f: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3g: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Prevent Entrapment in Construction Materials and Excavations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Restrict Monofilament Materials. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Best Practices for Night Lighting. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Avoid Bird and Bat Entrapment in Poles. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Minimize Noise Disturbance of Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Use Wildlife-Proof Trash Canisters. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Use Wildlife Safety Glass. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Prepare and Implement Pest Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Prohibit Use of Invasive Species during Operations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-19: Implement Habitat Reclamation Efforts. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(b): Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities are present within Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 of the study area. Permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts could occur on these sensitive natural communities should the Typical Projects be located within the portions of

Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 that contain these habitats. The Typical Projects could result in permanent and temporary impacts on sensitive natural communities as a result of construction activities should the project activities be located within an area that supports sensitive communities. Permanent impacts from construction activities could include the removal of existing vegetation and encroachment into the sensitive natural communities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts could include incidental disturbances within and adjacent to construction areas and clearing and grubbing for equipment staging and temporary construction access routes.

Temporary indirect impacts on riparian habitat, EFH, HAPCs, or other sensitive natural communities adjacent to the Typical Projects' limits of disturbance may be caused by construction activities (e.g., soil compaction, introduction of invasive species, dust, increased fire risk, chemical spills, sedimentation), which could lead to the degradation of native habitats and floodplains. The movement of heavy equipment and supplies during construction could compact the soil, affecting vegetation germination and growth. Construction activities could also have adverse effects on sensitive natural communities and native plants as a result of the introduction and spread of invasive plant species through construction activities throughout the project footprint and surrounding area. Accidental release of contaminants during construction, such as an inadvertent spill of gasoline, oil, or lubricants when fueling or storing construction equipment, could affect plant growth and survival. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities that are located within the LA River ROW of Frames 1, 2, and 6 through 9 could be affected by the Typical Projects' operation activities like recreation and maintenance. Indirect disturbances, such as dust and introduction of invasive species, could degrade riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities located in the LA River ROW that are within or adjacent to project operation activities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Category 1 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities. In addition, construction of KOP Category 1 could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on any riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities located within the study area, and impacts would be similar to those described for the Typical Projects above. Unlike the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project, implementation of KOP Category 1 could include in-channel work as well as off-channel work. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area potentially could be affected by KOP Category 1 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 1 component. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities, should they be present within the proposed project area, as a result of construction of KOP components. Construction of KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area, particularly on riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks, should they be present within the proposed project area. Impacts would be similar to those described for the Typical Projects; see the above subsection for details. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area could be affected by KOP Categories 2, 3, 4, and 6 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 2, 3, 4, or 6 component. Maintenance of vegetation within and adjacent to KOP Category 2, 3, 4, or 6 components, including landscaping and vegetation removal and trimming, could reduce in size or disturb sensitive natural communities that are located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 2, 3, 4, or 6 component, particularly with in-channel operations. The modification of the channel as part of KOP Category 2, the creation of crossings and platforms as a part of KOP Category 3, and off-channel land assets as a part of KOP Category 6 may substantially increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities during operations. Should channel modifications, such as flood-management functions, associated with KOP Category 2, or diversions, such as side channels, underground galleries, and diversion tunnels, associated with KOP Category 4, affect the current flow or water level of the LA River, there could be a potential for adverse impacts associated with physiological stress or plant mortality. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 5 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of sensitive natural communities, should they be present within the proposed project area, as a result of construction of KOP Category 5 components, including widening the channel, fields, storage, and side channels. Direct impacts as a result of construction of KOP Category 5 components would primarily be temporary because reclamation areas would be restored or reestablished with riparian and wetland habitats. However, there could be some permanent loss of sensitive vegetation communities from construction of proposed recreation facilities (e.g., Farmer's Markets, boardwalks), should sensitive vegetation communities be present within the proposed project area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area could potentially be adversely affected by KOP Category 5 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Category 5 component. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the discussion above for Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities occurring within the study area. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing vegetation and encroachment into plant communities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, and temporary construction access routes. Construction activities under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in temporary indirect effects, such as dust, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion, sedimentation, and pollutants, that could degrade riparian habitats and other sensitive natural communities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-4 through BIO-6, BIO-9, BIO-20a, BIO-20b, and BIO-20c) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Implementation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* may substantially increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on sensitive natural communities during operations, including trampling of native vegetation and increased introduction of invasive plant species from visitors straying off of designated trails. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 and BIO-18) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Federally or State-Listed Species, Consult with Wildlife Agencies, and Implement Permit Requirements. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Conduct Preconstruction Raptor Nest Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO 3c: Active Eagle Nest Avoidance Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(i): Conduct Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(ii): Implement Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(iii): Implement Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3e: Conduct Preconstruction Special-Status Bat Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3f: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3g: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Prevent Entrapment in Construction Materials and Excavations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Restrict Monofilament Materials. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Best Practices for Night Lighting. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Avoid Bird and Bat Entrapment in Poles. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Minimize Noise Disturbance of Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Use Wildlife-Proof Trash Canisters. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Use Wildlife Safety Glass. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Prepare and Implement Pest Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Prohibit Use of Invasive Species during Operations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-19: Implement Habitat Reclamation Efforts. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-20a: Avoid Riparian and Sensitive Natural Communities. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-20b: Protect Against Tree Diseases, Pests, and Pathogens. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-20c: Implement Riparian Mitigation and Restoration. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(c): Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally or State-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could directly affect wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that have a potential to occur within Frames 1 and 7 through 9 through permanent and temporary construction activities, should they be present beyond the top of bank in the landside portion of the LA River ROW. Direct effects on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources could result from project construction activities, including grading, excavating, soil stockpiling, or other earth-disturbing activities. Permanent and temporary disturbances from construction activities could result in indirect impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources present in the area surrounding the project site. Indirect impacts could include the introduction of nonnative species, erosion, sedimentation, chemical spills, and alteration of downstream hydrological conditions.

Direct impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources are not anticipated as a result of Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project construction within Frames 2 through 6. Wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that have the potential to occur adjacent to or near the project footprint could potentially be affected indirectly by permanent and/or temporary disturbances from nearby construction activities on the top of bank and landside portion of the LA River ROW. Indirect impacts could include the introduction of nonnative species, erosion, sedimentation, chemical spills, and alteration of downstream hydrological conditions. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation

Measures BIO-1, and BIO-21 a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that are located beyond the top of bank and within the landside LA River ROW of Frames 1 through 9, could be affected by operations and maintenance activities. Maintenance of vegetation, including vegetation removal and trimming, could affect wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that are located beyond the top of bank within the landside portion of the LA River ROW. Project operation will increase recreational use along the LA River, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and jurisdictional aquatic resources during operations, including trampling or damaging of native vegetation from visitors and pets straying off of designated trails. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 could take place outside or within the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resources and, therefore, could result in potentially significant impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources. Construction could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include encroachment into, or removal of, wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, and temporary construction access routes. Temporary indirect effects from construction-related activities, such as dust, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion, sedimentation, and pollutants, could degrade any wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources.

Implementation of KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 could include in-channel work and off-channel work. Should in-channel work take place in areas containing wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources—primarily Frames 1 and 6, where wetlands are present, but also in any frame where aquatic resources may be present—then permanent and/or temporary direct impacts could occur within the LA River channel, in addition to the wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring outside of the river channel. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the project area potentially could be affected by KOP Categories 1, 3, and 6 operations and maintenance activities, should they be located within or adjacent to a KOP Categories 1, 3, or 6 component. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 are expected to take place within the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resources or to connect to the LA River or other jurisdictional aquatic resource. Therefore, construction of KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 could result in potentially significant impacts on wetlands and/or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, and BIO-21a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any wetlands or potentially jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the study area could be affected by KOP Categories 2, 4, or 5 operations and maintenance activities, as KOP Categories 2, 4, and 5 could take place within a jurisdictional aquatic resource, including wetlands, or potentially be connected to one, if it exists in the study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and/or other jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the LA River frames. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing wetlands or jurisdictional aquatic resources or activities that may have permanent effects. Temporary direct impacts include clearing and grubbing, incidental disturbances within construction areas, equipment staging, temporary and permanent diversions, and temporary construction access routes. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-1, and BIO-21 a through BIO-21e) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Similar to the discussion for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 above, operations activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could potentially impact wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources occurring within the LA River frames. Maintenance of vegetation, including landscaping and vegetation removal and trimming, could reduce in size or disturb wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources that are located within or adjacent to a proposed Project. Indirect disturbances, such as dust and introduction of invasive species, could degrade wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Federally or State-Listed Species, Consult with Wildlife Agencies, and Implement Permit Requirements. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Conduct Preconstruction Raptor Nest Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO 3c: Active Eagle Nest Avoidance Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(i): Conduct Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(ii): Implement Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(iii): Implement Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3e: Conduct Preconstruction Special-Status Bat Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3f: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3g: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Prevent Entrapment in Construction Materials and Excavations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Restrict Monofilament Materials. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Best Practices for Night Lighting. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Avoid Bird and Bat Entrapment in Poles. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Minimize Noise Disturbance of Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Use Wildlife-Proof Trash Canisters. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Use Wildlife Safety Glass. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Prepare and Implement Pest Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Prohibit Use of Invasive Species during Operations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-19: Implement Habitat Reclamation Efforts. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-21a: Conduct a Jurisdictional Delineation. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-21b: Flag Wetland ESA. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-21c: Obtain Wetland Permits. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-21d: Restore Temporary Wetland Impacts. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-21e: Implement Mitigation for Permanent Loss of Wetlands or Jurisdictional Aquatic Resources. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-22a: Implement Permanent Wetlands Signage. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-22b: Obtain Wetland Permits for Operations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(d): Would the proposed Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

In addition to the Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas located within all frames, EFH also occurs in Frame 1 within marine and estuarine waters for finfish, coastal pelagic

species, and groundfish, and the estuary habitat is considered an HAPC, which are high priority conservation areas due to their important and fragile ecosystem function (NOAA 2020c). Construction impacts are the same for all frames, with the exception that EFH and HAPCs are not present within Frames 3 through 9.

Construction of Typical Projects would occur directly adjacent to the riverbanks, between the top of bank and the fenceline. Construction equipment use and storage, activities, and personnel may result in temporary and permanent impacts that could adversely affect habitat connectivity, species movement, and reproduction. Indirect construction impacts may include effects from noise, vibration, light, dust, human encroachment, chemical spills, or other construction-related indirect disturbances, introduction of invasive plant species, erosion, sedimentation, and pollutants. These impacts may also degrade habitats like riverine waters, wetlands, EFH, and HAPCs, or interfere with habitat availability, habitat connectivity, and species movement and behavior, all of which may disrupt or preclude the reproduction of fish and wildlife. All of these impacts could degrade habitats and interfere with or prohibit species movement and/or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any resources supporting the movement, migration, or reproduction of fish and/or wildlife species that are located within the LA River ROW of Frames 1 through 9 could be affected by the Typical Projects' operations and maintenance activities. The operation of Typical Projects could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. Such activities could result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction-related direct and indirect impacts on wildlife connectivity and nursery sites due to the construction of KOP Category 1 would be generally as described for the Typical Projects. The construction of KOP Category 1 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat removal, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. Such activities could result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of KOP Category 1 would be similar in scope and type as to the operation of the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project and, therefore, would have similar impacts. Habitat corridors, planted vegetated buffers, and connections between large habitat blocks would provide

beneficial effects for biological resources. Additionally, recreational use along the LA River may substantially increase due to implementation of KOP Category 1, potentially resulting in temporary and permanent direct and indirect impacts on habitats and species, such as trampling of vegetation, species disturbance, species habitat avoidance, and increased introduction of invasive plant species and pet droppings. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18 and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 will entail in-channel modifications and impacts and will have the potential to impact the same in-channel resources throughout Frames 1 through 9 in a similar way. The construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of habitats and nursery sites, imposed habitat fragmentation, and disruption and/or obstruction of connectivity as a result of construction of KOP Categories 2 and 4 components, including pumps, diversion pipes/tunnels/channels, overflow weirs, underground galleries, side channels, and storm drain interceptors. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of some of the design components under KOP Category 2 could potentially have deleterious effects on fish and wildlife connectivity and reproduction such as loss of habitat and habitat access due to potentially obstructive check dams and deployable barriers, levees, armored channels/vertical walls, added concrete, and bridge pier modifications. Operation of some of the design components under KOP Categories 2 and 4 could potentially have deleterious effects for wildlife connectivity and reproduction, such as loss of habitat and habitat access due to potentially obstructive diversions. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 3 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with the permanent and temporary loss of wildlife connectivity and nursery sites as a result of construction of KOP Category 3 components, including platforms, crossings, path ramps, structural walls, bridges, and cantilevers. Construction of KOP Category 3 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on habitats occurring within the study area, particularly on the aquatic and riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Wildlife connectivity and nursery sites occurring within the LA River potentially could be affected by KOP Category 3 operations and maintenance activities. The operation of KOP Category 3 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances that interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Construction of KOP Category 5 components could result in permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on habitats and connectivity areas occurring within the LA River, particularly on riparian habitats located within the LA River channel and/or along the riverbanks. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Wildlife connectivity and nursery sites occurring within the LA River potentially could be affected by KOP Category 5 operations and maintenance activities. Maintenance activities within and adjacent to KOP Category 5 components, including landscaping, vegetation removal and trimming, and human encroachment, could disturb and/or remove habitats. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The implementation of KOP Category 6 could result in potentially significant impacts on wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites associated with the permanent and temporary loss of habitats. Permanent impacts from construction activities may include removal of existing habitat, encroachment into habitat, habitat fragmentation, and establishing barriers to wildlife movement. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Any habitat or landscape features supporting wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites occurring within the study area potentially could be affected by KOP Category 6 operations and maintenance activities. The operation of KOP Category 6 could affect Wildlife Corridors, Linkages, and Local Connectivity Areas, EFH, HAPC, and fish and wildlife nursery and reproductive sites through direct habitat modifications, obstructions to existing fish and wildlife connectivity, hydrological interruption, or disturbances which interrupt species movements, movement ability, access to habitats and nursery sites, or reproduction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction activities under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in temporary indirect effects, such as noise, vibration, light, dust, human encroachment, introduction of invasive species, construction disturbances, equipment staging/storage, and temporary construction access routes, chemical spills, or other construction-related indirect disturbances that may degrade habitats like riverine waters, wetlands, EFH, and HAPCs; interfere with habitat availability, habitat connectivity, and species movement and behavior; and/or disrupt or preclude the reproduction of fish and wildlife. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-14, BIO-16, BIO-19, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* operations and maintenance activities could affect habitat or landscape features supporting wildlife connectivity and/or nursery sites occurring within the study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures BIO-9, BIO-11 through BIO-18, and BIO-23) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Literature Review, Habitat Assessment, and Project Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid or Minimize Effects on Federally or State-Listed Species, Consult with Wildlife Agencies, and Implement Permit Requirements. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: Conduct Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Conduct Preconstruction Raptor Nest Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO 3c: Active Eagle Nest Avoidance Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(i): Conduct Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(ii): Implement Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3d(iii): Implement Burrowing Owl Mitigation Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3e: Conduct Preconstruction Special-Status Bat Surveys. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3f: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3g: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Identify Work Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Prepare and Implement Weed Abatement Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Biological Monitoring During Construction. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: No Intentional Collection and/or Killing of Plants or Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Work Stoppage. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Prepare and Implement Construction Best Management Practices and Operations Recreation Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Prevent Entrapment in Construction Materials and Excavations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Restrict Monofilament Materials. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Best Practices for Night Lighting. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Avoid Bird and Bat Entrapment in Poles. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-14: Minimize Noise Disturbance of Wildlife. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-15: Use Wildlife-Proof Trash Canisters. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-16: Use Wildlife Safety Glass. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-17: Prepare and Implement Pest Management Plan. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-18: Prohibit Use of Invasive Species during Operations. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-19: Implement Habitat Reclamation Efforts. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure BIO-23: Maintain Connectivity in Subsequent Project Design, Construction, and Operation. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Impact 3.3(e): Would the proposed Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions. The construction and operations could have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-24) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Categories 1 through 6 could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions. The construction and operations of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could be expected to have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-24) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could conflict with local tree policies and ordinances under the Los Angeles County Tree Ordinance and city jurisdictions as a result of tree trimming and/or tree removal. Construction and operations impacts under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be the same as those identified for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6. Construction and operations under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could be expected to have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-24: Implement Avoidance, Transplantation, and Compensatory Mitigation Measures for Protected Trees. (See Section 7.3, *Biological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological impacts.

Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources

Impact 3.6(a): Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- **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?**
- **Strong seismic ground shaking?**
- **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
- **Landslides?**

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

The LA River is in a seismically active area due to the various active and potentially active faults in the region. Consequently, it is possible that the Typical Projects could be affected by strong ground shaking. In addition to being subject to strong seismic shaking, fault zone and landslide prone areas exist along the LA River. If the Typical Projects are to be constructed within fault zones, they would be subject to fault zone regulations, wherein, prior to a new project being permitted in a fault zone, cities and counties require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed structures will not be constructed on active faults. If any Typical Projects are to be constructed within a liquefaction zone, they could be subject to liquefaction zone mitigation recommendations.

Unlike Frames 1 through 4 (see Section 3.6.3 of the Draft PEIR), portions of Frames 5 through 9 are also in areas designated as landslide hazard areas (these are areas with variation in topography adjacent to the Santa Monica Mountains). Although the Typical Projects would adhere to the prevailing building codes and relevant regulations and permits, which would help minimize risk from seismic activity, and would be subject to fault zone, liquefaction, and landslide hazard regulations if constructed in these zones, there is still potential for substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic shaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, and landslides.

Implementation of the Typical Projects would attract visitors to the study area (the Common Elements Typical Project would attract up to 500 visitors, and the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project would attract up to 1,000 visitors). As such, visitors could be exposed to strong seismic shaking, fault rupture, and secondary seismic phenomena such as liquefaction and landslides. There could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exists throughout the footprint, in the case of strong seismic shaking, and in areas that exhibit specific conditions conducive of other seismic hazards (such as fault, liquefactions, and landslide zones). Thus, for both construction and operation of KOP

Categories 1 through 6, there could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exists throughout the footprint, in the case of strong seismic shaking, and in areas that exhibit specific conditions conducive of other seismic hazards (such as fault, liquefactions, and landslide zones). There could be potential impacts on people or structures from risks associated with seismic phenomena (including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards/landslides). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing⁵ Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(c): Would the proposed Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Urban Land typically consists of soils in areas of high population density in the largely built environment (which is the most common description of the land surrounding the LA River). These soils can be significantly changed human-transported materials, human-altered materials, or minimally altered or intact "native" soils. Due to the lack of site-specific details, there remains a potential for the presence of potentially unstable soils in the project study area. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The potential for seismic hazards exists throughout the footprint, including in areas that exhibit specific conditions potentially subject to seismic hazards such as liquefaction and seismically induced landsliding. In addition, the majority of soil components surrounding the LA River are

⁵ Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

classified as Urban Land by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. These soils can be significantly changed human-transported materials, human-altered materials, or minimally altered or intact “native” soils. Soils in urban areas can exhibit a wide variety of conditions and properties, increasing the potential for soil instability. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, all projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would require evaluation if constructed in State-designated geologic hazard areas and fault zones. Additionally, all *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects would adhere to all building code and permitting requirements, including geotechnical evaluations where appropriate. Although complying with building code and permitting requirements would assist in mitigating potential impacts from unstable soils, the potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse still exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing⁶ Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project’s geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(d): Would the proposed Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Soil components along and adjacent to the LA River are composed primarily of soils classified as Urban Land and can exhibit a wide variety of conditions and properties, including expansive potential. Urban soils could contain fine-grained soils (silts and clays), which contain variable amounts of expansive minerals—that is, soils that expand when they get wet and shrink as they dry out. Upward pressure can increase when these expansive soils swell, which may result in detrimental effects on structures and surface improvements if not properly mitigated. Due to the presence of expansive soils in the project study area, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

⁶ Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Categories 1 through 6 constructed as part of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would adhere to all current building codes and required permitting requirements. As projects would be implemented following proper engineering methods and building code requirements, it is expected that none of the activities associated with the construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 would cause or exacerbate expansive characteristics in soils. Nevertheless, due to the presence of expansive soils in the study area, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, all projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would adhere to all building code and permitting requirements, along with implementing recommendations from site-specific geotechnical studies, when deemed necessary. Complying with building code and permitting requirements would partially address potential impacts from expansive soils; however, a potentially significant impact could still occur. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing⁷ Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geologic impacts.

Impact 3.6(f): Would the proposed Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Thirty-two previously recorded and as-yet-unrecorded paleontological localities have been identified in seven of the nine frames of the study area. All nine frames contain deposits considered sensitive for containing significant unrecorded paleontological vertebrate fossils. Construction of the Typical Projects could destroy, remove, disturb, and alter surface-exposed and buried paleontological resources, resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

⁷ Load-bearing structures are structures that carry and transfer load to the ground safely (i.e., load-bearing walls transfer loads to the foundation or other suitable frame members and can support structural members like beams, slab, and walls on floors above).

Operation activities related to the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could include new single-story structures, such as pavilions, cafés, or restrooms, or lower-profile infrastructure, such as multi-use trails, signs, lighting, benches, and other associated recreational facilities, which may introduce activities that could directly affect significant paleontological resources. Operation elements, such as potentially increased erosion, even though not substantial, along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas could result from increased public use. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users to new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near an area with exposed deposits that are sensitive for significant paleontological resources could directly affect any undiscovered resources, through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance and increased public use. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOP categories would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in an adverse effect on significant paleontological resources. Impacts may be direct, through proposed ground disturbance, which could destroy, remove, disturb, or alter surface-exposed and buried paleontological resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operation of the KOP categories could result in significant impacts on sensitive geologic deposits with the potential for containing undiscovered significant paleontological resources, which include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas from increased public use and increased potential for disturbance. These activities could result in the exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of previously unrecorded significant paleontological resources. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

It is possible that construction activities of the 107 projects in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in an adverse change to a significant paleontological resource, resulting in a significant impact. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and GEO-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

The operations impacts of the 107 projects in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to those of the KOP categories, which could result in significant impacts on sensitive geologic deposits with the potential for containing undiscovered significant paleontological resources, including increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas from increased public use and increased potential for removal and disturbance. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure GEO-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Conduct Paleontological Resources Investigations. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Avoid Paleontological Resources or Conduct Monitoring. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: Avoid/Minimize Impacts on Paleontological Resources During Operations. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.6.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's paleontological impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 3.7(b): Would the proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

For all planning frames, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, SB 375, the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, and other State regulations (e.g., LCFS, Title 24 standards, SLCP Reduction Strategy). For future development of the Common Elements Typical Project within the City of Long Beach in either Frame 1 or 2, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the City of Long Beach CAAP. For future development in the City of Carson in Frame 2, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the City of Carson CAP. For future development in the City of Burbank in Frame 7, the Common Elements Typical Project would be consistent with the City of Burbank GGRP.

However, for all planning frames, the Common Elements Typical Project would be potentially inconsistent with the 2008 Scoping Plan and First Update, SB 32, EO S-3-05, 2020 CCAP, Los Angeles County CAP, and the County Sustainability Plan. While the County would encourage implementation of the Design Guidelines, there is no guarantee that all of these measures will be incorporated into the design of the Common Elements Typical Project by project proponents in subsequent projects, given that they are not required. Furthermore, the 2020 CCAP measure LUT-12 and Los Angeles County CAP measure T29 related to electrified landscaping and construction equipment are not addressed by the Design Guidelines best practices for the proposed Project. Therefore, construction and operation of the Common Elements Typical Project would potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and would therefore result in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and GHG-2) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Implement Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies Specific to Emission Sources of Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 3.8(b): Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities have the potential to expose construction personnel, the public, and/or the environment to contaminated media and/or hazardous building materials. However, prior to construction, any activities involving ground disturbance will require the implementing agency to retain a professional hazardous materials specialist specializing in hazardous materials impact assessment to conduct a project-level analysis to verify the presence or absence of hazardous materials conditions (including Cortese List sites) in the vicinity of the construction site and determine if there is potential for existing hazardous materials conditions to affect construction activities.

The type and extent of the contamination will dictate the appropriate response and remediation for the site and the agencies to be notified. Although these regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from the construction of the Typical Projects could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

The specific location and design for KOP Categories 1 through 6 have not yet been determined and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Potential impacts from construction of the design components under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. KOP categories would likely be larger than Typical Projects. As with the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects, contaminated sites associated with KOP Categories 1 through 6

would be remediated/addressed in coordination with and under oversight of the applicable oversight federal, State, and/or local agency (e.g., EPA, SWRCB, DTSC, or local environmental health or fire department). Although these regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from the construction of KOPs could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction impacts would be the same as those of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved. As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, although regulatory requirements would be followed, the potential for foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from construction under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures. (See Section 7.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(c): Would the proposed Project emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

There are several schools throughout the project study area, including school sites in every frame. Construction activities associated with the Typical Projects would involve routine handling of hazardous materials such as solvents, paints, oils, and grease and materials that are typical for construction projects. Consequently, there is potential that these materials would be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. As Typical Projects can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a hazardous materials site. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Additionally, structures built prior to 1980 to be demolished as part of the Typical Projects could contain hazardous building materials. Consequently, affected media or hazardous building materials could be handled within 0.25 mile of a

school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

As with the Typical Projects, there are several schools throughout the project study area. Consequently, there is potential that materials used in construction—such as solvents, paints, oils, and grease and materials that are typical for construction projects—would be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Consequently, the affected media potentially could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, there are several schools throughout the project study area. Depending on the contaminant characteristics of the hazardous materials site and extent of contamination, soil disturbance activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Consequently, the affected media potentially could be handled within 0.25 mile of a school. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures. (See Section 7.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(d): Would the proposed Project 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?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

As the Typical Projects can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a site that is on the Cortese List, Government Code Section 65962.5. If this the case, it is possible that excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil. Although the smaller footprint projects (e.g., access stairs, ramps, benches, hygiene facilities, restrooms, trash and recycling, drinking fountains) would not require as much media disturbance and would present a smaller risk of exposure to contaminated media, the potential for any of the Typical Projects to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation

Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

As with the Common Elements Typical Projects, hazardous materials sites, including LUST sites (which meet Cortese List requirements), exist within the project study area in all cities and frames. As KOP categories can occur anywhere in the project study area, it is possible that they could be constructed within or immediately adjacent to a site that is on the Cortese List, Government Code Section 65962.5. If this the case, it is possible that excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil, and the potential for any of the KOPs to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As discussed above for the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, hazardous materials sites, including LUST sites (which meet Cortese List requirements), exist within the project study area in all cities and frames. It is possible that potential excavation activities conducted during construction could encounter contaminated groundwater and/or contaminated soil, and the potential for projects under the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* to be located on such sites exists. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Conduct Project-Level Hazardous Materials Sites Assessment for Construction of Subsequent Projects Involving Soil Disturbance and Implement Measures. (See Section 7.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Impact 3.8(g): Would the proposed Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Frames 5 through 9 are within VHFHSZ (Frame 5) and High Fire Hazard areas (Frames 6 through 9). When conducted at sites within a VHFHSZ, construction activities would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk. Heat or sparks from construction equipment or vehicles, as well as the use of flammable materials, have the potential to ignite adjacent vegetation. Construction activities could introduce new potential ignition sources in the form of building materials (e.g., wood), vegetation for landscaping, and other materials for construction that are considered flammable. Subsequent projects within High Fire Hazard zones in Frames 5 through 9 would be subject to applicable city and County building codes, but the potential to exacerbate wildfire risks exists during

operations activities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The six KOP categories include a variety of construction activities that could occur anywhere in the study area. Therefore, subsequent projects under the KOP categories could be located in a VHFHSZ (in Frames 5 through 9).

Subsequent projects under the six KOP categories within High Fire Hazard zones would be subject to applicable city or County building codes, but impacts would be potentially significant if located in or near areas designated as VHFHSZ. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As mentioned under the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6 discussions above, none of the projects to be included under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are expected to result in a significant risk of exposure to wildfires. However, impacts would be potentially significant if they are located in or near areas designated as VHFHSZ. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 8.12, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.8.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 3.9(c): Would the proposed Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site; 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; or impede or redirect flood flows?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction—Frames 5 through 9

Construction impacts related to substantially altering the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in erosion or flooding or contributing runoff that would exceed the capacity of drainage systems would be similar to the impacts described above under Frames 1 through 4.

Several reaches in the LA River in Frames 5 through 9 do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity (Geosyntec and Olin 2018). As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff that may occur due to construction of the Common Elements Typical Project in these frames could exceed the system capacity. Thus, during construction, the proposed Project could create or contribute surface water runoff in Frames 5 through 9 that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

With implementation of the NPDES Construction General Permit, and Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b, project construction would not result in an exceedance of drainage system capacities because it would not impede or redirect flood flows and would minimize exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

Operations—Frames 5 through 9

Operation of the Common Elements Typical Project in Frames 5 through 9 would not result in substantial erosion or increased surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site, or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. However, due to existing flood capacity deficiencies, the Common Elements Typical Project could contribute runoff water that would exceed the existing or planned drainage system, provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows.

There are several regions within Frames 6 and 7 along the river that are hydraulically unstable, which may result in large and unstable surface waves. Effects of these waves are often alleviated by increasing channel and levee height to contain the waves and/or constructing channel side-slopes with rough cobble material to reduce wave run-up. River reaches throughout Frames 5 through 9 also have capacity constraints for the 1 percent storm event (100-year) flood, and could exceed the capacity of the channel in a large storm event.

During operation, the Common Elements Typical Project and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project could create or contribute surface water runoff in Frames 5 through 9 that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Stormwater drainage patterns could be temporarily altered during construction. In addition, several reaches in the LA River do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity. As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. In a large storm event, flows could exceed the system capacity. Thus, construction of KOP Categories 1

through 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with creating or contributing water that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

Until strategies to reduce flood risks are implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could create or contribute stormwater flows that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff could exceed the drainage system capacity. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Existing flood conveyance deficiencies would continue similar to existing conditions. Until strategies to reduce flood risks are implemented, construction of the overall 2020 LA River Master Plan could create or contribute stormwater flows that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

Operation of the overall 2020 LA River Master Plan must occur within the constraints of managing flood risk. However, several reaches in the LA River channel do not meet existing design standards for flood conveyance capacity. As a result, baseline conditions of the system capacity are exceeded in large storm events. Therefore, in a large storm event, any increase in site runoff could exceed the system capacity. Thus, operation of the overall 2020 LA River Master Plan could create or contribute stormwater flows that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Require Site-Specific Drainage Studies to Address Stormwater Management. (See Section 7.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b: Require Stormwater Control Measures. (See Section 7.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.9.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hydrology and water quality impacts.

Land Use and Planning

Impact 3.10(a): Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

KOP Category 6 could occur within established neighborhoods considering they would be located off-channel and occur outside of the ROW. As the location and extent of subsequent projects that could operate under KOP Category 6 are unknown, in the absence of specific details (e.g., type of project, detailed design, location, size), it cannot be stated with certainty whether there would be physical division of an established community. Permanent road closures or other barriers such as

walls could physically divide a community if alternative connectivity is not provided. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-2 and LU-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

All of the projects envisioned in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would improve connectivity across the river, providing gateways and additional recreational uses and trails. Many of the projects include bridges and overcrossings that would connect both sides of the river. These projects would reduce the effects of the physical barrier the LA River presents and would not further divide an established community; rather, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact with the exception of projects under KOP Category 6. Depending on the size and extent of projects under KOP Category 6, there could be a significant impact with respect to division of an established community without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures LU-2 and LU-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-3: Alternative Connectivity. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

Noise

Impact 3.12(a): Would the proposed Project result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Significant Effect

Common Elements Typical Project (City of Maywood) (Construction and Operation)

Noise-sensitive land uses within Frame 4 in the City of Maywood are residential land uses approximately 200 feet from the boundary of the LA River. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 4 is ST12 along the LA River within the City of Bell, which is representative of the land uses within the City of Maywood. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 58 dBA Leq.

Construction noise levels associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would be 87 dBA Leq during the noisiest phase of construction. As construction noise would exceed the City of Maywood's 70 dBA standard, impacts would be potentially significant without mitigation. However, implementation of proposed Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Common Elements Typical Project (City of Los Angeles) (Construction and Operation)

Noise-sensitive land uses within Frame 6 in the City of Los Angeles are varied but include residential land uses that front the LA River. Residential land uses are generally within 50 feet of the LA River right-of-way. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 6 is ST8 within the City of Los Angeles. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 64 dBA L_{eq} .

Construction associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would occur during the prescribed hours outlined in the City of Los Angeles's municipal code and CEQA guidelines. However, the City of Los Angeles's CEQA guidelines state that a significant impact may occur if Construction activities lasting more than 1 day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use or if construction activities lasting more than 10 days in a 3-month period would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use.

As shown in Table 3.12-9 in Section 3.12, *Noise*, of the Draft PEIR, noise levels could be as high as 87 dBA L_{eq} , which would exceed the existing ambient level by more than 20 dB. Therefore, impacts could be significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Common Elements Typical Project (County; Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, South Gate, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank) (Construction and Operation)

The Common Elements Typical Project would generally encompass no more than 3 acres and typically could include a variety of development types. The anticipated average daily patronage at the Common Elements Typical Project is up to 500 visitors per day, or 33 visitors per hour (based on the typical 7:00 a.m. through 10:00 p.m. L_{dn} daytime frame). The average raised male and female voice at 1 meter (3.28 feet) is 65 and 62 dBA, respectively. Therefore, if 50 percent of visitors were speaking at one time (equally split amongst men and women) the noise from visitors speaking would be approximately 53 dBA L_{eq} at a distance of 50 feet.

Noise from HVAC systems would likely exceed both the daytime unadjusted and adjusted sound level limits in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, impacts associated with the Common Elements Typical Project could be significant in the Cities of Long Beach, Carson, Compton, Paramount, Cudahy, Bell, Maywood, Vernon, Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require a focused noise study and implementation of its findings to reduce HVAC noise. Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study during the final design of the Common Elements Typical Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-4 and NOI-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction)

KOP Categories 1 through 5 would have similar construction components. The specific location (in-channel or off-channel) and design for these design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Considering the various development components that could be included in each individual KOP, construction impacts cannot be directly quantified until the specific locations (in-channel vs off-channel) are known. Based on the jurisdiction these projects occur in, construction would result in

potentially significant impacts. However, implementation of mitigation (Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)

Potential impacts from operations of the design components under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. Considering the uncertainty associated with the location, surrounding potential land uses, and general activity for some other recreational projects that could occur as they relate to noise, quantification of these types of impacts is not possible at this time and impacts would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-6 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Prepare Construction Noise Work and Mitigation Monitoring Plan. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Obtain Conditional Use Permit and Implement its Requirements during Construction Activities. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Require Noise-Reducing Practices Be Incorporated into Construction Activities. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-4: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings to Reduce HVAC Noise. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-5: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-6: Prepare a Noise Study. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

Impact 3.12(b): Would the proposed Project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Significant Effect

Common Elements Typical Project (Construction)

Construction-related vibration associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would occur and generally be associated with the location of the individual projects throughout the entire 51-mile study area. Because many jurisdictions do not include a codified threshold for vibration, the County's perception threshold (0.01 in/sec) is used unless otherwise noted. Vibration levels from construction equipment would attenuate to below the level of perception at a distance of 200 feet from the source. Based on the locations of the land uses throughout the study area, vibration-sensitive land uses could be as close as 50 feet from construction sites. As such, vibration levels

could exceed the County's threshold of 0.01 PPV. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project (Construction)

Similar to the Common Elements, because many jurisdictions do not include a codified threshold for vibration, the County's perception threshold (0.01 in/sec) is used unless otherwise noted. Vibration levels from construction equipment would attenuate to below the level of perception at a distance of 400 feet from the source. Based on the locations of the land uses throughout the study area, vibration sensitive land uses could be as close as 50 feet from construction sites. As such, vibration levels could exceed the County's threshold of 0.01 PPV, and impacts would be significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Construction)

The specific locations (in-channel or off-channel) and designs for KOP Categories 1 through 5 design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. Considering the KOP categories include a variety of construction activities ranging from trail modifications to diversion pipe/tunnel/channel, overflow weirs, underground gallery, side channel, storm drain interceptors, and wetlands, taking place anywhere in the study area, construction of the KOP categories could result in potentially significant impacts associated with vibration, as the construction equipment is not known. In-channel construction would likely locate potential high-impact, vibration-intensive construction equipment away from sensitive receptors; however, without knowing where construction would take place or the specific project details, quantifying vibration impacts is not possible at this time. Therefore, impacts associated with vibration would be potentially significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-9 would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-7: Locate Project 200 Feet or More from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-8: Locate Project 400 Feet or More from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

Public Services

Impact 3.14(a): Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- ***Fire protection***
- ***Police protection***
- ***Schools***
- ***Parks***
- ***Other Public Facilities***

Significant Effect

(KOP Categories 1 through 6) (Construction)

—Fire and Police Protection

The six KOP categories include a variety of construction activities, ranging from trail modifications to development of facilities, habitat corridors, channel access ramps, channel modifications, off-channel land development, floodplain reclamation, and recreational amenities such as amphitheaters, crossings, and platforms. The presence of some construction workers at a given subsequent project location compared to the overall population would not substantially increase demand for fire or police protection services; however, temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. Considering that the details on construction scenarios for subsequent projects under the six KOP categories are not known yet—including duration, number of construction workers, and phasing, along with the specific size, extent, and location of the KOP categories—there may be localized road closures and detours that could increase response times for emergency services. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce potential impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.14.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's public services impacts.

Transportation

Impact 3.16(a): Would the proposed Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities for Typical Projects would be a temporary condition (assumed to range from 10 to 20 weeks). Typical Project elements could involve intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction of those elements, which could impede vehicle, pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle circulation. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

The larger projects constructed under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would involve the use of cranes and jackhammers to break concrete. Staging areas for construction equipment would be located in the ROW or on appropriate vacant areas for in-channel or off-channel projects. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 through 6 are not known, it is possible that construction activities could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

The discussion of construction impacts for overall implementation would be the same as for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. There could be intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction, which could impede circulation. These impacts have the potential to be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Impact 3.16(b): Would the proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects may result in short-term increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). To account for potential impacts

on traffic circulation, transportation impacts related to construction activities for the Common Elements Typical Project would be considered potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. Construction of subsequent projects under the six KOP categories may result in short-term impacts related to increases in VMT. Thus, any transportation impacts related to construction activities for any of the KOP categories would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known, it is possible that construction activities of the 107 projects could conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Development of subsequent projects under the 107 projects in the *2020 LA River Master Plan* may result in short-term increases in VMT. These impacts have the potential to be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Impact 3.16(c)/(d): Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or result in inadequate emergency access?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project may result in short-term roadway effects (e.g., localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures), which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river (e.g., due to closed access ramps) and to adjacent land uses (e.g., due to driveways affected by lane closures). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOP categories may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river and to adjacent land uses. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of all 107 projects of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* over 25 years may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river and to adjacent land uses. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Utilities/Service Systems

Impact 3.18(d): Would the proposed Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

Subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 could be substantially larger than other KOP categories, depending on project elements such as affordable housing or museums, and could result in substantial generation of solid waste during construction depending on site location. Because the extent of the subsequent projects is unknown, KOP Category 6 could result in substantial generation of solid waste during construction that could affect landfill capacity. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure UTIL-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of the larger projects envisioned for KOP Category 6 could result in substantial amounts of solid waste unless requirements are included in each project for diversion of solid waste. All projects under KOP Category 6 would comply with State, regional, and local waste diversion regulations and ordinances, and would be expected to include provisions for reuse and diversion components such as recycling and composting. However, implementation of proposed mitigation

(Mitigation Measure UTIL-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Implementation of the 2020 LA River Master Plan is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4 would be implemented for KOP Category 6, which would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, after mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-3: Recycle Construction Materials and Reduce Waste. (See Section 7.13, *Utilities/Service Systems*, for detail.)

Wildfire

Impact 3.19(a): Would the proposed Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of the Common Elements Typical Project may result in short-term localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures. Emergency access to facilities within the project study area could be temporarily affected by construction, including temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic causing delays or obstructing the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, emergency access to facilities within the project study area could be temporarily affected by construction. Temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic within the 51-mile-long and 2-mile-wide study area could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The 2020 LA River Master Plan would involve construction and operation activities to implement 107 projects that could occur anywhere in the study area over a 25-year period. Temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic within the proposed project area could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-1: Construction Coordination with Emergency and Fire Services.

(See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(b): Would the proposed Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks of, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

The 51-mile-long and 2-mile-wide study area includes several areas designated as VHFHSZs. Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, there is a potential that construction could occur in or adjacent to canyons, steep slopes, or other areas designated as VHFHSZ areas. Construction activities, when at sites within a VHFHSZ, would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk in these areas. Construction activities could also introduce new potential ignition sources in the form of building materials (e.g., wood), vegetation for landscaping, and other materials for construction that are considered flammable, such as fuels and household cleaners. Therefore, construction activities associated with the Common Elements Typical Project within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ could result in a potentially significant impact related to exacerbating wildfire risks of, and thereby exposing project occupants to, direct or indirect risk of injury, loss, or death due to wildfire. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

There is a potential that construction could occur in or adjacent to canyons, steep slopes, or other areas designated as VHFHSZ areas. Construction activities, when at sites within a VHFHSZ, would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk in these areas. Heat or sparks from construction equipment or vehicles, as well as the use of flammable materials, have the potential to ignite adjacent vegetation and start a fire. Similar to the Typical Projects, existing regulations would address potential fire risks associated with the construction of new structures, including using appropriate equipment, conducting fuel modification, and obtaining review and approval by the State Fire Marshall. However, if construction or demolition activities associated with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* occur within VHFHSZs, the existing regulations may not adequately address the heightened risks, and further precautions may need to be taken. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in impacts similar to those described above for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(c): Would the proposed Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

The Typical Projects could be constructed on land without utilities or other infrastructure, or on developed sites that would require relocation of or modifications to existing utilities and infrastructure. The Typical Project could require localized installation of water, electric, natural gas, and sewer infrastructure such as mains and distribution pipes, as well as relocation of existing utilities on certain sites. The installation or extension of new utilities, such as water, electricity, and telecommunications, on sites that are within or adjacent to VHFHSZ areas could exacerbate wildfire risk, particularly the installation of electrical utilities, due to the high fire-ignition potential of electricity and the highly flammable nature of materials used during construction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Potential impacts from construction of the design components under the KOP categories would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. Projects under the KOP categories would likely be larger than those for the Typical Projects. Given the variance of types of projects, it could be anticipated that major utility upgrades would be required. Due to the unknown future locations of project sites it is possible that the installation or extension of utilities associated with the KOP categories would exacerbate the existing wildfire risk at the sites if located in a VHFHSZ. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be required to comply with all applicable California Building Code and California Fire Code requirements for development in a VHFHSZ including, but not limited to, specific requirements for structural hardening, water supply and flow, hydrant and standpipe spacing, signage, and fire department access. The construction process of installing overhead or underground electric utilities may temporarily increase the risk of fire ignition due to the type of materials and equipment used during the process, as well as the high fire risk of electricity in general. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(d): Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Wildfires can greatly reduce the amount of vegetation on hillsides, which reduces the ability of the soil surface to absorb rainwater and can allow for increased runoff that may include large amounts of debris. The potential for surface runoff and debris flows therefore increases substantially for areas recently burned by large wildfires. These hazards pose a risk to life and property due to their sudden occurrence, extreme force, and ability to strip vegetation, block drainages, and damage infrastructure. Areas adjacent to a flood zone could experience flood conditions during large storm events made more severe by runoff caused by post-fire conditions. The Typical Projects may be within both VHFHSZ areas and mapped flood zone areas. However, as stated in Section 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft PEIR, Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a would require site-specific drainage studies to address stormwater management.

In addition, there are areas adjacent to the LA River classified as having a high potential for landslides or being landslide-prone (see Figures 3.6-1 through 3.6-9 in Section 3.6, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, in the Draft PEIR). However, as described in Section 3.6 of the Draft PEIR, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require site-specific geotechnical studies and implementation of their recommendations prior to beginning construction activities.

Lastly, because the locations of specific sites are unknown at this time, construction of projects located in a VHFHSZ or that have recently involved wildfires combined with areas prone to landslides or slope instability could expose workers, structures, and property to significant risks related to post-fire conditions. In addition, operating a new project or facility in these areas would be exacerbating the existing risk of post-fire hazard by exposing additional people to this existing hazard. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a, and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation of KOP categories adjacent to or located in a VHFHSZ that are also areas prone to flood, landslide, or slope instability would have the potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage change. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a, and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation of 2020 LA River Master Plan projects that are adjacent to or in a VHFHSZ as well as areas prone to flood, landslide, or slope instability would have the potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage change. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-4: Post-Fire Risk Reduction Plan. (See Section 7.14, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Require Site-Specific Drainage Studies to Address Stormwater Management. (See Section 7.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Finding for Impact 3.15(b): Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on recreation, the following finding is made for Impact 3.15(b):

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impact due to the proposed Project is found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)***Aesthetics***

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures: Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1 wherein Mitigation Measure AES-1 will minimize obstruction of views of scenic resources by requiring the installation of construction fencing, Mitigation Measure

LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows, and Mitigation Measure REC-1 will minimize disruption of recreational uses and continue to allow opportunities for viewing scenic resources. These mitigation measures will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1 wherein Mitigation Measure AES-1 will minimize obstruction of views of scenic resources by requiring the installation of construction fencing, Mitigation Measure LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows, and Mitigation Measure REC-1 will minimize disruption of recreational uses and continue to allow opportunities for viewing scenic resources. These mitigation measures will ensure that the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b, wherein under Mitigation Measure AES-3a exterior lighting will be designed to shield and direct illumination to the subsequent project sites and minimize light spillover to any adjacent residential uses, and Mitigation Measure AES-3b will minimize glare by requiring that the exterior of the proposed buildings/structures be constructed of materials such as high-performance, tinted, non-mirrored glass; painted metal panels; and pre-cast concrete or fabricated wall surfaces. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, project construction would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Air Quality

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure AQ-5, which will require cleaning of equestrian facilities at least once per day. As well as composting manure and soiled bedding and covering stockpiled material with a lid or tarp at the furthest feasible distance from residents and/or sensitive receptors. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 would ensure that manure is properly handled or composted to reduce offsite nuisance violations. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts associated with project operations would be reduced to less than significant.

Biological Resources

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires that the implementing agency avoid “take” of species, if applicable/occurring, within the action area. Mitigation Measures BIO-3a through BIO-3g avoid or reduce potential construction impacts on birds, including burrowing owls, bats, and American badgers. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 would avoid or reduce potential impacts on sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, nest sites) if present. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9 would reduce or avoid potential construction-related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measures BIO-10 and BIO-11 would be implemented if there is potential for special-status wildlife, including special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians, that could become entrapped in construction

materials or excavations. If special-status birds (or those protected by the MBTA and CFGC) and special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians have the potential to occur then Mitigation Measures BIO-12 and BIO-13 would be implemented. If special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles could occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-14 would be implemented to avoid or reduce construction-related impacts. Mitigation Measures BIO-15 through BIO-17 would avoid or minimize direct and indirect impacts on invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds and raptors. Mitigation Measure BIO-18 would avoid the spread of invasive species and encourage the use of native plant species. Lastly, for where opportunities for habitat reclamation efforts exist, Mitigation Measure BIO-19 would be implemented to ensure restoration BMPs are used.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5 would avoid or reduce potential impacts on sensitive habitat (e.g., wetlands, habitat for special-status species, wildlife movement corridors, nest sites) is present. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9 would reduce or avoid potential construction related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measure BIO-20a requires that riparian and sensitive natural communities be mapped prior to construction. If the proposed Project cannot avoid direct impacts on either riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, then Mitigation Measure BIO-20c should be implemented to mitigate riparian habitats and sensitive communities.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is to begin the process of making a determination of whether or not the proposed individual subsequent project would have a significant environmental impact on biological resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-21a through BIO-21e would avoid or reduce impacts on wetlands and/or jurisdictional aquatic resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-22a and BIO-22b would avoid or reduce impacts on wetlands during project operations.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. The purpose of Mitigation Measure BIO-24 requires that if tree removals cannot be avoided, then compensatory mitigation be required on protected trees.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above. Mitigation Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9 would reduce or avoid potential construction related impacts on special-status plants, wildlife, and/or aquatic resources, sensitive habitat, or protected trees. Mitigation Measures BIO-10 and BIO-11 would be implemented if there is potential for special-status wildlife, including special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians, that could become entrapped in construction materials or excavations. If special-status birds (or those protected by the MBTA and CFGC) and special-status mammals, reptiles, or amphibians have the potential to occur then Mitigation Measures BIO-12 and BIO-13 would be implemented. If special-status wildlife, nesting birds, raptors, or eagles could occur, then Mitigation Measure BIO-14 would be implemented to avoid or reduce construction-related impacts. Mitigation Measures BIO-15 through BIO-17 would avoid or minimize direct and indirect impacts on invertebrates, fish, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds and raptors. Mitigation Measure BIO-18 would avoid the spread of invasive species and encourage the use of native plant species. Where opportunities for habitat reclamation efforts exist, Mitigation Measure BIO-19 would be implemented to ensure

restoration BMPs are used. Lastly, Mitigation Measure BIO-23 ensures that all projects, during design, construction, operations, and maintenance, at a minimum maintain current existing ecological connectivity function and value and prevent unintended deleterious consequences to wildlife species, connectivity, and nursery sites.

Geology

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards during construction and operation. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquification hazards.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential unstable soils, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse during construction. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on unstable soils, potential landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure GEO-1, which will require a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential unstable soils, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse during construction. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects from expansive soils.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 will require implementing agencies to conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with SVP Guidelines and to identify and determine potential sensitive paleontological resources. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on unique paleontological resources and unique geologic features. Mitigation Measure GEO-3 requires that implementing agencies either redesign the subsequent project to avoid sensitive paleontological resources or provide paleontological monitoring. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GEO-4 requires an avoidance and minimization plan will be prepared to avoid/minimize potential impacts on paleontological resources during operations.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and GHG-2. Mitigation Measure GHG-1a requires that implementing agencies implement GHG emission strategies to reduce GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure GHG-1b will implement operations GHG emission reduction strategies specific to emission sources of multi-use trails and access gateways. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GHG-2 will minimize waste by encouraging waste reductions. These mitigation measures will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on GHG emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which requires a project-level hazardous materials sites assessment for construction of subsequent projects. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from hazards and hazardous waste.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3, which require that a Construction Fire Protection Plan and a Fire Protection Plan be prepared.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b, which would create site-specific drainage studies and require stormwater control measures for construction and operations of the Common Elements Typical Project; Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project; KOP Categories 1 through 6, Frames 5 through 9; and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on hydrology or water quality.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures LU-2 and LU-3. Mitigation Measure LU-2 would require the implementing agency to consult with the applicable municipality to determine if the site proposed for development would divide a community. Mitigation Measure LU-3 would require the implementing agency to redesign the proposed Project to avoid affecting community connectivity or provide alternative connections during the subsequent design process. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on community connectivity.

Noise

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will predict anticipated construction-related noise levels and identify measures that will be implemented by the construction contractor in order to comply with the city's standard. If construction would occur in the City of Vernon, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would require the implementing agency to apply for and obtain a conditional use permit. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would require the contractor to implement noise-reducing practices that would reduce impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study and to implement findings to reduce HVAC noise. Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study during the final design of the Common Elements Typical Project. Mitigation Measure NOI-6 would require the implementing agency to conduct a noise study that would provide mitigation to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, should impacts be identified. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from noise on the nearby community.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures NOI-7 and NOI-8. Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would require the

implementing agency to locate any development of the Common Elements Typical Project farther than 200 feet from any occupied structure or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures. Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would require the implementing agency to locate any development of a Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project farther than 400 feet from any occupied structure (dependent on phase and construction equipment used) or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration-sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures.

Public Services

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1, which would deal with temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic that could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. This measure's Construction Management Plan includes consultation with the Fire and Police Departments for a traffic control plan, allowing for emergency vehicles to prepare for alternate routes if needed. This mitigation measure would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on public services.

Transportation

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1, which will manage construction parking and traffic flows. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on transportation.

Utilities

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4. Mitigation Measure UTIL-3 requires implementing agencies to recycle construction materials and incentivize construction contractors with waste minimization goals. Mitigation Measure UTIL-4 requires every project under KOP Category 6 to reduce the amount of solid waste generated from operation of the proposed Project.

Wildfire

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measure WF-1, which will minimize potential construction impacts on emergency response requirements of relevant police and fire departments. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measure WF-2, which will minimize potential construction impacts in VHFHSZ areas. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures WF-4, HYDRO-1a, and GEO-1. Mitigation Measure WF-4 ensures that if a project is in a VHFHSZ or an area that was recently burned by wildfire, then the implementing

agency will prepare a post-fire risk reduction plan. Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a would require site-specific drainage studies to address stormwater management. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require site-specific geotechnical studies and implementation of their recommendations prior to beginning construction activities. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Finding for Impact 3.15(b): Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on recreation, the following findings are made for Impact 3.15(b):

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impact due to the proposed Project when not carried out by the County is found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Aesthetics

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be

reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County.

Air Quality

Impacts associated with project operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure AQ-5) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Biological Resources

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-19 are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures BIO-9 through BIO-19 and BIO-23 are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measure BIO-24 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Geology

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4 are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and GHG-2) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measures HAZ-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures WF-2 and WF-3) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Land Use and Planning

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under KOP Category 6 and the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures LU-2 and LU-3) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Noise

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under KOP Category 6 and the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the Typical Projects would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures NOI-7 and NOI-8) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Public Services

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Transportation

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that

could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Utilities

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the 2020 LA River Master Plan would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Wildfire

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the 2020 LA River Master Plan would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure WF-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the 2020 LA River Master Plan would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure WF-2) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the 2020 LA River Master Plan would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a, GEO-1, and WF-4) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to

later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

7.12 Transportation

Impact 3.16(a): Would the proposed Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction activities for the Typical Projects would be a temporary condition (assumed to range from 10 to 20 weeks). Elements of the Typical Projects could involve intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction of those elements, which could impede vehicle, pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle circulation. However, implementation of the proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

The larger projects constructed under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would involve the use of cranes and jackhammers to break concrete. Staging areas for construction equipment would be located in the ROW or on appropriate vacant areas for in-channel or off-channel projects. As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 through 6 are not known, it is possible that construction activities could conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

The discussion of construction impacts for overall implementation would be the same as for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. There could be intermittent lane and sidewalk closures during construction, which could impede circulation. These impacts have the potential to be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1, which will manage construction parking and traffic flows. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on transportation.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Impact 3.16(b): Would the proposed Project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of the Common Elements Typical Project and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project may result in short-term increases in VMT. To account for potential impacts on traffic circulation, transportation impacts related to construction activities for the Common Elements Typical Project would be considered potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Per County Guidelines, construction impacts, if they occur, can be discussed on a qualitative basis. Construction of subsequent projects under the six KOP categories may result in short-term impacts related to increases in VMT. Thus, any transportation impacts related to construction activities for any of the KOP categories would be potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

As the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known, it is possible that construction activities of the 107 projects could conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Development of subsequent projects under the 107 projects may result in short-term increases in

VMT. These impacts have the potential to be significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1, which will manage construction parking and traffic flows. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on transportation.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Impact 3.16(c)/(d): Would the proposed Project substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or result in inadequate emergency access?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of Common Elements or Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects may result in short-term roadway effects (e.g., localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures), which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river (e.g., due to closed access ramps) and to adjacent land uses (e.g., due to driveways affected by lane closures). However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOP categories may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river and to adjacent land uses. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of all 107 projects of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* over 25 years may result in short-term roadway effects, for example localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures, which could result in increased hazards from geometric design and emergency access, both along the river and to adjacent land uses. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure LU-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure LU-1, which will manage construction parking and traffic flows. This

mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on transportation.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on transportation due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if the mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure LU-1) is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

7.13 Utilities/Service Systems

Impact 3.18(d): Would the proposed Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

Subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 could be substantially larger than other KOP categories, depending on project elements such as affordable housing or museums, and could result in substantial generation of solid waste during construction depending on site location. Because the extent of the subsequent projects is unknown, KOP Category 6 could result in substantial generation of solid waste during construction that could affect landfill capacity. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure UTIL-3) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Operation of the larger projects envisioned for KOP Category 6 could result in substantial amounts of solid waste unless requirements are included in each project for diversion of solid waste. All projects under KOP Category 6 would comply with State, regional, and local waste diversion regulations and ordinances, and would be expected to include provisions for reuse and diversion components such as recycling and composting. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure UTIL-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4 would be implemented for KOP Category 6, which would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, after mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-3: Recycle Construction Materials and Reduce Waste.

Implementing agencies will require construction contractors to recycle construction materials and divert inert solids (asphalt, brick, concrete, dirt, fines, rock, sand, soil, and stone) from disposal in a landfill, according to local, regional, and State regulations and ordinances. Implementing agencies will incentivize construction contractors with waste minimization goals in bid specifications.

Mitigation Measure UTIL-4: Divert Solid Waste.

For every project under KOP Category 6, the implementing agency will include one or more of the following actions to reduce the amount of solid waste generated from operation of the Project:

- Provide on-site recycling containers both outside and indoors on each floor of the development.
- Ensure that all contracts for landscape maintenance include provisions for recycling/composting of green waste.
- Provide for regular collection of recyclable material and green waste for diversion from landfill.
- Include signage throughout the project site encouraging the reuse and recycling of waste.
- Provide incentives for project operators to reduce and divert solid waste from operation of the Project; these incentives could include rebates to property owners for identified volume levels of recycled waste per development and innovative changes to standard operating procedures.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on utilities, the following finding is made for construction and operation of KOP Category 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on utilities due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of KOP Category 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4. Mitigation Measure UTIL-3 requires implementing agencies to recycle construction materials and incentivize construction contractors with waste minimization goals. Mitigation Measure UTIL-4 requires every project under KOP Category 6 to reduce the amount of solid waste generated from operation of the proposed Project.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on utilities, the following findings are made for construction and operation of KOP Category 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on utilities due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of KOP Category 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures UTIL-3 and UTIL-4) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

7.14 Wildfire

Impact 3.19(a): Would the proposed Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

Construction of the Common Elements Typical Project may result in short-term localized increases in delay and traffic queuing that stems from lane closures. Emergency access to facilities within the

project study area could be temporarily affected by construction, including temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic causing delays or obstructing the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Similar to the Typical Projects, emergency access to facilities within the project study area could be temporarily affected by construction. Temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic within the 51-mile-long and 2-mile-wide study area could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would involve construction and operation activities to implement 107 projects that could occur anywhere in the study area over a 25-year period. Temporary lane closures and construction-related traffic within the proposed project area could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-1) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-1: Construction Coordination with Emergency and Fire Services.

The implementing agency and construction contractor will regularly notify and coordinate with Los Angeles County and/or local jurisdictions' emergency departments on project construction design, activities, and scheduling. For future projects with substantial construction periods (e.g., more than 10 months), the following measures will be implemented as applicable to minimize construction impacts on emergency response requirements of relevant police and fire departments.

- Prior to the start of construction, consult the fire station(s) serving the project area and review phasing, road/lane closure, and detour plans. The fire station(s) may then identify alternative fire and emergency medical response routes.
- Prior to the start of construction, consult the police station(s) serving the project area, as appropriate, of project-related lane and/or road closures and detour plans. The police station(s) may then identify alternative police emergency response routes.
- If determined to be necessary by the relevant police and/or fire service providers, implement one or more of the following applicable traffic control measures capable of reducing the temporary adverse effects on police and emergency vehicle travel during project construction:
 - Use flag persons to direct traffic.
 - Post "No Parking" signs along the affected area.
 - Install temporary signals or signs to direct traffic or other equivalent traffic control measures.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan due to the proposed Project for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operation of overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure WF-1, which will minimize potential construction impacts on emergency response requirements of relevant police and fire departments. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts related to impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on adopted emergency and evacuation plans for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if Mitigation Measure WF-1 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(b): Would the proposed Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks of, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

The 51-mile-long and 2-mile-wide study area includes several areas designated as VHFHSZs. Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, there is a potential that construction could occur in or adjacent to canyons, steep slopes, or other areas designated as VHFHSZ areas. Construction activities, when at sites within a VHFHSZ, would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk in these areas. Construction activities could also introduce new potential ignition sources in the form of building materials (e.g., wood), vegetation for landscaping, and other materials for construction that are considered flammable, such as fuels and household cleaners. Therefore, construction activities associated with the Common Elements Typical Project within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ could result in a potentially significant impact related to exacerbating wildfire risks of, and thereby exposing project occupants to, direct or indirect risk of injury, loss, or death due to wildfire. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

There is a potential that construction could occur in or adjacent to canyons, steep slopes, or other areas designated as VHFHSZ areas. Construction activities, when at sites within a VHFHSZ, would involve equipment that may exacerbate wildfire risk in these areas. Heat or sparks from construction equipment or vehicles, as well as the use of flammable materials, have the potential to ignite adjacent vegetation and start a fire. Similar to the Typical Projects, existing regulations would address potential fire risks associated with the construction of new structures, including using appropriate equipment, conducting fuel modification, and obtaining review and approval by the State Fire Marshall. However, if construction or demolition activities associated with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* occur within VHFHSZs, the existing regulations may not adequately address the heightened risks, and further precautions may need to be taken. Implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in impacts similar to those described above for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan.

For construction projects that are proposed in or adjacent to areas designated as Very High FHSZs, prior to construction, the implementing agency will prepare a construction fire protection plan. The construction fire protection plan will include, but will not be limited to, the following measures to address potential ignition sources during construction:

- Parking for workers' vehicles and equipment will be designated away from dry brush and other ignition sources.
- Vehicle idling will be prohibited.
- Specify that personnel must be trained in the practices of the fire safety plan relevant to their duties. Construction and maintenance personnel will be trained and equipped to extinguish small fires to prevent them from growing into more serious threats.
- Prohibit smoking in wildland areas, with smoking limited to paved areas or areas cleared of all vegetation.
- During high fire risk conditions, designated vehicles will carry fire-prevention equipment, such as water, a shovel, and/or a fire extinguisher, on the construction site at all times.
- Fireproof mats or shields will be used during welding or other construction activities that could produce sparks during high fire risk conditions.
- Demonstrate compliance with applicable plans and policies established by State agencies.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks, and thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks, and thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, the following finding is made for construction are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure WF-2, which will minimize potential construction impacts in VHFHSZ areas. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks, and thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on wildfire risks for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if Mitigation Measure WF-2 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(c): Would the proposed Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction)

The Typical Projects could be constructed on land without utilities or other infrastructure, or on developed sites that would require relocation of or modifications to existing utilities and infrastructure. The Typical Project could require localized installation of water, electric, natural gas, and sewer infrastructure such as mains and distribution pipes, as well as relocation of existing utilities on certain sites. The installation or extension of new utilities, such as water, electricity, and telecommunications, on sites that are within or adjacent to VHFHSZ areas could exacerbate wildfire risk, particularly the installation of electrical utilities, due to the high fire-ignition potential of electricity and the highly flammable nature of materials used during construction. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction)

Potential impacts from construction of the design components under the KOP categories would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function. Projects under the KOP categories would likely be larger than the Typical Projects. Given the variance of types of projects, it could be anticipated that major utility upgrades would be required. Due to the unknown future locations of project sites it is possible the construction or extension of utilities associated with the KOP categories would exacerbate the existing wildfire risk at the sites if located in VHFHSZs. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction)

Construction of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be required to comply with all applicable California Building Code and California Fire Code requirements for development in a VHFHSZ including, but not limited to, specific requirements for structural hardening, water supply and flow, hydrant and standpipe spacing, signage, and fire department access. The construction process of installing overhead or underground electric utilities may temporarily increase the risk of fire ignition due to the type of materials and equipment used during the process, as well as the high fire risk of electricity in general. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-2) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-2: Prepare a Construction Fire Protection Plan. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks by requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, the following finding is made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks by requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, the following finding is made for construction are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measure as described above: Mitigation Measure WF-2, which will minimize potential construction impacts in VHFHSZ areas. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (Not carried out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exacerbating wildfire risks by requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, the following findings are made for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on wildfire risks for construction of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if Mitigation Measure WF-2 is adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(d): Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Significant Effect

Typical Project (Construction and Operation)

Wildfires can greatly reduce the amount of vegetation on hillsides, which reduces the ability of the soil surface to absorb rainwater and can allow for increased runoff that may include large amounts of debris. The potential for surface runoff and debris flows therefore increases substantially for areas recently burned by large wildfires. These hazards pose a risk to life and property due to their sudden occurrence, extreme force, and ability to strip vegetation, block drainages, and damage infrastructure. Areas adjacent to a flood zone could experience flood conditions during large storm events made more severe by runoff caused by post-fire conditions. The Typical Projects may be within both VHFHSZ areas and mapped flood zone areas. However, as stated in Section 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft PEIR, Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a would require site-specific drainage studies to address stormwater management.

In addition, there are areas adjacent to the LA River classified as having a high potential for landslides or being landslide-prone (see Figures 3.6-1 through 3.6-9 in Section 3.6, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, of the Draft PEIR). However, as described in Section 3.6 of the Draft PEIR, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require site-specific geotechnical studies and implementation of their recommendations prior to beginning construction activities.

Lastly, because the locations of specific sites are unknown at this time, construction of projects located in VHFHSZs or that have recently involved wildfires combined with areas prone to landslides or slope instability could expose workers, structures, and property to significant risks related to post-fire conditions. In addition, operating a new project or facility in these areas would be exacerbating the existing risk of post-fire hazard by exposing additional people to this existing hazard. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a, and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation of KOP categories adjacent to or located in VHFHSZs that are also areas prone to flood, landslide, or slope instability would have the potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage change. However, implementation of proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction and operation of *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects that are adjacent to or in VHFHSZs as well as areas prone to flood, landslide, or slope instability would have the potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage change. However, implementation of

proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, HYDRO-1a and WF-4) would reduce impacts to less than significant for later activities carried out by the County.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-4: Post-Fire Risk Reduction Plan.

This measure is required to ensure that if a project is in Very High FHSZs or an area that was recently burned by wildfire, then the implementing agency will prepare a post-fire risk reduction plan. The plan will focus on the specific construction site and be finalized prior to the beginning of construction. The post-fire risk reduction plan will implement one or more of the following applicable measures:

- Treat all wildfire burned areas within the construction area to control stormwater runoff prior to winter rains.
- Restore wildfire areas within the construction area by planting native vegetation cover or encouraging the re-growth of native species using best practices as soon as possible to aid in control of stormwater runoff.
- Remove dead, woody vegetation along watercourses following a catastrophic fire, as directed by local fire officials.
- Post-fire, implement slope stabilization measure by planting native vegetation cover as soon as possible to aid in landslide control, as directed by local fire officials.
- Ensure excess storm flow is properly diverted away from important property improvements or unstable slopes.
- Check drainage systems and clear out culverts, roof gutters, street gutters, infiltration and detention basins, concrete waterways, etc., to allow water to drain, as directed by local fire officials.
- Remove potentially toxic materials, ideally before rain washes toxic runoff into storm drains and waterways, as directed by local fire officials.
- Minimize foot traffic, equipment, and disturbance on burned landscapes.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Conduct a Site-Specific Geotechnical Study and Implement Recommendations for Load-Bearing Subsequent Projects Prior to Construction Activities. (See Section 7.4, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Require Site-Specific Drainage Studies to Address Stormwater Management. (See Section 7.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for detail.)

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff and post fire slope instability, the following finding is made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff and post fire slope instability, the following finding is made for construction and operation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project has been changed by requiring the following mitigation measures as described above: Mitigation Measures WF-4, HYDRO-1a, and GEO-1. Mitigation Measure WF-4 ensures that if a project is in VHFHSZ or an area that was recently burned by wildfire, then the implementing agency will prepare a post-fire risk reduction plan. Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a would require site-specific drainage studies to address stormwater management. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require site-specific geotechnical studies and implementation of their recommendations prior to beginning construction activities This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to exposing people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff and post fire slope instability, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of the mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on wildfire risks for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities. However, if Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a, GEO-1, and WF-4 are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Chapter 8

Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

8.1 Aesthetics

Impact 3.1(a) Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

Scenic vistas within the study area are limited in nature, with the viewshed largely consisting of an urban hardscape with limited scenic resources. Where scenic vistas are available, views encompass larger scenic visual elements and/or panoramic views of the Pacific Ocean, ridgelines, hillsides, or large open park and greenspace areas that encapsulate a large viewscape viewed from multiple vantage points. However, once constructed, above-ground structures related to KOP Category 6, if located in an area encompassing a scenic vista, could result in substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista or obscure a panoramic view. Because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas. Although proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-2) would be implemented, KOP Category 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or obscure a panoramic view.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Due to the unknown nature of the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is possible that they could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas. Impacts would be potentially significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-2) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or obscure a panoramic view.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-2: Minimize Obstruction of Scenic Vistas.

During project design, the implementing agency will minimize visual intrusions from public views of designated scenic vistas by following local jurisdictions' applicable policies and ordinances that protect views of designated scenic vistas by taking into consideration sightlines, scale and massing of structures, and materials used for construction, and other measures as needed.

To the extent practicable, the implementing agency will maintain the scenic vistas' visual quality and comply with the applicable jurisdiction's general plan and design guidelines to preserve scenic vistas and minimize visual intrusions.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on aesthetics, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Category 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on aesthetics due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Category 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

While implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-2 would minimize obstruction of scenic vistas, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas.

Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation Measure AES-2 would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, there are no known additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10, *Findings Regarding Project Alternatives in the PEIR*, below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore,

other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

8.2 Air Quality

Impact 3.2(b): Would the proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area with respect to the applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Implementation of the KOP categories would result in the generation of air pollutant emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, trips by heavy-duty haul trucks, earthwork activities, and other construction activities. Such emissions could exceed construction thresholds for regional and localized pollutant emissions depending on the schedules, equipment used, and material movement required. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and GHG-2) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Operation of the KOP categories would generate air pollutant emissions associated with motor vehicle trips, onsite consumption of natural gas for space and water heating, onsite use of solvents and consumer products, landscaping, and other sources. Emissions could exceed operational thresholds for regional and localized pollutant emissions depending on project details. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, GHG-1a, and GHG-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The impact discussion above for the six KOP categories would similarly apply to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* for both construction and operation. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Require Cleaner Construction Equipment and Vehicles and Low-VOC Coatings.

In the event that construction-period emissions exceed regional or localized emissions standards in effect at the time that subsequent project details are known, implementing

agencies will implement the following or more effective measures to achieve emissions reductions:

- For exceedances of PM or NO_x regional or localized significance thresholds, the implementing agency (or its contractors) will:
 - **Require at Least Tier 4 Final Engines on Construction Equipment.** All off-road equipment greater than 50 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities will operate on at least an EPA-approved Tier 4 Final or newer engine.
 - **Require Best Available Control Technology on Construction Equipment.** All construction off-road equipment must be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology devices including, but not limited to, CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters.
 - **Require Use of Diesel Trucks with 2010-Compliant Model Year Engines.** Diesel trucks that have 2010 model year or newer engines, but no less than the average fleet mix for the current calendar year as set forth in CARB's EMFAC database, must be used. In the event that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained, a rationale explaining why and showing that a good-faith effort to locate such engines was conducted must be documented.
 - **Require Low-VOC Coatings during Construction.** To reduce construction-related fugitive VOC emissions beyond the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 1113, low-VOC coatings that have a VOC content of 25 grams per liter or less will be used during construction. Evidence must be submitted to SCAQMD detailing the use of low-VOC coatings prior to the start of construction.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Implement Operations Strategies to Reduce VOC Emissions.

The implementing agency will verify if operations air pollutant emissions exceed regional or localized VOC emissions standards in effect at the time that subsequent project details are known. In the event that operations emissions under subsequent projects exceed regional or localized VOC emissions standards, the implementing agency will implement the following to achieve VOC emissions reductions during operations.

- Use low-VOC coatings (VOC content less than or equal to 25 grams per liter) for periodic painting and facility upkeep.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Not-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on air quality, the following findings are made for operation and construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on air quality due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Finding (carried out by the County and Not-carried out by the County)

Without specific details on construction and operation of later activities, emissions were not able to be quantified. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty that impacts would be reduced below applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measures GHG-2 and AQ-1 would control construction-period emissions under the KOP categories, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, AQ-2, and TRA-1b would control operation-period emissions under the KOP categories. Because these impacts cannot be quantified and the impact reduction achieved from mitigation cannot be quantified, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where implementation of mitigation may be inadequate to reduce impacts below thresholds. Despite implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutant. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against the applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Furthermore, there are no additional known feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on air quality. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

Impact 3.2(c): Would the proposed Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

For the Typical Projects, without specific details on the locations of construction activities, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where diesel particulate matter emissions could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-3, and GHG-2) would be implemented, construction of Typical Projects could result in diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions that could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

During the operations period for the Typical Projects, criteria pollutant emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or risk. It is not anticipated that the Common Elements Typical Project would exceed the most stringent 1-hour carbon monoxide standard and no detailed carbon monoxide hot-spots analysis would be required. However, without specific details on the locations of building footprints, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where DPM emissions from operations could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, construction of the Typical Projects could result in DPM emissions that could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

As discussed above for Impact 3.2(b), implementation of the KOP categories would result in the generation of air pollutant emissions during construction activities. Unlike the Typical Projects, such emissions could exceed construction thresholds and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, depending on the schedules, equipment used, and material movement required. These emissions, if left unmitigated, could contribute to ground-level ozone formation in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which at certain concentrations, can contribute to short- and long-term human health effects. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b [and Mitigation Measure AQ-4 for KOP Category 6]) would be implemented, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in DPM emissions that could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions. Because details about the *2020 LA River Master Plan* construction scenario are unknown, emissions associated with the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* have not been quantified. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting in health risks could result in a significant impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be

implemented, it cannot be stated that health risks from operations activities would be reduced to a level that would be below SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Require Cleaner Construction Equipment and Vehicles and Low-VOC Coatings. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Implement Operations Strategies to Reduce VOC Emissions. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Require Subsequent Projects that Exceed the SCAQMD LSTs and Are within 1,000 Feet of Sensitive Receptors to Perform a Health Risk Assessment and Implement Measures to Reduce Health Risks.

For subsequent projects that (1) exceed the SCAQMD LSTs and (2) are within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors, as defined by SCAQMD (e.g., residences, daycares), the implementing agency will prepare a site-specific construction and operational HRA. The HRA must identify whether the health risk exposures for adjacent receptors will be less than the SCAQMD project-level thresholds. If the HRA demonstrates that the health risk exposures for adjacent receptors will be less than SCAQMD project-level thresholds, then additional mitigation will be unnecessary. However, if the HRA demonstrates that health risks will exceed SCAQMD project-level thresholds, additional on- and offsite mitigation will be analyzed by the implementing agency to help reduce risks to the greatest extent practicable. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and GHG-2 would be required.

Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Require Subsequent Projects with Sensitive Receptors within 1,000 Feet of Existing Toxic Air Contaminant Hazards to Perform a Health Risk Assessment.

For subsequent projects with sensitive receptors (e.g., affordable housing) within 1,000 feet of existing TAC hazards (e.g., heavily traveled roadways, stationary sources), the implementing agency will prepare a site-specific construction and operational HRA. If the HRA demonstrates that the health risk exposures for onsite receptors will be less than SCAQMD project-level thresholds, then additional mitigation would be unnecessary. However, if the HRA demonstrates that health risks will exceed SCAQMD project-level thresholds, additional feasible onsite mitigation (e.g., air filters with a higher Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value rating) will be analyzed by the implementing agency to help reduce risks to the greatest extent practicable.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on air quality, the following findings are made for operation and construction of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on air quality due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on construction and operation of later activities, mitigation for future project health risks may be inadequate to reduce impacts below SCAQMD's threshold level. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty that impacts would be reduced, even with implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measures GHG-2 and AQ-1 would control construction-period emissions under the KOP categories, Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, AQ-2, and TRA-1b would control operation-period emissions under the KOP categories, and Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would require development that exceeds the localized significance thresholds (LSTs) and is within 1,000 feet of existing sensitive receptors prepare a site-specific operational Health Risk Assessment (HRA). Mitigation Measure AQ-4 requires, for subsequent projects with sensitive receptors (e.g., affordable housing) within 1,000 feet of existing TAC hazards (e.g., heavily traveled roadways, stationary sources), the implementing agency will prepare a site-specific construction and operational HRA. Because these impacts cannot be quantified and the impact reduction achieved from mitigation cannot be quantified, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where implementation of mitigation may be inadequate to reduce impacts below thresholds. Despite implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against the applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or

alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on air quality. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

8.3 Cultural Resources

Impact 3.4(a): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects would involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials to build facilities such as cafés, pavilions, restrooms, multi-use trails, art/performance spaces. Depending on the specific design and location of the project, as well as the type of cultural resource(s) that could be located on or near the site, construction of the Typical Projects may cause a substantial adverse change in historical resources in or near the Typical Project area. As discussed in Section 3.4.3.2, *Resources Identified in the Project Study Area*, of the Draft PEIR, segments of the Channel have been found eligible as contributing features of a potential historic district that includes the 51-mile-long Channel; character-defining features of the Channel that have been called out specifically are the parapet paved berms, trapezoidal channels, and central trench at the bottom. New construction has the potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources or alter character-defining features of historical resources, and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-2a, CR-2b, and CR-2c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Activities related to the operation of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects have the potential to cause substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. For example, impacts could include damage to historical resources due to water and/or waste leakages from hygiene facilities, restrooms, and/or water features; if historical resources are integrated into the design of the proposed Project, increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Depending on the project design and location, presence or absence of historical resources, and the character-defining features of the historical resource, the impact could

be significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-3a, CR-3b, and CR-3c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Design components of KOP Categories 1 through 6 may cause a substantial adverse change to historical resources in or near the project area. New construction has the potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources, or alter character-defining features of historical resources and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. Therefore, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-2a, CR-2b, and CR-2c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Operation of the KOPs could result in direct and indirect impacts on historical resources, including physical damage to historical resources within or along the proposed trails, due to intentional (i.e., vandalism) or inadvertent (i.e., accidental collision) actions.

These activities also could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded significant archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features, floodplain storage, and wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or buried cultural resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-3a, CR-3b, and CR-3c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction impacts would be the same as for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Similar to the reasons identified above for the Typical Projects, the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-2a, CR-2b, and CR-2c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The operations impacts for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be the same as for Typical Projects and KOPs described above. Activities related to the 107 projects have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, including damage to historical resources; if historical resources are integrated into the design of the proposed Project, then increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-3a, CR-3b, and CR-3c) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.

For later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, during design and prior to construction, the implementing agency will conduct a cultural resources assessment to determine the potential for presence of historical/built, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources.

As part of this assessment, the implementing agency will identify sensitive historical resources that physically may be outside the construction area, but could be affected by changes in noise levels or alterations to visual continuity, if these features are important to the significance of the historical resources. During the design phase of the Project, the implementing agency will conduct a records search/literature review. The records search will be conducted at the South Coastal Central Information Center and will cover a quarter-mile around the location-specific project study area. The records search will provide background information on cultural surveys and site identification and will be supplemented by reviewing the maps/tables of identified historical resources. For the literature review, additional background research conducted online and in person will be conducted.

Required information sources will include, at a minimum:

- NRHP National Park Service online website
(<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm> and
<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm>)
- Office of Historic Preservation (https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30338)
 - California Historical Landmarks
 - California Points of Historical Interest
 - California Historical Resource Inventory System
 - California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)
- Local historical societies
- Local registers and general plans
- Sacred Land File Search at Native American Heritage Commission

Supplemental information sources that could be consulted include:

- Sanborn maps (available at the Los Angeles Public Library)
- Historic U.S. Geological Survey quadrangles
- Historic aerial maps
- Ethnographic data
- Surface geological data

In addition to conducting literature review and searches, the implementing agency tiering from the PEIR will coordinate with the applicable California Native American Tribe, to verify the presence/absence of tribal cultural resources (TCRs) in the API. The California Native American

Tribe will identify TCRs and provide substantial documentation of the TCR per PRC Section 5024.1. All TCR documentation and information obtained during consultation will be confidential and not included in public documents.

If, following the records search, literature review, sacred land file search, and coordination with the tribe, it is determined that there are no historical/built, archaeological, and TCRs present in the API, then the impact would be less than significant and no further action is required.

As outlined in CR-1a, if, following the records search, literature review, sacred land file search, and coordination with the tribe, it is determined that historical/built, archaeological, or TCRs are present in the API, then Mitigation Measure CR-1b would be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.

- **Conduct Field Survey of API:** The implementing agency will hire qualified architectural historians and/or historians and archaeologists to physically inspect the API, verify the presence or absence of known historical resources, and document potentially historical resources. This will be accomplished through intensive pedestrian surveys, photo-documentation, and written notes, at a minimum.
- **Record and Identify Cultural Resources:** Each historical resource and archaeological site that has been previously identified will be recorded with an updated California Natural Resources Agency – Department of Parks and Recreation DPR form (Continuation Sheet, DPR 523-L). Newly identified historical resources and archaeological sites will be recorded on DPR 523A (Primary Record), DPR 523B (Building, Structure, Object Record), and DPR 523J (Location Map), with recordation on DPR 523D (District Record), DPR 523E (Linear Feature Record), and DPR 523L (Continuation Sheet) completed as appropriate. DPR forms will be completed by a qualified architectural historian, historian, or archaeologist.
- **Prepare Technical Report and Evaluate Identified Resources:** The report will include the background, research, methods, results, and evaluation of any identified cultural resources. All cultural resources identified in the project area will be evaluated for their inclusion in the CRHR and, if determined to be historical resources (eligible), then a determination of impacts would occur. Each technical report, which includes proposed subsurface work elements, will need to include a buried site sensitivity analysis, which assesses the potential for the location-specific subsequent project study area to contain buried cultural deposits. For areas determined to be sensitive for buried deposits, archaeological monitoring will be required.

If, following the physical survey of the API, and eligibility determination, it is determined that the later activity would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a significant historical resource, then the impact would be less than significant, and no further action is required.

As outlined in CR-1b, if, following the physical survey of the API, and eligibility determination, it is determined that the later activity would cause an adverse change in the significance of a significant historical resource, then the impact would be significant and Mitigation Measures CR-2a through CR-2c will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure CR-2a: Avoid or Relocate Historical/Built Resources.

If significant impacts are identified for historical/built resources after completing Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b, the implementing agency will implement one of the following measures:

- **Avoidance/Redesign:** Avoid historical resource impacts during the design process and require redesign of the Project to avoid impacts.
- **Relocation:** If a historical resource cannot be avoided but can be relocated (if location, setting, and association are not important aspects of its integrity or support the significance of the resource), then the following actions are required:
 - Contact local historical societies, community resource groups, and/or local groups with an interest in the type and/or style of the historical resource who may have a suitable site for relocation.
 - Contact specialized movers of historical resources to develop a plan for preparing of and moving of the resource from its original location and for conducting groundwork necessary for the transplanting of the resource to the new location.
 - Conduct photo documentation of the resource in the original and new locations.

Mitigation Measure CR-2b: Prepare and Implement a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan during Construction.

If historical resources are present in the API and cannot be avoided in the design stages, nor relocated, then the implementing agency will prepare a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan (HRMP) for Construction. The following actions are required in the preparation of the HRMP:

- Survey or photographic documentation of the historical resource before construction begins as a baseline condition for assessing damage
- Preparation of protocols for the documentation of inadvertent damage, should it occur, as well as notification to the appropriate owner and/or jurisdiction
- Strategy for repair of historical resource in accordance with the SOI's Standards

Mitigation Measure CR-2c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Construction.

If noise and/or vibration are considered a potential significant impact of construction, then instrumentation that will capture those impacts will be installed at a suitable location, as necessary (i.e., noise and/or vibration monitors), and qualified preservation architects and/or historic preservation specialists will review the feedback from those instruments on a regular basis. These instruments will monitor the historical resource for physical changes, such as cracks in the exterior material, or inadvertent changes to a historical resource, such as character-defining features falling from a structure, due to increased vibration. A preconstruction survey must be prepared for each individual historical resource to identify existing issues, such as cracks, or other damage, which must include general photos of the historical resource, detailed photos of existing damage, and detailed photos of potentially affected features. Instrumentation may be physically attached to building/structures or placed in close vicinity if damage would occur from the installation of the measuring instruments. Similarly, preconstruction noise surveys will establish base levels of noise if a quiet setting is a

character-defining features of the historic setting. During and post-construction noise measurements must be taken to determine if ambient or specific noise occurrences are present. Thresholds will be determined on a case-to-case basis. If impacts are discovered due to noise and vibration, then a strategy for repair in accordance with the Standards would be required. See Mitigation Measure CR-2b.

Mitigation Measure CR-3a: Avoid Impacts on Historical/Built Resources During Operations.

If historical resources are identified within a project API during design of subsequent projects, indirect effects during operations will be avoided, including redesigning project elements. Specific steps to be taken during operations include but are not limited to the following:

- Secure resource from accessibility or visitation.
- Prepare an operations and maintenance/restoration plan to avoid degradation of resource. Identify a baseline of conditions (e.g., photo-documentation, written documentation) that is stored with the appropriate jurisdiction (e.g., Los Angeles County or other implementing agency) in the plan, with a requirement that the implementing agency or project proponent conduct visual inspection of the historical resource at least twice a year. The baseline condition report must be supplemented with yearly photographs, yearly updates on condition, and any additional reports related to vandalism, accidental damage due to humans or animals, and damage due to weather or earthquakes.

Mitigation Measure CR-3b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan for Operations.

If historical resources are present in the API and potential effects cannot be avoided in the design stages or the resource cannot be relocated, then the implementing agency will prepare an HRMP for operations. The following actions will be implemented for the HRMP.

- Survey or photographic documentation of the historical resource will be completed before construction begins as a baseline condition for assessing damage.
- Protocols for the documentation of inadvertent damage, should it occur, will be prepared, and notification made to the appropriate owner and/or jurisdiction.
- Strategy for repair of historical resource will be developed in accordance with the SOI's Standards.

Mitigation Measure CR-3c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Operations

If it is determined that noise and/or vibration are considered a potential significant impact of operations, then instrumentation that will capture those impacts will be installed (i.e., noise and/or vibration monitors), and the feedback from those instruments will be reviewed on a regular basis by qualified preservation architects and/or historic preservation specialists.

These instruments will monitor the historical resource for physical changes, such as cracks in the exterior material, or inadvertent changes to a historical resource, such as character-defining features falling from a structure, due to increased vibration. A preconstruction survey must be prepared for each individual historical resource to identify existing issues, such as cracks, or other damage, which must include general photos of the historical resource, detailed photos of

existing damage, and detailed photos of potentially affected features. Instrumentation may be physically attached to buildings/structures or placed in close vicinity if damage would occur from the installation of the measuring instruments. Similarly, preconstruction noise surveys will establish base levels of noise if a quiet setting is a character-defining feature of the historic setting. During and post-construction noise measurements must be taken to determine if ambient or specific noise occurrences are present. Thresholds would be determined on a case-to-case basis. If impacts are discovered, then a strategy would be required for repair in accordance with the Standards.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on historical resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on historical resources due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on historical resources cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-2a, CR-2b, CR-2c, CR-3a, CR-3b, and CR-3c would minimize potential impacts on historical resources; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects for both construction and operations under Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are not known, these activities could substantially impact historical resources. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on historical resources. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

Impact 3.4(b): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Previously recorded or unrecorded California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible archaeological resources could be present within the area of potential impacts (API) of subsequent projects. Therefore, the construction of the Typical Projects could destroy, remove, disturb, and alter surface-exposed and buried archaeological resources, resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, and CR-5) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Operation elements, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas, could result from increased public use. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near a CRHR-eligible archaeological resource could directly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use, and otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-6) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in an adverse effect on a significant archaeological resource. Impacts may be direct through proposed ground disturbance that could destroy, remove, disturb, or alter surface-exposed and buried CRHR-eligible archaeological resources. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, and CR-5) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The operation of the KOPs could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources, which include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas due to increased public use, as well as increased potential for looting. These activities could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or

removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-6) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The construction impacts of the 107 projects for the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would be similar to impacts for the KOPs. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to the significance of an archaeological resource, resulting in a significant impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, and CR-5) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The operations impacts of the 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to the impacts of the KOPs, which could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources. Other KOP operations, which include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands, could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-6) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.

(See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist.

The implementing agency will retain a qualified archaeologist defined as an archaeologist who meets the SOI's Standards for professional archaeology to carry out all mitigation measures related to prehistoric and historic period archaeological resources. The qualified archaeologist will be the subsequent project's Principal Investigator and will oversee and direct all archaeologists working on the subsequent project. For TCRs, a Native American Monitor, as determined by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during consultation, will coordinate with the Qualified Archaeologist as needed for mitigation measure implementation.

Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

If significant archaeological sites or TCRs are identified in the API, avoidance, where feasible, is the preferred method of treatment. Impacts on significant archaeological resources can be avoided through establishing fencing around the known boundaries of these resources and delineating these locations as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). Preservation in place of

archaeological materials will maintain the critical relationship between archaeological artifacts and their archaeological context. Additionally, should sacred objects or objects of religious importance to Native American groups be identified, preservation in place avoids conflicts with traditional values of groups who ascribe meaning to these resources.

Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan.

If avoidance is not feasible, and if the subsequent project-related ground disturbance is anticipated to occur at archaeological sites identified as a result of the archaeological fieldwork and inventory efforts, an archaeologist will be present to monitor ground-disturbing activity. If ground-disturbing activities are to proceed at archaeological sites that contain Native American cultural materials, a Native American monitor will be retained, in addition to an archaeological monitor. Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, an Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) will be developed to guide archaeological monitoring work during ground-disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries.

If avoidance is not feasible, and if the subsequent project-related ground disturbance is anticipated to occur at archaeological sites identified as a result of the archaeological fieldwork and inventory efforts, an archaeologist will be present to monitor ground-disturbing activity. If ground-disturbing activities are to proceed at archaeological sites that contain Native American cultural materials, a Native American monitor will be retained, in addition to an archaeological monitor. Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, an Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) will be developed to guide archaeological monitoring work during ground-disturbing activities.

The AMP will be prepared and the Native American Consulting Tribes will be provided the opportunity to review and provide comments. The AMP will outline the requirement to conduct Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resource Awareness Training for construction workers and the qualifications necessary for archaeological monitors. The plan must also detail the locations where archaeological monitoring will take place and the depths of excavation that will require monitoring. The AMP must include roles and responsibilities for cultural resources staff and contact information for the Archaeological Principal Investigator, archaeological and Native American monitors, and appropriate management staff.

The AMP must detail monitoring procedures, discovery protocols, and general procedures for documenting and recovering archaeological materials, artifact identification, repository institution identification, associated repository fees, guidelines for preparing the archaeological monitoring, and the mitigation final report. The AMP must also include protocols for communication and response should an unanticipated discovery be made at times that archaeological monitors are not present.

The AMP must require attendance by construction personnel at a preconstruction meeting led by a Qualified Principal Investigator/Project Archaeologist. The Principal Investigator/Project Archaeologist will explain the likelihood for encountering archaeological resources, what resources may be discovered, and the methods that will be employed if anything is discovered (who to call, construction diversion away from the find, etc.). The AMP must include a sample proposed letter regarding transfer of salvaged materials to an appropriate museum curation

facility, a sample daily monitoring report form, and recordation and analysis forms for all other pertinent archaeological resources.

The Native American monitor should be affiliated with a local Native American tribe. At a minimum, the archaeological monitor will meet the Society for California Archaeology professional qualification standards for an archaeological crew leader and will work under the direction of an individual that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology.

If unanticipated discoveries are made during archaeological monitoring, then the unanticipated discoveries protocol described in Mitigation Measure CR-5 will be enacted. This includes halting ground-disturbing activities for a reasonable period of time, consultation with the lead agency and Native American representatives (if the find is Native American in origin), development of a mitigation plan, and potential development and implementation of a data recovery plan. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the archaeological monitor will follow the HSC 7050.5 (Mitigation Measure CR-7).

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.

If buried cultural resources of potential significance are discovered inadvertently during ground-disturbing activities, work will be temporarily halted in the area and within 50 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the implementing agency. If the find is prehistoric or Native American in origin, consultation with local Native American tribes who have expressed interest and concern regarding the proposed Project will be undertaken.

The implementing agency's Principal Investigator will notify the implementing agency to discuss the significance determination and will also submit a letter indicating next steps required. If the discovery is determined to be not significant in consultation with the implementing agency, work will be permitted to continue in the area. If, in consultation with the implementing agency, a discovery is determined to be significant, the implementing agency will prepare a mitigation plan to be carried out in accordance with state guidelines. If the resource cannot be avoided, the implementing agency will develop a data recovery plan to ensure collection of sufficient information to address archaeological and historical-period research questions, with results presented in a technical report describing field methods, materials collected, and conclusions. The qualified archaeologist will treat recovered items in accordance with current professional standards by properly proveniencing (i.e., establishing the in-situ location at the time of archaeological discovery), cleaning, analyzing, researching, reporting, and curating them in a collection facility meeting the SOI's Standards, as promulgated in 36 CFR 79.

Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.

The implementing agency will avoid significant archaeological resources through establishment of ESAs specific to Typical Projects' operations. If physical portions of previously identified archaeological resources are left in place after construction, then ESAs will be established to protect any remaining physical portions of the resource from further direct or indirect effects that may result as part of operations of Typical Projects. The implementing agency will establish

ESAs in coordination and consultation with Native American Tribes, as necessary. As part of the operational avoidance activities, the implementing agency will:

- Prepare an operations and maintenance plan to minimize degradation of archaeological resources still extant in the API.
- Design and develop interpretive exhibits to provide education and understanding of the importance to avoid the resource.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on archaeological resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on archaeological resources due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on historical resources cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, and CR-6 would minimize potential impacts on archaeological resources; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects for both construction and operations under Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are not known, these activities could substantially impact archaeological resources. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on archaeological resources. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

Impact 3.4(c): Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Existing known cemeteries are not anticipated to be affected under any of the proposed project scenarios for the Typical Projects. However, there is potential for previously unknown prehistoric to historic period burials and unmarked cemeteries to be located in the project study area. Holocene-aged alluvial deposits, which could contain burials and previously unknown human remains, are located in the project study area. This is not uncommon where burials and human remains are located concurrently with certain archaeological site types; therefore, areas with increased sensitivity for containing archaeological deposits maintain an elevated sensitivity for containing human remains. Consequently, construction of the Typical Projects could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure CR-7) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Operations activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure CR-7) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts. Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operations activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities

associated with the KOPs near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources, either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance, or increased looting potential due to increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-6) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the KOPs, construction of all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts.

Similar to the KOPs, potential impacts from operation of the design components for all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operations activities related to the 107 projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to the increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, and CR-7) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.

(See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations. (See above for detail.)**Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.**

If human remains are found, no further disturbance will occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98 (State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5). In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, all work within 50 feet of the find will be halted until the remains have been evaluated by the county coroner, and appropriate action taken in coordination with the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code or, if the remains are Native American, Section 5097.98 of the PRC. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the county coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant. The Most Likely Descendant will complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts to historical resources cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent

feasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, CR-6, and CR-7 would minimize potential impacts on human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects for both construction and operations under Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are not known, these activities could substantially impact archaeological resources. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

8.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

3.7(a): Would the proposed Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of Typical Projects would generate GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Construction of Typical Project is estimated to generate a total of 304 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) over the 19-month construction period. When amortized over a 30-year period, the construction GHG emissions from the Typical Projects would be approximately 10 MTCO_{2e} per year. It should be noted that total and annual construction GHG emissions represent a conservative assessment because GHG emissions would decrease in future years as the construction industry shifts toward implementation of cleaner fuels (i.e., electrified equipment) and more efficient technologies. As such, the annual construction GHG emissions associated with the Typical Projects would decrease over time and are likely to be lower than assumed herein.

Operationally, it is anticipated that buildings would use natural gas, and landscaping equipment would be gasoline powered, both of which are inconsistent with OPR (2018b) guidance. In addition, daily vehicle trips would exceed OPR's (2018a) daily trip screening threshold. Consequently, while emissions from the land use sector would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan,

emissions from the energy, mobile, area, water, and waste sectors would be potentially inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and applicable regulatory programs. Therefore, emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Typical Projects may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b, emissions associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would have a significant impact on the environment, and this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Categories 1 and 4 through 6 would generate GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Because details about KOP Categories 1 through 6 are unknown, GHG emissions associated with construction and operations activities have not been quantified.

It is anticipated that project operations would result in GHG emissions from multiple sources, including energy at the equestrian facilities and light towers, mobile-source emissions from visitor and maintenance vehicle trips, area-source emissions from landscaping equipment used in habitat corridors, water from irrigation of the habitat corridor and use in the water tower, and waste at the equestrian facility. KOP Categories 1 through 6 could affect the State's ability to meet its mobile source GHG reduction targets and could be inconsistent with the long-term GHG reduction goals of the 2017 Scoping Plan. The GHG emissions from non-mobile sectors could also potentially conflict with applicable sector-specific reduction targets and strategies. Therefore, the construction and operation emissions associated with KOP Categories 1 through 6 may have a potentially significant impact on the environment.

Although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project design details (e.g., sustainability features, expected VMT, electricity and natural gas consumption), it cannot be stated with certainty that KOP Categories 1 through 6 would comply with the long-term GHG reduction targets and goals of applicable regulatory programs. With mitigation, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction impacts of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to those described for the KOP categories. Operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* would involve GHG emissions from building natural gas use, stationary sources, worker and visitor vehicle trips, and other sources. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the GHG emissions could also potentially conflict with applicable sector-specific reduction targets and strategies. Therefore, the construction and operation emissions associated with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with GHG emissions for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Implement Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies Specific to Emission Sources of Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on GHG, the following findings are made for operation and construction of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHG due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

The Common Elements Typical Projects and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan's overall goal of avoiding losses in carbon sequestration and limiting land use emissions. The *2020 LA River Master Plan Design Guidelines* for the Common Elements Typical Project related to water, energy, and waste, if implemented, would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan's measures and the State's regulatory programs within these sectors (the Design Guidelines are draft guidelines and will be finalized with adoption of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*). However, while the County would encourage implementation of the Design Guidelines, there is no guarantee that any of these measures will be incorporated into the design of the Common Elements Typical Project given that they are not required and the decision to implement them would be determined by the project proponent. Furthermore, it is anticipated that buildings would use natural gas and landscaping equipment would be gasoline powered, both of which are inconsistent with the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2018a) guidance. In addition, daily vehicle trips would exceed the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (2018b) daily trip screening threshold.

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, GHG emissions were not able to be quantified. Mitigation would be implemented for projects

developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1a, compliance with a minimum of the Design Guidelines for the Common Elements Typical Project related to water, energy, and waste would be required for all new construction. Mitigation would also require electrified buildings and landscaping equipment. Nonetheless, there would still be an increase in VMT from the Project. Mitigation Measure TRA-1b would require various TDM measures to reduce VMT, which would reduce mobile-source emissions. Nonetheless, given the range in the possible size and programmatic intensity of the project elements/design, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigated even with TDM measures. Consequently, while emissions from the land use, energy, area, water, and waste sectors would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan with implementation of mitigation, emissions from the mobile sector would be inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and applicable regulatory programs. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against the applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Therefore, emissions associated with both the construction and operation phases of the Common Elements Typical Project would be significant and unavoidable.

For the six KOP categories, subsequent project-level analyses will identify the appropriate strategies from Mitigation Measure GHG-1a. For example, if, at the time specific project details are known, it can be stated with certainty that KOP Category 3 would not result in emissions associated with a particular sector (e.g., area) outlined in Mitigation Measure GHG-1a, then the corresponding mitigation for that sector (e.g., electric landscaping equipment) would not need to be implemented for that KOP category. Nonetheless, although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project design details (e.g., sustainability features, expected VMT, electricity and natural gas consumption), it cannot be stated with certainty that KOP Categories 1 through 6 would comply with the long-term GHG reduction targets and goals of applicable regulatory programs. Even with mitigation, both construction and operation impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG impacts.

Impact 3.7(b): Would the proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Many of the design components of KOP Categories 1 through 6 (e.g., lookouts, boardwalks, vegetated buffer) are passive (i.e., no emissions are associated with them) and therefore would likely not result in a relatively high amount of GHG emissions during operations. However, operation of these KOP categories would require an unknown amount of electricity during use of water pumps for diversion activities. It should be noted that project operations would not include building energy or stationary sources (e.g., generators). In addition, the lack of specific sites or detailed design information makes it particularly challenging to make informed assumptions about reasonable construction and operations scenarios for KOP Categories 1 through 6. It is assumed that development under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be greater than the Typical Projects, and that associated GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed in detail for the Common Elements Typical Project. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-2, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 would have significant and unavoidable impacts on GHG.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction would involve GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Operation would involve GHG emissions from building natural gas use, stationary sources, worker and visitor vehicle trips, and other sources. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated construction and operation GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed for the Typical Projects. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-2, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would have significant and unavoidable impacts on GHG.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)**Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)**

For the above impacts on GHGs, the following findings are made for operation and construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on GHGs due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Because the applicable policies, plans, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs are relevant to both the construction and operation phases of the proposed Project, discussion of the plan consistency has been combined.

Without specific details on construction and operation of later activities, emissions were not able to be determined to not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty that impacts would be reduced, even with implementation of mitigation measures, to a level less than significant. The lack of specific sites or detailed design information makes it particularly challenging to make informed assumptions about reasonable construction and operations scenarios for the KOP categories. It is assumed that development under the KOP categories would be greater than for the Typical Projects, and that associated GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the KOP categories to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be potentially significant. Although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and GHG-2 would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project details (e.g., expected VMT, proximity to transit centers), it cannot be stated with certainty that the construction and operation of the KOP categories would be consistent with the applicable GHG regulatory programs. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated construction and operation GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed for the Typical

Projects. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce impacts and even with mitigation, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG impacts.

8.5 Land Use and Planning

Impact 3.10(a): Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction)

Off-channel land asset design components would likely entail greater levels of construction than the other five KOP categories and would occur outside the ROW. KOP Category 6 design components would be anticipated to be considerably larger than the other KOP categories' design components, resulting in more extensive environmental effects during construction. This KOP category could occur within established neighborhoods and could result in temporary road closures and obstructions to community facilities, which could divide an established community. For these larger KOP Category 6 design components, a potentially significant impact could occur as a result of physical division of an established community. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during the construction period as a result of physical division of an established community.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan.

The implementing agency will require a construction management plan (CMP) be prepared that will include the following elements:

- No construction staging will be allowed within residential neighborhoods.
- Construction workers will park in a specified off-site location and be shuttled to and from the construction site. Local residential neighborhoods will not be used for construction worker parking under any circumstances.
- The CMP will provide a traffic control plan that identifies the location and timing of temporary closures and detours of public streets with the goal of maintaining traffic flow, especially during peak travel periods. The CMP will be site specific and include, at a minimum, signage to alert drivers to the construction zone, traffic control methods, traffic speed limitations, and alternative access and detour provisions during road closures. Local police and fire departments will be consulted during preparation of the CMP.
- Require signs to be posted at least 30 days prior to construction to inform community members that construction will begin, provide detour signage, and wayfinding to nearby amenities during LA River pathway closure. See also REC-1.
- Any temporary closure or removal of parking areas or roadways during construction will be temporary and will be restored upon completion of construction. Efforts will be made to minimize their removal or shorten the length of time that these facilities are inoperable to the extent possible.
- Construction hours and parking for construction vehicles will be implemented; freight and passenger rail services will be protected; and truck routes and construction for special events during project construction, bicycle and pedestrian access, and transit access will be maintained. Screening will be provided for all construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible.
- Alternative access to community facilities and neighborhood-serving commercial uses will be provided if access is obstructed by construction activities.

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on land use and planning, the following findings are made for construction of KOP Category 6, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on land use and planning due to the proposed Project for construction of Category 6 are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Off-channel land asset projects would likely entail greater levels of construction for KOP Category 6 than for the Typical Projects and the other five KOP categories and would occur outside the ROW. Design components under KOP Category 6 could be considerably larger than design components under the other KOP categories, resulting in more extensive environmental effects during construction. These projects could occur within established neighborhoods and result in temporary road closures and obstructions to community facilities, which could divide an established community.

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on established communities cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during the construction period as a result of physical division of an established community. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on established communities. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

Impact 3.10(b): Would the proposed Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 and 2 (Operation)

Minor inconsistencies with applicable land use policies could occur under KOP Categories 1 and 2, such as if a subsequent project would conflict with planned land uses on adjacent parcels, be incompatible with adjacent land uses, or result in out-of-scale development. Subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 and 2 could consist of multi-use trails, a recreational use, or a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions. These subsequent projects would not be located within residential neighborhoods and would provide additional recreational uses serving visitors and residents. KOP Categories 1 and 2 would not be expected to result in inconsistency with these goals, but the potential remains for a significant impact to occur. Although Mitigation Measure LU-4 would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 and 2 could result in inconsistencies with these goals, and a significant and unavoidable impact could occur.

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

Larger off-channel land asset projects under KOP Category 6, such as affordable housing and museums, would entail greater levels of construction than the other five KOP categories. As it is unknown the location and extent of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6, there could be inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, a potentially significant impact. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-4, a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during construction and operation.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

While temporary inconsistencies with land use plans and policies could occur during construction, these would be minimized with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, which would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels for KOP Categories 1, 2, 4, and 5 for later activities when carried out by the County, but would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County. Subsequent projects under KOP Category 3 could result in out-of-scale development despite implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4, which would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. For KOP Category 6, impacts would be significant and unavoidable for construction and operation.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See above for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-4: Site Selection Process.

To avoid potential project inconsistency with applicable land use plans, the following will be implemented:

- During the site selection process, as specific projects under the KOP category are developed, the implementing agency will consult with the affected jurisdiction to determine if potential inconsistencies with land use plans and policies could occur.
- Results of the consultation could include:
 - Selection of an alternative site
 - Revision or substitution of specific project components (alternative design)
 - Reduction in size of the project
 - Abandonment of the project

The results of the consultation will be documented in writing, with written concurrence from the affected jurisdiction, and incorporated into the implementing agency's project file.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on land use and planning, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Categories 1 and 2, and construction and operation of KOP Category 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on land use and planning due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Categories 1, and 2 and construction and operation of KOP Category 6 and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Larger off-channel land asset design components in KOP Category 6, such as affordable housing and museums, would entail greater levels of construction than under the other five KOP categories. Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts related to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or reducing an environmental effect cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Despite implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, if further CEQA review determines a potentially significant impact could occur from construction of

the specific design components proposed under KOP Category 6 and no feasible mitigation is available, a significant and unavoidable impact for KOP Category 6 could occur under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. This conclusion of significant and unavoidable impacts also applies to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects regarding conflicting with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Minor inconsistencies with applicable land use policies could occur, such as if a design component under KOP Categories 1 and 2 would conflict with planned land uses on adjacent parcels, be incompatible with adjacent land uses, or result in out-of-scale development. Projects under KOP Categories 1 and 2 would consist of multi-use trails, a recreational use, or a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions to provide additional recreation uses serving visitors and residents, and would not be within residential neighborhoods and therefore would not be expected to result in inconsistency with the goals listed in Table 3.10-7 of the Draft PEIR. As it is unknown the location and extent of subsequent projects that could operate under KOP Category 6, in the absence of specific details (e.g., type of project, detailed design, location, size), it cannot be stated with certainty whether there would be inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. However, the potential remains for a significant impact to occur despite implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4. Should further CEQA review determine that a potential impact could occur from operation of the specific design components proposed under KOP Categories 1, 2, and 6, and no further feasible mitigation is available, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur. This conclusion of significant and unavoidable impacts also applies to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

8.6 Noise

Impact 3.12(a): Would the proposed Project result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Significant Effect

Typical Project (City of Vernon) (Construction)

Most land uses within the City of Vernon's jurisdiction within one-tenth of a mile of the LA River are commercial/industrial; however, there are some residential land uses within this area. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 4 is ST11 along the LA River, within the City of Vernon. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 64 dBA L_{eq} . Table 3.12-9 in Section 3.9, *Noise*, of the Draft PEIR indicates that construction noise levels associated with Typical Projects would be 87 dBA L_{eq} during the noisiest phase of construction. Construction noise levels of this nature would be expected to attenuate by approximately 19 dB, not accounting for intervening structures or anomalous and atmospheric spreading. Therefore, noise levels from construction would attenuate to approximately 68 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors within the City of Vernon.

Although Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would be implemented during construction for Typical Projects, construction could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on noise.

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

The specific location and design for the Off-Channel Land Assets design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including location of the improvements, complement of construction equipment, project proponent, and availability of funding. Considering this KOP includes a variety of construction activities, construction impacts of KOP Category 6 cannot be directly quantified as the specific design details, sizes, and locations are not known. Construction noise associated with these projects cannot be associated comparatively with any construction element listed herein due to the uncertainty with these types of projects. Therefore, depending on the jurisdiction in which the KOP Category 6 project occurs, construction would result in potentially significant impacts. Even with mitigation (Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3), impacts would still be significant and unavoidable.

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the Off-Channel Land Assets KOP would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location. Considering the uncertainty associated with the location, surrounding potential land uses, and general activity that could occur at these locations as they relate to noise, quantification of these types of impacts is not possible at this time. Therefore, impacts could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on noise. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-6, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As described above, the Typical Projects and six KOP categories under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would comply with jurisdictional thresholds and requirements for both construction and operations

incumbent within the municipal codes, general plans, and planning documents as it relates to noise. Inclusion of mitigation measures would help reduce impacts and compliance with the jurisdictional thresholds and requirements. However, given the uncertainty as to the location and extent of projects associated with the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is possible that impacts would not be reduced to less-than-significant levels. As such, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Prepare Construction Noise Work and Mitigation Monitoring Plan. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Obtain Conditional Use Permit and Implement its Requirements during Construction Activities. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Require Noise-Reducing Practices Be Incorporated into Construction Activities. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-4: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings to Reduce HVAC Noise. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-5: Prepare Focused Noise Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-6: Prepare a Noise Study. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, the following findings are made for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project (City of Vernon), construction and operation of KOP Category 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise due to the proposed Project for construction of the Common Elements Typical Project (City of Vernon), construction and operation of KOP Category 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Inclusion of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 and compliance with the jurisdictional codes and planning documents would reduce impacts. Inclusion of Mitigation Measure LU-4, preparation of a focused noise study, and implementation of site-specific mitigation measures identified in that noise study would reduce impacts. Implementation of mitigation measure NOI-2 would require the implementing agency to obtain a conditional use permit with the City of Vernon. As there is no guarantee that the city would approve the application for a conditional use permit, this mitigation measure cannot reduce impacts to less than significant with mitigation. For similar reasons, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-5, operational impacts could remain significant and unavoidable for the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

Impact 3.12(b): Would the proposed Project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**Significant Effect****KOP Category 6 (Construction)**

The specific location and design for the Off-Channel Land Assets design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including location of the improvements, complement of construction equipment, project proponent, and availability of funding. Considering this KOP includes a variety of construction activities, including but not limited to affordable housing, recreation fields, urban agriculture/composting, and arts and culture facilities, construction impacts of KOP Category 6 cannot be directly quantified as the specific locations are not known. Construction vibration associated with these projects cannot be quantified as to the effects on any surrounding land uses. Therefore, depending on the jurisdiction in which the KOP Category 6 project occurs, construction would result in potentially significant impacts even with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-9.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the vibrational impacts considered together could also potentially result in significant impacts by exceeding thresholds established by the jurisdictions.

Although Mitigation Measures NOI-7, NOI-8, and NOI-9 would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project design details (e.g., scale of project design, construction equipment, construction duration, nearby sensitive receptors and land uses), it cannot be stated with certainty that vibration impacts could be reduced to levels below the thresholds set by the jurisdictions. As such, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

Mitigation Measure NOI-7: Locate Project 200 Feet or more from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-8: Locate Project 400 Feet or more from Occupied Structures or Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure NOI-9: Prepare Vibration Study and Implement Findings. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on noise, the following findings are made for construction of KOP Category 6 and construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on noise due to the proposed Project for construction of KOP Category 6 and construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels cannot be quantified. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to

ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Inclusion of Mitigation Measure NOI-7 and compliance with the jurisdictional codes and planning documents would reduce impacts. However, it cannot be stated with certainty that vibration impacts could be reduced to levels below the County's 0.01 peak particle velocity threshold. As such, construction impacts associated with KOP Category 6 could be significant and unavoidable. For similar reasons, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-7 through NOI-9, construction impacts could remain significant and unavoidable for the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

8.7 Public Services

3.14(a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- Fire protection
- Police protection
- Schools
- Parks
- Other Public Facilities

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)

Police and Fire Protection

Operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5 could result in a substantial increase of daily users such that there could be an increase in demand on police protection services. A higher density of visitors to the area could result in more incidents that could require police intervention or fire services. Most of the visitors to the KOP categories that include recreational amenities are expected to be current residents of the service area of the providers within or in the vicinity of the study area.

KOP Category 6 could include affordable housing that could increase resident populations; however, affordable housing that could occur under the KOP category would accommodate growth that is already projected in local and regional plans. Existing residents and the potential for growth in population are accounted for in regional growth plans, such as the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) SoCal Connect, which is based on individual jurisdictions' growth projections. All police and fire services consider staffing and facility needs on an ongoing basis and during the annual budgeting process; they also account for projected population growth. However, increases in the number of visitors and residents could result in an increase in the number of incidents requiring police and/or fire response, which could affect police and fire provider service ratios and response times and result in a need for additional law enforcement and emergency staff. This could result in a need for increased patrols or new bicycle facilities or amenities under the KOP categories. KOP categories could also be situated in areas that have coverage issues for police and fire protection that have not yet been addressed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 would lessen the impacts associated with the proposed Project. Because the size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, it is anticipated that impacts would be potentially significant.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As described in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is anticipated that approximately 107 projects ranging in size from extra-small (less than 1 acre) to extra-large (150+ acres/10+ miles) would be implemented over the 25-year period to meet the *2020 LA River Master Plan's* nine objectives. These would include the Typical Projects that would be implemented along the river, and subsequent projects composed of the KOP categories' multi-benefit design components. There may be localized road closures and detours that could increase response times for emergency services. Mitigation Measure LU-1 would minimize construction impacts; however, because the size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, impacts would be potentially significant for police and fire services.

Increases in the number of visitors and residents to project areas could result in an increase in the number of incidents requiring police response, which could affect police provider service ratios and response times and result in a need for additional law enforcement staff. Given that the proposed Project includes parks, recreation areas, and open space, it is unlikely the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in a significant increase in the use of and demand for other park facilities. The projects pursuant to the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not anticipated to result in a significant increase in population that would substantially increase school enrollment or library service. However, because the overall size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, impacts would remain potentially significant for police and fire protection.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure PS-1: Ensure Police and Fire Service Providers Have Adequate Resources.

During subsequent project design and development, the implementing agency will regularly notify and coordinate with police and fire service providers that have jurisdiction over subsequent project sites on project construction design, activities, and scheduling—including any street or lane closures related to subsequent projects—to ensure police and fire service providers have adequate resources to continue to serve the project area within their respective required levels of service and response times once the subsequent project is constructed.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on public services, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on public services due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on police and fire services cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 would minimize potential impacts on fire and police services; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could substantially impact the service ratios. Mitigation

Measure LU-1 requires a construction management plan, which would assist in reducing potential impacts on fire and police response times. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on police and fire services. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.14.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's public services impacts.

8.8 Recreation

Impact 3.15(b): Would the proposed Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Significant Effect

Throughout all nine frames, the proposed Project would include the construction and operation of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Construction could require demolition, grading, and excavation activities and the construction of permanent facilities. These activities would result in a temporary increase in noise and an increase in air quality construction-related emissions, and could also have impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, hydrology and water quality, land use, traffic, and utilities. Additionally, the operation of new and expanded recreational facilities may result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Refer to the following sections in the Draft PEIR for detailed descriptions of the proposed Project and potential environmental impacts: 3.1, *Aesthetics*; 3.2, *Air Quality*; 3.3, *Biological Resources*; 3.4, *Cultural Resources*; 3.5, *Energy*; 3.6, *Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources*; 3.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*; 3.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; 3.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; 3.10, *Land Use and Planning*; 3.11, *Mineral Resources*; 3.12, *Noise*; 3.13, *Population and Housing*; 3.14, *Public Services*; 3.16, *Transportation*; 3.17, *Tribal Cultural Resources*; 3.18, *Utilities and Service Systems*; and 3.19, *Wildfire*.

Aesthetics

Impact 3.1(a) Would the proposed Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

Scenic vistas within the study area are limited in nature, with the viewshed largely consisting of an urban hardscape with limited scenic resources. Where scenic vistas are available, views encompass larger scenic visual elements and/or panoramic views of the Pacific Ocean, ridgelines, hillsides, or large open park and greenspace areas that encapsulate a large viewscape viewed from multiple vantage points. However, once constructed, above-ground structures related to KOP Category 6, if located in an area encompassing a scenic vista, could result in substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista or obscure a panoramic view. Because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas. Although proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-2) would be implemented, KOP Category 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or obscure a panoramic view.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Due to the unknown nature of the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is possible that they could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas. Impacts would be potentially significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure AES-2) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or obscure a panoramic view.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AES-2: Minimize Obstruction of Scenic Vistas. (See Section 8.1, *Aesthetics*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.1.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

Air Quality

Impact 3.2(b): Would the proposed Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area with respect to the applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Implementation of the KOP categories would result in the generation of air pollutant emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, trips by heavy-duty haul trucks, earthwork activities, and other construction activities. Such emissions could exceed construction thresholds for regional and localized pollutant emissions depending on the

schedules, equipment used, and material movement required. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and GHG-2) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Operation of the KOP categories would generate air pollutant emissions associated with motor vehicle trips, onsite consumption of natural gas for space and water heating, onsite use of solvents and consumer products, landscaping, and other sources. Emissions could exceed operational thresholds for regional and localized pollutant emissions depending on project details. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, GHG-1a, and GHG-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The impact discussion above for the six KOP categories would similarly apply to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* for both construction and operation. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in a substantial adverse effect on regional or localized emissions thresholds.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Require Cleaner Construction Equipment and Vehicles and Low-VOC Coatings. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Implement Operations Strategies to Reduce VOC Emissions. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

Impact 3.2(c): Would the proposed Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

For the Typical Projects, without specific details on the locations of construction activities, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where diesel particulate matter emissions could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-3, and GHG-2) would be implemented, construction of

Typical Projects could result in DPM emissions could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

During the operations period for the Typical Projects, criteria pollutant emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or risk. It is not anticipated that the Common Elements Typical Project would exceed the most stringent 1-hour carbon monoxide standard and no detailed carbon monoxide hot-spots analysis would be required. However, without specific details on the locations of building footprints, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where DPM emissions from operations could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, construction of the Typical Projects could result in DPM emissions that could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

As discussed above for Impact 3.2(b), implementation of the KOP categories would result in the generation of air pollutant emissions during construction activities. Unlike the Typical Projects, such emissions could exceed construction thresholds and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, depending on the schedules, equipment used, and material movement required. These emissions, if left unmitigated, could contribute to ground-level ozone formation in the SCAB, which at certain concentrations, can contribute to short- and long-term human health effects. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-2, AQ-3, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b [and Mitigation Measure AQ-4 for KOP Category 6]) would be implemented, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in DPM emissions that could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in criteria pollutant and TAC emissions. Because details about the *2020 LA River Master Plan* construction scenario are unknown, emissions associated with the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* have not been quantified. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations resulting in health risks could result in a significant impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4, GHG-1a, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, it cannot be stated that health risks from operations activities would be reduced to a level that would be below SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Require Cleaner Construction Equipment and Vehicles and Low-VOC Coatings. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Implement Operations Strategies to Reduce VOC Emissions. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Require Subsequent Projects that Exceed the SCAQMD LSTs and Are within 1,000 Feet of Sensitive Receptors to Perform a Health Risk Assessment and Implement Measures to Reduce Health Risks. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Require Subsequent Projects with Sensitive Receptors within 1,000 Feet of Existing Toxic Air Contaminant Hazards to Perform a Health Risk Assessment. (See Section 8.2, *Air Quality*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.2.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

Cultural Resources

Impact 3.4(a): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects would involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials to build facilities such as cafés, pavilions, restrooms, multi-use trails, art/performance spaces. Construction would generally occur along the ROW and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways) and last 10 to 20 months, respectively. Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation. Excavation would be to a maximum depth of 7 feet below ground surface (bgs) to construct pavilions and install footings for bollards, lighting, or fences and generally 2 feet bgs for trails.

Depending on the specific design and location of the project, as well as the type of cultural resource(s) that could be located on or near the site, construction of the Typical Projects may cause a substantial adverse change in historical resources in or near the Typical Project area. As discussed in Section 3.4.3.2, *Resources Identified in the Project Study Area*, of the Draft PEIR, segments of the Channel have been found eligible as contributing features of a potential historic district that includes the 51-mile-long Channel; character-defining features of the Channel that have been called out specifically are the parapet paved berms, trapezoidal channels, and central trench at the bottom. New construction has the potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources or alter character-defining features of historical resources, and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact.

Activities related to the operation of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects have the potential to cause substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. For example, impacts could include damage to historical resources due to water and/or waste leakages from hygiene facilities, restrooms, and/or water features; if historical

resources are integrated into the design of the proposed Project, increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Depending on the project design and location, presence or absence of historical resources, and the character-defining features of the historical resource, the impact could be significant.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Within all frames, the Common Elements Typical Project analyzed above could be implemented in whole or as a combination of its individual elements with all the KOP categories discussed below. Therefore, for potential impacts of Common Elements Typical Projects, see above. The impact discussion below focuses on specific KOPs only. Appendix E of the Draft PEIR presents a summary table of potential construction and operations impacts under each KOP category.

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar and involve a variety of tasks and features, ranging from trail modifications to development of facilities, habitat corridors, flood management infrastructure, channel access ramps, affordable housing, and solar fields anywhere in the project study area. Design components of these KOPs may cause a substantial adverse change to historical resources in or near the project area. New construction has the potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources, or alter character-defining features of historical resources and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. Therefore, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources.

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including whether it is in-channel or off-channel. The specific location and design for these components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, operation of the KOPs could result in direct and indirect impacts on historical resources, including physical damage to historical resources within or along the proposed trails, due to intentional (i.e., vandalism) or inadvertent (i.e., accidental collision) actions. For example, the introduction of an amphitheater could affect the integrity of a sensitive historical resource due to the increase in noise, vibration, light, and/or glare. Considering the KOPs include a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions, and would involve landscapes, parks, and recreational facilities, operation of the KOPs could include such impacts as ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources.

These activities also could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded significant archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features, floodplain storage, and wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or buried cultural resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction impacts would be the same as for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some subsequent projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction

equipment and activities would be involved (e.g., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators). As noted, some subsequent projects would be larger than others and include a wide variety of design components. Similar to the reasons identified above for the Typical Projects, the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact.

The operations impacts for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be the same as for Typical Projects and KOPs described above. When constructed and operational, the 107 projects would include a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions, and would involve landscapes, parks, and recreational facilities, and could include such impacts as ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources. Activities related to these 107 projects have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, including damage to historical resources; if historical resources are integrated into the design of the proposed Project, then increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Therefore, the impact could be significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-2a: Avoid or Relocate Historical/Built Resources. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-2b: Prepare and Implement a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan during Construction. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-2c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Construction. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-3a: Avoid Impacts on Historical/Built Resources During Operations. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-3b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan for Operations. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-3c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Operations. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

Impact 3.4(b): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*Significant Effect*Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Construction would occur along the ROW and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways) and last about 10 to 20 months, respectively. Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation. Excavation would be to a maximum depth of 7 feet bgs to construct pavilions and install footings for bollards, lighting, or fences, and generally 2 feet bgs for trails. Previously recorded or unrecorded CRHR-eligible archaeological resources could be present within the API of subsequent projects. Therefore, the construction of the Typical Projects could destroy, remove, disturb, and alter surface-exposed and buried archaeological resources, resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource.

Operation elements, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas, could result from increased public use. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near a CRHR-eligible archaeological resource could directly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use, and otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-6) would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in an adverse effect on a significant archaeological resource. Impacts may be direct through proposed ground disturbance that could destroy, remove, disturb, or alter surface-exposed and buried CRHR-eligible archaeological resources.

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs would vary depending on the specific component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including in-channel or off-channel. The specific location and design for these components has not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft PEIR and under the construction section above, the KOPs include a variety of construction scenarios that include ground-disturbing activities. The operation of the KOPs could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources, which include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas due to increased public use, as well as increased potential for looting. These activities could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The construction impacts of the 107 projects for the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would be similar to impacts for the KOPs. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved (i.e., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators, etc.). As noted, the projects are expected to be constructed over a 25-year period. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to the significance of an archaeological resource, resulting in a significant impact.

The operations impacts of the 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to the impacts of the KOPs, which could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources. These impacts include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas, due to increased public use and increased potential for looting. These activities could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Other KOP operations, which include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands, could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

Impact 3.4(c): Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Existing known cemeteries are not anticipated to be affected under any of the proposed project scenarios for the Typical Projects. However, there is potential for previously unknown prehistoric to historic period burials and unmarked cemeteries to be located in the project study area. Holocene-aged alluvial deposits, which could contain burials and previously unknown human remains, are located in the project study area. This is not uncommon where burials and human remains are located concurrently with certain archaeological site types; therefore, areas with increased sensitivity for containing archaeological deposits maintain an elevated sensitivity for containing human remains.

Construction of the Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Construction would occur along the ROW and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways). Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation up to a maximum depth of 7 feet bgs for pavilions, footings for bollards, lighting, or fences, and generally 2 feet bgs for trails. Any disturbance of human remains is considered significant. Therefore, construction of the Typical Projects could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains.

Operations activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts.

Similar to the Typical Projects, potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operations activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists

and trail users near new facilities associated with the KOPs near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources, either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance, or increased looting potential due to increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Similar to the KOPs, construction of all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts.

Similar to the KOPs, potential impacts from operation of the design components for all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operations activities related to the 107 projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to the increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.4.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 3.7(a): Would the proposed Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of Typical Projects would generate GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Construction of Typical Project is estimated to generate a total of 304 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) over the 19-month construction period. When amortized over a 30-year period, the construction GHG emissions from the Typical Projects would be approximately 10 MTCO_{2e} per year. It should be noted that total and annual construction GHG emissions represent a conservative assessment because GHG emissions would decrease in future years as the construction industry shifts toward implementation of cleaner fuels (i.e., electrified equipment) and more efficient technologies. As such, the annual construction GHG emissions associated with the Typical Projects would decrease over time and are likely to be lower than assumed herein.

Operationally, it is anticipated that buildings would use natural gas, and landscaping equipment would be gasoline powered, both of which are inconsistent with OPR (2018b) guidance. In addition, daily vehicle trips would exceed OPR's (2018a) daily trip screening threshold. Consequently, while emissions from the land use sector would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan, emissions from the energy, mobile, area, water, and waste sectors would be potentially inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and applicable regulatory programs. Therefore, emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Typical Projects may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b, emissions associated with the Common Elements Typical Project would have a significant impact on the environment, and this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Construction of KOP Categories 1 and 4 through 6 would generate GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Because details about KOP Categories 1 through 6 are unknown, GHG emissions associated with construction and operations activities have not been quantified.

It is anticipated that project operations would result in GHG emissions from multiple sources, including energy at the equestrian facilities and light towers, mobile-source emissions from visitor and maintenance vehicle trips, area-source emissions from landscaping equipment used in habitat corridors, water from irrigation of the habitat corridor and use in the water tower, and waste at the equestrian facility. KOP Categories 1 through 6 could affect the State's ability to meet its mobile source GHG reduction targets and could be inconsistent with the long-term GHG reduction goals of the 2017 Scoping Plan. The GHG emissions from non-mobile sectors could also potentially conflict with applicable sector-specific reduction targets and strategies. Therefore, the construction and operation emissions associated with KOP Categories 1 through 6 may have a potentially significant impact on the environment.

Although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project design details (e.g., sustainability features, expected VMT, electricity and natural gas consumption), it cannot be stated with certainty that KOP Categories 1 through 6 would comply with the long-term GHG reduction targets and goals of applicable regulatory programs. With mitigation, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction impacts of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to those described for the KOP categories. Operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* would involve GHG emissions from building natural gas use, stationary sources, worker and visitor vehicle trips, and other sources. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the GHG emissions could also potentially conflict with applicable sector-specific reduction targets and strategies. Therefore, the construction and operation emissions associated with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* may have a potentially significant impact on the environment. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with GHG emissions for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-1b: Implement Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies Specific to Emission Sources of Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG impacts.

Impact 3.7(b): Would the proposed Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*Significant Effect*KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

Many of the design components of KOP Categories 1 through 6 (e.g., lookouts, boardwalks, vegetated buffer) are passive (i.e., no emissions are associated with them) and therefore would likely not result in a relatively high amount of GHG emissions during operations. However, operation of these KOP categories would require an unknown amount of electricity during use of water pumps for diversion activities. It should be noted that project operations would not include building energy or stationary sources (e.g., generators). In addition, the lack of specific sites or detailed design information makes it particularly challenging to make informed assumptions about reasonable construction and operations scenarios for KOP Categories 1 through 6. It is assumed that development under KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be greater than the Typical Projects, and that associated GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed in detail for the Common Elements Typical Project. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-2, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 would have significant and unavoidable impacts on GHG.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction would involve GHG emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, construction worker vehicle trips, material deliveries, and trips by heavy-duty haul trucks. Operation would involve GHG emissions from building natural gas use, stationary sources, worker and visitor vehicle trips, and other sources. Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated construction and operation GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed for the Typical Projects. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, GHG-2, and TRA-1b) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would have significant and unavoidable impacts on GHG.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1a: Implement Sector-Specific Operations GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Implement Construction GHG Emissions Reduction Strategies. (See Section 7.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.7.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's GHG impacts.

Land Use and Planning

Impact 3.10(a): Would the proposed Project physically divide an established community?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Construction)

Off-channel land asset design components would likely entail greater levels of construction than the other five KOP categories and would occur outside the ROW. KOP Category 6 design components would be anticipated to be considerably larger than the other KOP categories' design components, resulting in more extensive environmental effects during construction. This KOP category could occur within established neighborhoods and could result in temporary road closures and obstructions to community facilities, which could divide an established community. For these larger KOP Category 6 design components, a potentially significant impact could occur as a result of physical division of an established community. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during the construction period as a result of physical division of an established community.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

Impact 3.10(b): Would the proposed Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 and 2 (Operation)

Minor inconsistencies with applicable land use policies could occur under KOP Categories 1 and 2, such as if a subsequent project would conflict with planned land uses on adjacent parcels, be incompatible with adjacent land uses, or result in out-of-scale development. Subsequent projects under KOP Categories 1 and 2 could consist of multi-use trails, a recreational use, or a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions. These subsequent projects would not be located within residential neighborhoods and would provide additional recreational uses serving visitors and residents. KOP Categories 1 and 2 would not be expected to result in inconsistency with these goals, but the potential remains for a significant impact to occur. Although Mitigation Measure LU-4 would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 and 2 could result in inconsistencies with these goals and a significant and unavoidable impact could occur.

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

Larger off-channel land asset projects under KOP Category 6, such as affordable housing and museums would entail greater levels of construction than the other five KOP categories. As it is unknown the location and extent of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6, there could be inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, a potentially significant impact. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1, LU-2, and LU-4a a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during construction and operation.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

While temporary inconsistencies with land use plans and policies could occur during construction, these would be minimized with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, which would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels for KOP Categories 1, 2, 4, and 5 for later activities when carried out by the County, but would be significant and unavoidable for later activities when not carried out by the County. Subsequent projects under KOP Category 3 could result in out-of-scale development despite implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4, which would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. For KOP Category 6, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-2: Consultation. (See Section 7.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure LU-4: Site Selection Process. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.10.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use and planning impacts.

Noise

Impact 3.12(a): Would the proposed Project result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

*Significant Effect*Typical Project (City of Vernon) (Construction)

Most land uses within the City of Vernon's jurisdiction within one-tenth of a mile of the LA River are commercial/industrial; however, there are some residential land uses within this area. The closest ambient field measurement conducted within Frame 4 is ST11 along the LA River, within the City of Vernon. Ambient noise levels at this location measured 64 dBA L_{eq} . Table 3.12-9 in Section 3.9, *Noise*, of the Draft PEIR indicates that construction noise levels associated with Typical Projects would be 87 dBA L_{eq} during the noisiest phase of construction. Construction noise levels of this nature would be expected to attenuate by approximately 19 dB, not accounting for intervening structures or

anomalous and atmospheric spreading. Therefore, noise levels from construction would attenuate to approximately 68 dBA at noise-sensitive receptors within the City of Vernon.

KOP Category 6 (Construction and Operation)

The specific location and design for the Off-Channel Land Assets design components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including location of the improvements, complement of construction equipment, project proponent, and availability of funding. Considering this KOP includes a variety of construction activities, construction impacts of KOP Category 6 cannot be directly quantified as the specific design details, sizes, and locations are not known. Construction noise associated with these projects cannot be associated comparatively with any construction element listed herein due to the uncertainty with these types of projects. Therefore, depending on the jurisdiction in which the KOP Category 6 project occurs, construction would result in potentially significant impacts. Even with mitigation (Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, and NOI-3), impacts would still be significant and unavoidable.

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the Off-Channel Land Assets KOP would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location. Considering the uncertainty associated with the location, surrounding potential land uses, and general activity that could occur at these locations as they relate to noise, quantification of these types of impacts is not possible at this time. Therefore, impacts could result in significant and unavoidable impacts regarding noise. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-6, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As described above, the Typical Projects and six KOP categories under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would comply with jurisdictional thresholds and requirements for both construction and operations incumbent within the municipal codes, general plans, and planning documents as they relate to noise. Inclusion of mitigation measures and preparation of a focused noise study would help reduce impacts and compliance with the jurisdictional thresholds and requirements. However, given the uncertainty as to the location and extent of projects associated with the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is possible that impacts would not be reduced to less-than-significant levels. As such, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Obtain Conditional Use Permit and Implement its Requirements during Construction Activities. (See Section 7.9, *Noise*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.12.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

Public Services

Impact 3.14(a): Would the proposed Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- ***Fire protection***
- ***Police protection***
- ***Schools***
- ***Parks***
- ***Other Public Facilities***

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operations)

Police and Fire Protection

Operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5 could result in a substantial increase of daily users such that there could be an increase in demand on police protection services. A higher density of visitors to the area could result in more incidents that could require police intervention or fire services. Most of the visitors to the KOP categories that include recreational amenities are expected to be current residents of the service area of the providers within or in the vicinity of the study area.

KOP Category 6 could include affordable housing that could increase resident populations; however, affordable housing that could occur under the KOP category would accommodate growth that is already projected in local and regional plans. Existing residents and the potential for growth in population are accounted for in regional growth plans, such as SCAG's SoCal Connect, which is based on individual jurisdictions' growth projections. All police and fire services consider staffing and facility needs on an ongoing basis and during the annual budgeting process; they also account for projected population growth. However, increases in the number of visitors and residents could result in an increase in the number of incidents requiring police and/or fire response, which could affect police and fire provider service ratios and response times and result in a need for additional law enforcement and emergency staff. This could result in a need for increased patrols of new bicycle facilities or amenities under the KOP categories. KOP categories could also be situated in areas that have coverage issues for police and fire protection that have not yet been addressed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 would lessen the impacts associated with the project. Because the size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, it is anticipated that impacts would be potentially significant.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

As described in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is anticipated that approximately 107 projects ranging in size from extra-small (less than 1 acre) to extra-large (150+ acres/10+ miles) would be implemented over the 25-year period to meet the *2020 LA River Master Plan's* nine objectives. These would include the Typical Projects that would be implemented along the river, and subsequent

projects composed of the KOP categories' multi-benefit design components. There may be localized road closures and detours that could increase response times for emergency services. Mitigation Measure LU-1 would minimize construction impacts; however, because the size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, impacts would be potentially significant for police and fire services.

The 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be constructed in accordance with current building and fire/life/safety ordinance and codes, including all applicable jurisdictional code requirements related to construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants. Increases in the number of visitors and residents could result in an increase in the number of incidents requiring police response, which could affect police provider service ratios and response times and result in a need for additional law enforcement staff. Given that the proposed Project includes parks, recreation areas, and open space, it is unlikely the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan* would result in a significant increase in the use of and demand for other park facilities. The projects pursuant to the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not anticipated to result in a significant increase in population that would substantially increase school enrollment or library service. However, because the overall size, extent, and location of the projects are unknown, impacts would remain potentially significant for police and fire protection.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Construction Management Plan. (See Section 8.5, *Land Use and Planning*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure PS-1: Ensure Police and Fire Service Providers Have Adequate Resources. (See Section 8.7, *Public Services*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.14.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's public services impacts.

Transportation

Impact 3.16(b): Would the proposed project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Tables 3.16-2 and 3.16-3 in Section 3.16, *Transportation*, of the Draft PEIR show all of the design components that could be constructed for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. As shown in these two tables, the majority of the design components are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, 11 design components were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, the majority of the design components for KOP Categories 1 through 6 are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact.

However, 11 design components identified in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft PEIR were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, the majority of the design components for overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, 11 design components identified in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft PEIR were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. As stated in Appendix I of the Draft PEIR, each individual project's potential to result in a significant transportation impact would need to be evaluated by the project proponent when the project's exact location, configuration, and scale are known, and cannot be determined based on the current level of project specificity. Further VMT analysis will continue to be required for any project containing one of these potentially impactful project elements. Therefore, while the likelihood of an impact arising from implementation of the full *2020 LA River Master Plan* decreases over time, the impact on VMT is determined to be potentially significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT. (See Section 8.9, *Transportation*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

Utilities/Service Systems

Impact 3.18(a): Would the proposed Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Operation)

Operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5 would require the use of electricity, natural gas, and water, and could generate wastewater and solid waste. There could be potentially significant impacts with regard to sufficient supply/capacity for one or more utilities for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

Operational impacts on utilities for projects under KOP Category 6 would vary depending on the type of project. A housing or wastewater treatment facility project, for example, would demand greater amounts of water, electricity, and natural gas than spreading grounds or dry wells, which would not be expected to demand these utilities. These projects would be evaluated on a subsequent-project-specific and location-specific basis to determine the level of impact, if any, on utilities. Because the extent of these projects is unknown, there could be localized insufficiencies of utility services that could require expansion of existing infrastructure or construction of new infrastructure, and an environmental impact could occur. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The specific location or size of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is not currently known. Each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable during operations. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Prepare and Implement Utilities Plan. (See Section 8.11, *Utilities/Public Services*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

Impact 3.18(b): Would the proposed Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

Senate Bill 610 requires that water supply assessments occur early in the land use planning process for all large-scale development projects (refer to thresholds identified in Section 3.18.3.2 of the Draft PEIR). In the absence of any project-specific, site-specific, and design-specific information at this program-level of analysis, it is not feasible to prepare a water supply assessment. Because of the larger extent of KOP Category 6 projects, there would be potentially significant impacts with regard to sufficient water supply. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-2, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The specific location or size of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is not currently known. Each project site will require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Construction impacts for all projects would be less than significant with mitigation. For operation, projects implemented under KOP Category 4 and KOP Category 5 would result in a beneficial impact on water supply. For KOP Category 5 and KOP Category 6 under the *2020 LA River*

Master Plan, implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant levels. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-2, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-2: Prepare a Water Supply Assessment. (See Section 8.11, *Utilities/Public Services*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

Impact 3.18(c): Would the proposed Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

KOP Category 6 could result in a wide variety of projects, many of which would generate wastewater. Because the location, size, and extent of these projects are unknown, it cannot be quantified how much wastewater would be generated by an individual project under KOP Category 6. Wastewater generation could exceed the capacity of existing wastewater treatment facilities or local conveyance systems. When the peak flow in a sewer reaches a predetermined level, it usually triggers a planning study that is initiated in time to ensure that additional capacity is provided to meet future demands. However, it is possible that local sewer capacity could be constrained such that additional wastewater could not be accommodated. Although Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Considering the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* includes 107 projects that would range in size from up to 3 acres/1 mile to more than 150 acres/10 miles and that most of them (85) would be of smaller size (3 acres/1 mile), it is reasonable to assume that for larger projects under KOP Category 6, insufficiencies in utilities could occur that would require the expansion or construction of new facilities, which could, in turn, result in significant environmental impacts. Additionally, operational impacts under KOP Category 6 could be significant. Because the location and extent of projects that could be proposed under KOP Category 6 are unknown, as is whether site-specific mitigation could be implemented to minimize or avoid impacts, there could be insufficient wastewater capacity to serve the proposed Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Prepare and Implement Utilities Plan. (See Section 8.11, *Utilities/Public Services*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

Wildfire

Impact 3.19(b): Would the proposed Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks of, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Operation of the Typical Projects could introduce additional visitors and staff. If a newly constructed Typical Project design component is within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, it could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Furthermore, the addition of more people and structures to an area that is designated as a VHFHSZ could exacerbate existing wildfire risks. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, if KOP Categories 1 through 6 design components are within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, they could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation design components could be located within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, which could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 8.12, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(c): Would the proposed Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Operation of the Typical Projects within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ will require the implementation of certain measures to protect defensible space surrounding the property, such as routine vegetation clearing or additional sprinkler systems. These measures would be intended to reduce the potential risk of fire ignition and spread. While protective measures such as brush management are intended to reduce wildfire risk, the ongoing removal of vegetation could result in other impacts on the environment. Therefore, because the locations of the Typical Projects are unknown, and the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations are unknown, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could result in temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could be within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ. Because the locations of KOP categories are unknown, and the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations are unknown, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could result in temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation design components could be located within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ. Because the locations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are unknown, and the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations are unknown, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could result in temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan. (See Section 8.12, *Wildfire*, for detail.)

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Finding for Impact 3.15(b): Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on recreation, the following findings are made for Impact 3.15 (b):

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impact due to the proposed Project is found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Aesthetics

While implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-2 would minimize obstruction of scenic vistas, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could substantially block or obstruct scenic vistas such as views of the ocean, ridgelines, and open space areas.

Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation Measure AES-2 would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, there are no known additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on a scenic vista. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality

Without specific details on construction and operation of later activities, emissions were not able to be quantified. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty that impacts would be reduced below applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measures GHG-2 and AQ-1 would control construction-period emissions under the KOP categories, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, AQ-2, and TRA-1b would control operation period emissions under the KOP categories. Because these impacts cannot be quantified and the impact reduction achieved from mitigation cannot be quantified, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where implementation of mitigation may be inadequate to reduce impacts below thresholds. Despite implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed

Project would make a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against the applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Furthermore, there are no additional known feasible mitigation measures or alternatives available (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on air quality. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Cultural Resources

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-2a, CR-2b, CR-2c, CR-3a, CR-3b, and CR-3c would minimize potential impacts on historical resources; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects for both construction and operations under Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are not known, these activities could substantially impact historical resources. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would reduce substantial adverse effects on historical resources. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Because the applicable policies, plans, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs are relevant to both the construction and operation phases of the proposed Project, discussion of the plan consistency has been combined.

The lack of specific sites or detailed design information makes it particularly challenging to make informed assumptions about reasonable construction and operations scenarios for the KOP categories. It is assumed that development under the KOP categories would be greater than for the Typical Projects, and that associated GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the KOP categories to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be potentially significant. Although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and GHG-2 would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project details (e.g., expected VMT, proximity to transit centers), it cannot be stated with certainty that the construction and operation of the KOP categories would be consistent with the applicable GHG regulatory programs.

Because development of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* represents all of the Typical Projects and KOP categories combined, the associated construction and operation GHG emissions could potentially result in an inconsistency with one or more of the GHG plans analyzed for the Typical Projects. Impacts related to the potential for construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs would be significant. Even with mitigation, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Land Use and Planning

Off-channel land asset projects would likely entail greater levels of construction for KOP Category 6 than for the Typical Projects and the other five KOP categories and would occur outside the ROW. Design components under KOP Category 6 could be considerably larger than design components under the other KOP categories, resulting in more extensive environmental effects during construction. These projects could occur within established neighborhoods and result in temporary road closures and obstructions to community facilities, which could divide an established community. Site-specific and project-specific design details of subsequent projects would determine their construction schedules and would ultimately be driven by the County's needs or the needs of any other jurisdictions implementing these projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, a potentially significant impact could remain for KOP Category 6 during the construction period as a result of physical division of an established community.

Larger off-channel land asset design components in KOP Category 6, such as affordable housing and museums, would entail greater levels of construction than under the other five KOP categories. As the location and extent of design components under KOP Category 6 are unknown, there could be inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, a potentially significant impact. Despite implementation of Mitigation Measures LU-1 and LU-2, if further CEQA review determines a potentially significant impact could occur from construction of the specific design components proposed under KOP Category 6 and no feasible mitigation is available, a significant and unavoidable impact for KOP Category 6 could occur under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. This conclusion of significant and unavoidable impacts also applies to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

Minor inconsistencies with applicable land use policies could occur, such as if a design component under KOP Categories 1 and 2 would conflict with planned land uses on adjacent parcels, be incompatible with adjacent land uses, or result in out-of-scale development. Projects under KOP Categories 1 and 2 would consist of multi-use trails, a recreational use, or a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions to provide additional recreation uses serving visitors and residents, and would not be within residential neighborhoods and therefore would not be expected to result in inconsistency with the goals listed in Table 3.10-7 in the Draft PEIR. As the

location and extent of subsequent projects that could operate under KOP Category 6 are unknown, in the absence of specific details (e.g., type of project, detailed design, location, size), it cannot be stated with certainty whether there would be inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations. However, the potential remains for a significant impact to occur despite implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4. Should further CEQA review determine that a potential impact could occur from operation of the specific design components proposed under KOP Categories 1, 2, and 6, and no further feasible mitigation is available, a significant and unavoidable impact would occur. This conclusion of significant and unavoidable impacts also applies to the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Noise

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would require the implementing agency to obtain a conditional use permit with the City of Vernon. Obtaining a conditional use permit requires the implementing agency to apply for the permit and go through the City of Vernon's application process. As there is no guarantee for approval, this mitigation measure cannot reduce impacts to less than significant with mitigation.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Public Services

Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS-1 would minimize potential impacts on fire and police services; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects under KOP Category 6 are not yet known, it is possible that KOP Category 6 and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could substantially impact the service ratios. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would reduce substantial adverse effects on public services. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Transportation

Implementation of a site-specific screening pursuant to County Guidelines Sections 3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.2, and 3.1.2.3 for land use projects and Guidelines Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 for transportation projects, along with implementation of a TDM and/or site/neighborhood enhancement program for any subsequent project that does not screen out (Mitigation Measure TRA-1a) would reduce VMT impacts. However, given the range in the possible size and programmatic intensity of the potentially significant project elements/design components for the Common Elements Typical Project, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable even with TDM measures (Mitigation Measure TRA-1b). As such, impacts could be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Utilities/Service Systems

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a utilities plan to identify project modifications that will minimize any significant environmental impact on utilities as well as develop a utilities report to compare the expected operational demand and generation for the various utility resources against existing supply and infrastructure. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure UTIL-2 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a water supply assessment in accordance with the requirements of SB 610. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

Wildfire

Mitigation Measure WF-3 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a Fire Protection Plan (FPP) to minimize potential operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and the potential wildfire-related risks (e.g., types of vegetation at project sites and level of human activity) are also unknown.

Accordingly, it cannot be guaranteed that the preparation and implementation of an FPP would effectively reduce the potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

8.9 Transportation

Impact 3.16(b): Would the proposed Project conflict or be Inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Tables 3.16-2 and 3.16-3 in Section 3.16, *Transportation*, of the Draft PEIR present all of the design components that could be constructed for the Typical Projects and KOP categories. As shown in these two tables, the majority of the design components are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, 11 design components were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects, the majority of the design components for KOP Categories 1 through 6 are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, 11 design components identified in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft PEIR were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to the Typical Projects and KOP Categories 1 through 6, the majority of the design components for overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are screened from VMT analysis and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, 11 design components identified in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft PEIR were not screened out and were determined to have the potential to result in a significant VMT impact. As stated in Appendix I of the Draft PEIR, each individual project's potential to result in a significant transportation impact would need to be evaluated by the project proponent when the project's exact location, configuration, and scale are known, and cannot be determined based on the current level of project specificity. Further VMT analysis will continue to be required for any project containing one of these potentially impactful

project elements. Therefore, while the likelihood of an impact arising from implementation of the full *2020 LA River Master Plan* decreases over time, the impact on VMT is determined to be potentially significant. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would be implemented, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Determine VMT Based on Type of Subsequent Project.

For any subsequent projects that include project elements that are identified in the VMT Impact Evaluation Matrix as having the potential to generate a significant VMT impact, the implementing agency will conduct the following two-step screening process:

- **Step 1.** Conduct a trip generation analysis to determine whether a project would generate a net increase of 110 or more daily trips, or determine whether the location is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor based on its County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Sections 3.1.2.1 and 3.1.2.3. If the subsequent project is screened out once project design and location details are known, then no further actions are required.

If the subsequent project is not screened out after Step 1, the implementing agency will move on to Step 2.

- **Step 2.** Perform a VMT analysis for the subsequent project using the County's VMT impact criteria that have been developed based on guidance from OPR and CARB. Per the criteria, project VMT impact thresholds vary depending on the project type, as follows:
 - For residential development land use projects, the project would generate residential VMT per capita exceeding 16.8 percent below the existing residential VMT per capita for the Baseline Area in which the project is located.
 - For office land use projects, the project would generate employment VMT per employee exceeding 16.8 percent below the existing employment VMT per employee for the Baseline Area in which the project is located.
 - For regional serving retail land use projects, entertainment projects, and/or event center land uses, the project would result in a net increase in existing Total VMT. Trips associated with these land uses are typically discretionary trips, which may be either substitute trips to other, closer destinations, or new trips entirely. A project-specific customized approach will be required to estimate VMT for such projects. The methodology should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.
 - For unique land uses in which a land use project does not fit into any of the above categories, a project-specific customized approach may be required to estimate daily trips and VMT, but may be based on the existing employment trip element using an approach similar to that for office projects, above. The methodology and thresholds to be used in such cases should be developed in consultation with and approved by Public Works staff at the outset of the study.

If the subsequent project cannot be screened out but the VMT is determined to not exceed the threshold based on the applicable guideline and project type, then no further action is needed.

If the subsequent project cannot be screened out and the VMT is determined to exceed the threshold based on the applicable guideline and project type, then Mitigation Measure TRA-1b will be required and implemented.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Implement TDM Strategies and/or Enhancements to Reduce VMT.

The implementing agency will implement a subsequent project-specific program utilizing transportation demand management (TDM) strategies and neighborhood or site enhancements to reduce VMT, and any other appropriate strategies to address identified impacts and reduce VMT to the River Corridor.

The program to reduce VMT will be based on the suite of eligible TDM strategies included in the County Guidelines or other measures with substantial evidence, or, if the subsequent project is located in an incorporated city, the program will be based on mitigation measures (these apply to all project elements, i.e., both Typical Projects, six KOP categories, and overall 2020 LA River Master Plan, unless specified otherwise) on the local jurisdiction's list of qualifying VMT mitigation strategies. Specific measures can include but are not limited to:

- Increasing transit accessibility
- Relocating a project in order to be adjacent to transit
- Pricing any provided parking at river access sites to discourage vehicle trips to the River Corridor
- Providing bicycle parking
- Implementation of neighborhood or site enhancements such as pedestrian network improvements (for example, high-visibility crosswalks, continuous sidewalks, and Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA]-compliant directional curb cuts at intersections), and traffic calming measures such as speed humps or chicanes

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on transportation, the following findings are made for operation of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impact due to the proposed Project is found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, VMT cannot be quantified. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Implementation of a site-specific screening pursuant to County Guidelines Sections 3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.2, and 3.1.2.3 for land use projects and Guidelines Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 for transportation projects, and implementation of a TDM and/or site/neighborhood enhancement program for any subsequent project that does not screen out (Mitigation Measure TRA-1a) would reduce VMT impacts. However, given the range in the possible size and programmatic intensity of the potentially significant project elements/design components for the Common Elements Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan*, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigable even with TDM measures (Mitigation Measure TRA-1b). No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be quantified. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce VMT impacts. As such, impacts could be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.16.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

8.10 Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact 3.17(a), Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR defined in PRC Section 21074 as a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is either of the following:

- a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k)?**

b. A resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria in PRC Section 5024.1©. In applying this criteria, the lead agency will consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Construction and Operation)

Construction of the Typical Projects would involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Construction would occur along the LA River ROW. A Sacred Lands File search conducted through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on March 12, 2020, identified positive results on two U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangles that intersect Frames 5, 6, and 9 within the study area. Therefore, surface-exposed or buried cultural materials, cultural objects, or landscapes determined to be TCRs have been identified in Frames 5, 6, and 9. TCRs that have not yet been identified could be present within all nine frames, and construction of the Typical Projects could result in the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR, if present. Additionally, the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could include new single-story structures—such as pavilions, cafes, and restrooms—or lower-profile infrastructure—such as multi-use trails, signs, lighting, benches, and other associated recreational facilities—that could interfere with or otherwise adversely affect the setting or viewshed of a nearby TCR, which could indirectly affect the integrity of the resource.

Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, TCR-1, TCR-2, and TCR-3) would help reduce the impacts, the specific locations of Typical Projects and presence of TCRs as well as the Typical Projects' effects on TCRs are not known at this time. Therefore, the proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR as defined in PRC Section 21074.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Construction and Operation)

The construction activities proposed under all the KOP categories could result in significant impacts on TCRs. Impacts may be direct through proposed ground disturbance, which could include site clearing and excavation that may result in adverse effects on surface-exposed or buried cultural materials, cultural objects, or landscapes determined to be TCRs. Impacts on TCRs could also be indirect and would include potential significant changes to the setting or viewshed of a TCR, which could include construction of new structures, recreational facilities, and elements that could indirectly affect the integrity of the resource. Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOP categories would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including in-channel or off-channel. The specific location and design for these components have not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding.

Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, TCR-1, TCR-2, and TCR-3) would help reduce the impacts, the specific locations of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and presence of TCRs as well as the KOP Categories 1 through 6's effects on TCRs are not known at this time. Therefore, the proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR as defined in PRC Section 21074.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Construction of all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the TCR. Potential impacts from operation of the design components of all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in significant impacts on human remains. Operations activities related to the 107 projects could introduce or increase public use activities such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the projects near TCRs could directly affect TCRs through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance, increased looting potential due to increased use, or other negative impacts on the integrity of the resource.

Although mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, TCR-1, TCR-2, and TCR-3) would help reduce the impacts, the specific locations of overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation and presence of TCRs as well as the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation's effects on TCRs are not known at this time. Therefore, the proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR as defined in PRC Section 21074.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-1a. Conduct Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological, and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine Presence of Resources. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-1b. Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological, and Tribal Cultural Resources and Implement Findings. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological Sites or TCRs through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards. (See Section 8.3, *Cultural Resources*, for detail.)

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Conduct Native American Monitoring.

If determined necessary via consultation, in addition to Mitigation Measure CR-4c Native American monitoring requirements, Native American monitoring will be conducted by the tribe that identified the TCR through AB 52 consultation. Native American monitors will be present during construction activities in native sediments and will observe all ground-disturbing activities conducted within 100 feet of the TCR. Should unanticipated discoveries be made during Native American monitoring, then the unanticipated discoveries protocol described in Mitigation Measure CR-5 will be enacted. This includes halting ground-disturbing activities for a reasonable period of time, consulting with the lead agency and Native American representatives (if the find is Native American in origin), developing a mitigation plan, and potentially developing and implementing a data recovery plan. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the monitor will follow Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code (Mitigation Measure CR-7), described in Section 3.4.2.2 of the Draft PEIR.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Avoid TCRs during Project Operations through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

If physical portions of previously identified TCRs are left in place after project construction, then Environmentally Sensitive Areas will be established to protect any remaining physical portions of the TCR from further direct or indirect affects that may result as part of project operations. The establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas will be conducted in coordination and consultation with Native American tribes.

Mitigation Measure TCR-3: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated TCR Discoveries during Operations.

If TCRs are discovered inadvertently during project operations, work will be temporarily halted in the area and within 100 feet of the find. The implementing agency will notify the consulting Native American tribe to assess the find and develop the appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the implementing agency and Native American tribes.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts on tribal cultural resources, the following findings are made for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on tribal cultural resources due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Although implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1a, CR-1b, CR-4a, CR-4b, CR-4c, CR-4d, CR-5, TCR-1, TCR-2, and TCR-3 could help reduce the impacts, the specific locations of projects and presence of TCRs, as well as the projects' effects on TCRs, are not known at this time. Therefore, it is possible that impacts could remain significant. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be certain. Furthermore, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on TCR. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.17.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's tribal cultural resources impacts.

8.11 Utilities/Service Systems

Impact 3.18(a): Would the proposed Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Significant Effect

KOP Categories 1 through 5 (Operation)

Operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5 would require the use of electricity, natural gas, and water, and could generate wastewater and solid waste. There could be potentially significant impacts with regard to sufficient supply/capacity for one or more utilities for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 5. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

Impacts on utilities for projects under KOP Category 6 would vary depending on the type of project. A housing or wastewater treatment facility project, for example, would demand greater amounts of water, electricity, and natural gas than spreading grounds or dry wells, which would not be expected to demand these utilities. These projects would be evaluated on a subsequent-project-specific and location-specific basis to determine the level of impact, if any, on utilities. Because the extent of these projects is unknown, there could be localized insufficiencies of utility services that could require expansion of existing infrastructure or construction of new infrastructure, and an environmental impact could occur. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The specific location or size of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is not currently known. Each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable during construction and operations. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Prepare and Implement Utilities Plan.

During design, the implementing agency will prepare a utilities plan that:

- Identifies the location of existing utilities and connections and new/expanded infrastructure that will be required to connect to existing services
- Quantifies demand and generation factors for construction of the new/expanded infrastructure on a project-specific basis and determine whether supply/capacity can meet demand
- Identifies project modifications that will minimize any significant environmental impact on utilities

As part of the utilities plan, the implementing agency will prepare a utilities report that compares the expected operational demand and generation for the various utility resources against existing supply and infrastructure to determine whether sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the Project; if any insufficiency is identified, the implementing agency will modify the Project to avoid the impact in consultation with the affected utility provider(s).

Modifications to the Project could include the following site-specific conservation features above those required by the applicable codes and ordinances:

- On-site wastewater treatment
- On-site recycled water infrastructure
- On-site solid waste recycling
- Solar panels
- Use of alternative energy such as biofuels

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on utilities, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on utilities due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of the Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on utilities cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a utilities plan to identify project modifications that will minimize any significant environmental impact on utilities as well as develop a utilities report to compare the expected operational demand and generation for the various utility resources against existing supply and infrastructure. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that,

without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on sufficient supply/capacity for one or more utilities. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

Impact 3.18(b): Would the proposed Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

SB 610 requires that water supply assessments occur early in the land use planning process for all large-scale development projects (refer to thresholds identified in Section 3.18.3.2 of the Draft PEIR). In the absence of any project-specific, site-specific, and design-specific information at this program-level of analysis, it is not feasible to prepare a water supply assessment. Because of the larger extent of KOP Category 6, there would be potentially significant impacts with regard to sufficient water supply during operation of projects. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-2, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

The specific location or size of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is not currently known. Each project site will require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. For operation, projects implemented under KOP Categories 4 and 5 would result in a beneficial impact on water supply. For KOP Category 5 and KOP Category 6 under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant levels. Although the implementing agency would implement Mitigation Measure UTIL-2, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-2: Prepare Water Supply Assessment.

The implementing agency will prepare a water supply assessment in accordance with the requirements of SB 610.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on utilities, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on utilities due to the proposed Project for operation of KOP Category 6 and construction and operation of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Finding (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on water supplies cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure UTIL-2 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a water supply assessment in accordance with the requirements of SB 610. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives in the Final PEIR (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on water supplies. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

Impact 3.18(c): Would the proposed Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Significant Effect

KOP Category 6 (Operation)

KOP Category 6 could result in a wide variety of projects, many of which would generate wastewater. Because the location, size, and extent of these projects are unknown, it cannot be quantified how much wastewater would be generated by an individual project under KOP Category 6. Wastewater generation could exceed the capacity of existing wastewater treatment facilities or local conveyance systems. When the peak flow in a sewer reaches a predetermined level, it usually triggers a planning study that is initiated in time to ensure that additional capacity is provided to meet future demands. However, it is possible that local sewer capacity could be constrained such that additional wastewater could not be accommodated. Although Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would be implemented, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Construction and Operation)

Considering the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* includes 107 projects that would range in size from up to 3 acres/1 mile to more than 150 acres/10 miles and that most of them (85) would be of smaller size (3 acres/1 mile), it is reasonable to assume that for larger projects under KOP Category 6, insufficiencies in utilities could occur that would require the expansion or construction of new facilities, which could, in turn, result in significant environmental impacts. Additionally, operational impacts under KOP Category 6 could be significant. Because the location and extent of projects that could be proposed under KOP Category 6 are unknown, as is whether site-specific mitigation could be implemented to minimize or avoid impacts, there could be insufficient wastewater capacity to serve the proposed Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Prepare and Implement Utilities Plan. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on utilities, the following findings are made for operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 and construction and operations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on utilities due to the proposed Project for construction and operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6, and of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on wastewater cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare a utilities plan to identify project modifications that will minimize any significant environmental impact on utilities as well as develop a utilities report to compares the expected operational demand and generation for the various utility resources against existing supply and infrastructure. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and each subsequent project would require evaluation to determine whether insufficiencies in utilities exist. Implementation of mitigation would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on wastewater. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.18.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities impacts.

8.12 Wildfire

Impact 3.19(b): Would the proposed Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks of, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Operation of the Typical Projects could introduce additional visitors and staff. If a newly constructed Typical Project design component is within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, it could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Furthermore, the addition of more people and structures to an area that is designated as a VHFHSZ could exacerbate existing wildfire risks. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, if KOP Categories 1 through 6 design components are within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, it could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation design components could be located within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ, it could expose additional visitors, staff, and structures to hazardous conditions associated with the high risk of wildfire at the site who were not previously exposed to this risk. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan.

For projects that are proposed in areas designated as Very High FHSZs, the implementing agency will prepare a fire protection plan (FPP) for the project prior to commencing operation of the facility. The FPP will be prepared to ensure that projects developed within Very High FHSZs are in compliance with current regulatory codes and that impacts resulting from wildland fire hazards are adequately mitigated. The FPP will include, but will not be limited to, the following:

- Measures to address specific location, topography, geology, level of flammable vegetation, and climate of the project site

- Measures consistent with applicable fire codes
- A vegetation management plan that includes measures such as reducing flammable vegetation around the property's structure and installing sprinklers that activate in the case of fire
- Consultation with all affected jurisdictions, including applicable regulatory and resource agencies

In addition, the following elements will be included in the FPP:

- Emergency services – availability and travel time
- Access for emergency services and evacuation of students and faculty (primary and, if required, additional access)
- Firefighting water supply
- Fire sprinkler system
- Ignition resistant construction
- Defensible space, ornamental landscaping, and vegetation management

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on wildfire, the following findings are made for operation of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on wildfire due to the proposed Project for operation of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Finding (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on wildfire risk cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects

developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure WF-3 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare an FPP to minimize potential operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and the potential wildfire-related risks (e.g., types of vegetation at project sites and level of human activity) are also unknown. Accordingly, it cannot be guaranteed that the preparation and implementation of an FPP would effectively reduce the potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on wildfire risk. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Impact 3.19(c): Would the proposed Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment?

Significant Effect

Typical Projects (Operation)

Operation of the Typical Projects within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ will require the implementation of certain measures to protect defensible space surrounding the property, such as routine vegetation clearing or additional sprinkler systems. These measures would be intended to reduce the potential risk of fire ignition and spread. While protective measures such as brush management are intended to reduce wildfire risk, the ongoing removal of vegetation could result in other impacts on the environment. Therefore, because the locations of the Typical Projects are unknown, and the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations are unknown, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could pose temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

KOP Categories 1 through 6 (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, operation of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could be within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ. Because the locations of the KOP categories are unknown, as are the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could pose temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation (Operation)

Similar to Typical Projects, overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation design components could be located within or adjacent to a VHFHSZ. Because the locations of the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are unknown, and the types of fire breaks or utilities that may be required at these locations are unknown, there is the potential that operation and maintenance of fire breaks, utilities, or other infrastructure could pose temporary or permanent environmental impacts. Although mitigation (Mitigation Measure WF-3) would be implemented, Typical Projects could result in substantial operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure WF-3: Prepare a Fire Protection Plan. (See above for detail.)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

For the above impacts on wildfire, the following findings are made for operation of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation, even with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on wildfire due to the proposed Project for operation of Typical Projects, KOP Categories 1 through 6, and overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Finding (carried out by the County and Non-carried out by the County)

Without specific details on the scale, location, design, construction, and operation of later activities, impacts on exacerbating fire risk cannot be determined. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with

certainty, without specific details on construction and operation of the later activities, that impacts would be reduced, even with the mitigation proposed. Mitigation would be implemented for projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure WF-3 is required to ensure that the implementing agency will prepare an FPP to minimize potential operations-related impacts associated with wildfire risk for projects. However, the locations of future projects are unknown, and the potential wildfire-related risks (e.g., types of vegetation at project sites and level of human activity) are also unknown. Accordingly, it cannot be guaranteed that the preparation and implementation of an FPP would effectively reduce the potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that, without specific details on the proposed Project, the impacts and impact reductions from mitigation cannot be determined. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on exacerbating fire risk. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that, for projects not carried out by the County, the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

9.1 Less-than-Significant Cumulative Impacts

The Draft PEIR identifies certain resource areas that would result in no cumulative impact because the context for a cumulative condition for that resource was determined in the Draft PEIR to not occur or the contribution would not be considerable. These include the following:

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Energy
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Recreation

Each is described in detail below.

9.1.1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

In general, cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are most often associated with commercial or industrial land uses, compared with residential uses. Projects and plans that do not substantially increase the potential for industrial activity are not considered to generate cumulatively significant impacts within the County (City of Los Angeles 1995). Continued growth and development in the Southern California region, including transportation improvements, and the anticipated increased mobility from implementation of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS may result in greater exposure of local populations to various hazards and may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of increased hazardous materials transport. However, any future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to hazardous materials. Required compliance with these regulations would minimize contribution of cumulative impacts related to the hazardous materials sites, and impacts would not be cumulatively significant (SCAG 2020).

Findings

There is no cumulative condition with respect to hazards and hazardous materials; therefore, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

References

Section 3.8 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hazards and hazardous waste impacts.

9.1.2 Energy

Cumulative growth and development in the greater Los Angeles region would result in additional demand, leading to increased consumption of electricity and natural gas. However, cumulative electricity demands within the County in 2035 would total about 15.1 billion kilowatt hours per year (15,100 gigawatt hours per year). Cumulative natural gas demands in 2035 would total about 232 million therms per year (61.6 million cubic feet of natural gas per day). These demand projections are within the forecasts for the individual utility providers, and these cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant.

Implementation of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the general plans of individual jurisdictions in the study area, as well as transportation projects included in the 2020 RTP/SCS, when taken into consideration with other development and infrastructure projects within the SCAG region and surrounding areas, would have the potential to increase the consumptive use of energy. Therefore, there is a cumulative condition related to energy.

Construction activities under the proposed Project would rely primarily on diesel-powered generators to produce the electricity required to operate electrical equipment. It is anticipated that the utilities would address demands within their respective service territories, which are under the oversight of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Furthermore, the proposed Project would not have a detrimental effect on local and regional energy supplies or requirements for additional capacity. In addition, the proposed Project would not impede a local utility's ability to meet the Project's peak- and base-period demand for electricity and other forms of energy. Construction activities associated with the Project would be relatively short term and would represent a relatively minor demand on local and regional fuel supplies that would be easily accommodated. Compliance with anti-idling regulations would further reduce fuel consumption. As such, construction activities associated with the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of transportation fuels in meaningful amounts.

During operation of all subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, each project site would comply with California Title 24 standards and the CALGreen Code for energy efficiency.

Findings

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would not cause wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in cumulatively considerable contributions to impacts on energy supplies, and the impact would be less than significant.

References

Section 3.5 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's energy impacts.

9.1.3 Land Use and Planning

The proposed Project would not have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on land use and planning because, in combination with other projects within the greater Los Angeles region, it would be consistent with adopted land use goals, objectives, and policies of applicable lands use plans and would not create incompatible land uses with the immediate surrounding land uses. The cumulative growth and development in the greater Los Angeles region is expected to be largely consistent with the plans that have been established to guide and regulate growth patterns

and infrastructure improvements. Regional planning documents, such as SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, are used for planning within the greater Los Angeles area. However, some strategies may not be consistent with the general plans of city and County areas when it comes to land use patterns and densities. On a local level, goals and policies in the local jurisdictions' general plans would supersede strategies in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

Local land use plans and policies guide development within a particular jurisdiction. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development within the applicable jurisdictions along the river's extent may have resulted in some site-specific physical division of an established community or inconsistencies with land use plans and policies; however, all local jurisdictions require design review for all projects and consideration of consistency with its land use plans. Therefore, the impact with regard to land use would not be cumulatively significant. On a local level, there is no cumulative condition with regard to land use.

The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. Project impacts with regard to land use compatibility would be cumulatively less than significant, and the Project would be generally consistent with land use plans and policies

Findings

As there is no cumulative condition with regard to land use, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to land use and planning impacts, and the impact would be less than significant.

References

Section 3.10 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's land use impacts.

9.1.4 Mineral Resources

Important local mineral resources in the Project region include construction materials and minerals of historical significance, including precious gemstones and metals. Aggregate resources include rock, sand, and gravel, which are important for the construction and manufacturing of concrete. Further urbanization in the County could result in development on lands containing aggregate resources. Significant potential deposit sites have been identified by the State Geologist along the floodplain from the San Fernando Valley through downtown Los Angeles. Development generally results in a demand for minerals, especially construction aggregate. The general plans of the Cities of Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maywood, Commerce, and Glendale contain policies that relate to mineral and gas resources, providing for conservation and maintenance of mineral resource lands. Development in these jurisdictions would be consistent with these goals and policies. The remaining jurisdictions have no goals and policies pertaining to mineral resources, as they do not contain significant sources of aggregate minerals or oil and gas.

Findings

As there is no cumulative condition relative to mineral resources, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to mineral resource impacts, and the impact would be less than significant.

References

Section 3.11 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's mineral resources impacts.

9.1.5 Population and Housing

The proposed Project would not have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on population and housing because it would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure) or displace a substantial number of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Past projects in the County (cities and unincorporated County areas) have converted undeveloped and agricultural land to urban uses, resulting in residential and employment population increases. The adopted planning documents, such as general plans prepared by cities, would be subject to regional plans such as SCAG's RCP and the RTP/SCS. The general plans of County jurisdictions have been prepared to be consistent with the population forecast of the regional planning documents. Therefore, these projects would accommodate anticipated future growth, not induce new growth. Because cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable land use plans governing regional growth, a significant cumulative impact would not occur.

Findings

As there is no significant cumulative condition with respect to population and housing, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to population and housing impacts, and the impact would be less than significant.

References

Section 3.13 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's population and housing impacts.

9.1.6 Recreation

Cumulative development would still incrementally increase the need for new or expanded facilities, which would have the potential to result in adverse environmental effects. As noted in the EIR for the *Los Angeles County General Plan (2014)*, the deterioration that would occur to local parks and recreational facilities from regional population growth may be offset with funding from new development such as in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland pursuant to the Quimby Act. The Quimby Act is a funding mechanism for parkland acquisition for jurisdictions. As allowed by this act, most cities in the County have park dedication ordinances as part of their municipal codes. The park dedication ordinances require most residential subdivisions to dedicate parkland or pay in-lieu fees (or both, in some circumstances) to enable the jurisdictions to acquire local parkland at ratios between 3 acres and 5 acres per 1,000 residents. In order to accommodate future demand for parks and recreational facilities from population growth in the Los Angeles County region, additional parks and recreational facilities will be developed and constructed throughout the region. Other cumulative projects, such as schools or residential projects in adjacent jurisdictions, would increase the need for recreational facilities in the region.

However, existing regulations do not ensure that the funding for parkland acquisition would be proportional to increases in population. As noted, the County sets minimum requirements of

parkland per 1,000 residents. As a result, there is an inherent deficit between the ratio of local parkland the County would like to maintain and the amount of parkland it can provide in accordance with County Code Section 21.24.340. Therefore, although much of the demand for local parkland can be accommodated, a deficit of parkland would remain compared to the County's goal.

Grants from State and county bond sources are available to fund parks and recreational facilities in urban areas, and funding for maintenance of those facilities would be provided through property assessments and taxes. Other regulations, including the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 and the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, would serve as supplemental sources of funding for parkland. Enforcement of existing parkland dedication requirements would serve to reduce the potential for deterioration of facilities by allowing for adequate funding for the provision and maintenance of recreational facilities. While existing regulations, general plan update policies, and implementation programs address in part the need for parkland acquisition and maintenance, considering the deficit of parkland compared to the County goal, a cumulative condition with respect to recreation exists in the County.

Findings

The proposed Project would increase opportunities for recreation for residents and visitors and provide additional recreational trails and multi-use facilities as well as connectivity to the existing County and local trail networks. Therefore, the proposed Project would add to the current inventory of parks and recreational facilities within the County. As there is no current cumulative condition with respect to recreation in the County, the proposed Project would not make a contribution to a cumulative impact on recreation; in fact, the proposed Project would result in a beneficial contribution to recreational opportunities within Los Angeles County.

References

Section 3.15 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's recreation impacts.

9.2 Less-than-Significant Cumulative Impacts with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)/ Significant Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts (Not Carried Out by the County)

The Draft PEIR identifies certain activities that would contribute to a cumulative condition but would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation and therefore would not contribute to a cumulative impact; these include the following:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Paleontology
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation

These are described in detail below.

The County will adopt the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR and will implement or require implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR for later activities or subsequent projects that are carried out by the County. As such, the County could only guarantee the implementation of all required mitigation measures when the County is carrying out the later activity (i.e., the County is directly undertaking the project).

Because some later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County and could be carried out by one of the 17 cities or other public agencies or private parties in the project study area, the County does not have the legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the mitigation measures would be incorporated in all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Therefore, where the PEIR concludes a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated, the impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable when these activities are not carried out by the County.

9.2.1 Aesthetics

Implementation of development, infrastructure, and other projects in the County has the potential to degrade the visual character or quality of the County where open space is the baseline condition; this, when considered in combination with other development within the SCAG region and nearby areas, constitutes a cumulative condition with respect to the visual character of the region. The anticipated new growth and development would change the character of the region over time, potentially damage scenic resources, and introduce new sources of nighttime light and glare, thereby contributing to the cumulative condition of the SCAG region (SCAG 2020).

Scenic views within the LA River are limited in nature, with the viewshed largely consisting of an urban hardscape with limited scenic resources. Where limited scenic vistas are available, views are of larger scenic visual elements or panoramic views of the Pacific Ocean, ridgelines, hillsides, or large open park and greenspace areas that encompass a large viewscape. Once constructed, projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would only encompass a small portion of the LA River viewshed and would contribute to enhanced viewing opportunities for users to experience the vistas. The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be subject to local design guidelines as well as local jurisdictions' general plans. In addition, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is consistent with most, if not all, goals and policies identified in the applicable jurisdictions' general plans. The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would improve the visual quality of the study area.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not affect scenic highways or contribute to a cumulative loss of scenic vistas or focal views. The *2020 LA River Master Plan* is proposed in a setting in which there are numerous existing sources of light and glare, including LA River Trail safety lighting, nearby rail and freeway activity, and nearby residential, industrial, and commercial buildings on adjacent streets. The proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area during construction.

Findings: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on aesthetics when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on aesthetics when carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

Implementing the following mitigation measures as described above in Chapters 7 and 8 of these Findings of Fact (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) will ensure that there would not be a cumulative substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas because Mitigation Measure AES-1 will minimize obstruction of views of scenic resources by requiring the installation of construction fencing, Mitigation Measure LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows, and Mitigation Measure REC-1 will minimize disruption of recreational uses and continue to allow opportunities for viewing scenic resources. These mitigation measures will ensure that the cumulative effect of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and it would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Therefore, aesthetic cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on aesthetics when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on aesthetics when not carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County does not have legal authority to enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by other agencies or private parties for all potential later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures AES-1, LU-1, and REC-1) are adopted by the agency undertaking the later activities, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County.

Additionally, the County finds that these specific mitigation measures, when they are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency, can and should be adopted. The County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County; other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and it is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts with mitigation on later activities.

References

Section 3.1 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's aesthetics impacts.

9.2.2 Biological Resources

Present and future regional growth involving the construction of development and infrastructure projects occurring over time would have the potential to result in the loss of species and/or habitats and natural communities. While the general plans of the various jurisdictions along the river's extent attempt to reduce biological effects through implementation of goals and policies regarding the use of open space and targeting growth within developed areas, the potential growth that may be pushed out to other areas could result in the loss of habitat for plants and animals, including some sensitive species. In this context, growth and development are considered to generate significant cumulative impacts on biological resources. Although direct impacts on special-status species and the loss of sensitive habitats would be mitigated, due to the loss of common habitats and diminished resource availability, impacts on special-status species would be cumulatively significant. In addition, the impediment of wildlife movement is cumulatively significant (Los Angeles County 2014).

The proposed Project would be located in a primarily urban landscape. The general plans for the jurisdictions along the LA River include goals and policies protecting biological resources. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and consistency with general plan goals and policies, the construction and operations of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would have a less-than-significant effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Additionally, the proposed Project would not reduce habitat, but rather would increase it.

Findings: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on biological resources when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on biological resources when carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would potentially have beneficial permanent direct effects on wildlife connectivity and nursery sites with creation and restoration of native upland and wetland habitats, enhancements to wildlife connectivity, and features supporting nursery sites. Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to biological impacts, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Implementing the following mitigation measures as described above in Chapters 7 and 8 (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-24) will ensure that there would not be a cumulative substantial adverse effect on cumulative biological resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-24 would ensure that any impact associated with habitat interference, wetlands, or protected species would be less than significant, by providing detailed guidance on how to comply with the MBTA, avoiding any destruction of active nests, and complying with the CFGC and other applicable requirements. Implementation of and compliance with the mitigation measures would ensure that the species' normal behavior and chances for long-term survival would not be adversely affected by construction activities. The general plans for the jurisdictions along the LA River include goals and policies protecting biological resources. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and consistency with general plan goals and policies, the construction and operations of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would have a less-than-significant effect.

Implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-24 would potentially have beneficial permanent direct effects on wildlife connectivity and nursery sites with creation and restoration of native upland and wetland habitats, enhancements to wildlife connectivity, and features supporting nursery sites.

Therefore, biological cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on biological resources when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on biological resources when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-24 are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Additionally, the County finds that these specific mitigation measures, when they are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency, can and should be adopted. The County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County; other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and it is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts with mitigation on later activities.

References

Section 3.3 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's biological resources impacts.

9.2.3 Geology, Soils, and Paleontology

Most of Southern California, including the locations of cumulative programs and projects in the greater Los Angeles region, is in an area of relatively high seismic activity, and buildout and development of the cumulative programs and projects in the County would expose additional people and new infrastructure to the effects of earthquakes, seismically related ground failure, liquefaction, and seismically induced landslides.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* project area could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking or unstable soil conditions. Construction activities would not be expected to be at depths sufficient to cause significant geologic events (e.g., fault rupture, landslides, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction) or exacerbate geologic conditions because Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would be implemented. Geologic conditions in the area would remain unchanged as a result of the proposed Project. However, landslide- and liquefaction-prone areas as well as areas with collapsible soils could expose workers to geologic hazards. The proposed Project would comply with all applicable regulations and would be consistent with goals and policies contained in the applicable general plans.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* could occur in or near undiscovered fossil resources (e.g., within Quaternary alluvium deposits, at depths of up to 3 feet; younger alluvium, at depths greater than 5 feet; and areas of older alluvium or paleontologically sensitive surface bedrock). The proposed Project would require notification and inventory of paleontological resources and implementation of an unanticipated discovery plan to mitigate potentially significant impacts (Mitigation Measures GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4).

Findings: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on geology, soils, and paleontology when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on geology, soils, and paleontology when carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

Implementing the following mitigation measures as described above in Chapters 7 and 8 (Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4) will ensure that there would not be a cumulative substantial impact on geology, soils, and paleontology. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires a site-specific geotechnical study with recommendations for load-bearing projects to address potential fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction hazards during construction and operation. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and liquification hazards. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 requires implementing agencies to conduct paleontological resource investigations consistent with SVP Guidelines and to identify and determine potential sensitive paleontological

resources. This mitigation measure will ensure that there will not be substantial adverse effects on unique paleontological resources and unique geologic features. Mitigation Measure GEO-3 requires that implementing agencies either redesign the subsequent project to avoid sensitive paleontological resources or provide paleontological monitoring. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GEO-4 requires an avoidance and minimization plan to avoid/minimize potential impacts on paleontological resources during operations.

With implementation of identified mitigation measures, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on paleontological resources or related to geology and soils, and the impact would be less than significant.

Therefore, geology, soils, and paleontology cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on geology, soils, and paleontology when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on geology, soils, and paleontology when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4 are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed for later activities carried out by the County.

Additionally, the County finds that these specific mitigation measures, when they are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency, can and should be adopted. The County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County; other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and it is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts with mitigation on later activities.

References

Section 3.6 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's geology, soils, and paleontology impacts.

9.2.4 Hydrology and Water Quality

One of the primary objectives of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* is to promote healthy, safe, clean water. Construction activities could result in short-term water quality degradation associated with soil erosion and subsequent sediment transport, generation of pollutants, or accidental spills that could temporarily contaminate runoff, surface water, or groundwater. However, BMPs, as required in a SWPPP, would be required during construction to reduce erosion and restrict non-stormwater discharges from the construction site as well as release of hazardous materials. In addition, Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b would reduce potential project impacts related to erosion, runoff, and potential flooding to less-than-significant levels.

The proposed Project would comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit, Long Beach MS4 Permit and County MS4 Permit and their associated provisions, and other local water quality and LID requirements and stormwater ordinances. Therefore, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not violate any water quality standards or degrade water quality, and several components would likely improve water quality.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would provide groundwater resource benefits and would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies, interfere with groundwater recharge, or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Furthermore, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be consistent with goals and policies identified in the applicable general plans related to hydrology and water quality.

Findings: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality when carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

The proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b would create site-specific drainage studies and require stormwater control measures for construction and operations.

Therefore, hydrology and water quality cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. However, if these mitigation measures are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for activities carried out by the County.

Additionally, the County finds that these specific mitigation measures, when they are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another public agency, can and should be adopted. The County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County; other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and it is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts with mitigation on later activities.

References

Section 3.9 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's hydrology and water quality impacts.

9.2.5 Noise

The greater Los Angeles region is a developed, urban area. The study area and its surroundings are subject to existing high levels of ambient noise. Development of new residential, commercial, or industrial structures as well as transportation projects could increase both stationary and mobile sources of noise from heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning and other equipment, as well as vehicles. Construction activities could also generate significant cumulative noise and vibration effects if in proximity to one another or in combination with operational or vehicular noise. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable land use compatibility classifications and noise ordinances. However, buildout of the County of Los Angeles General Plan would also result in substantial noise level increases throughout the County. Implementation of general plan policies would reduce impacts to the extent feasible. However, impacts related to noise land use compatibility are considered significant because of the anticipated level of buildout of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would comply with jurisdictional thresholds and requirements for both construction and operations incumbent within the municipal codes, general plans, and planning documents as they relate to noise. Inclusion of mitigation measures would help reduce impacts. The cumulative noise and vibration impacts would be localized to the area where construction activities would take place. Noise and vibration effects diminish substantially as distance between the source and receptors widens. Noise generated by a stationary noise source, or "point source," decreases by approximately 6 dBA over hard surfaces (e.g., reflective surfaces, such as parking lots or smooth bodies of water) and 7.5 dBA over soft surfaces (e.g., absorptive surfaces, such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees) for each doubling of the distance. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, NOI-3, NOI-4, NOI-5, NOI-6, NOI-7, NOI-8, and NOI-9 would further help reduce potential project impacts.

Findings: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on noise when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on noise when carried out by the County are found to be:

Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

With implementation of mitigation measures the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative noise and vibration impacts, and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 will predict anticipated construction-related noise levels and identify measures that will be implemented by the construction contractor in order to comply with the city's standard. If construction would occur in the City of Vernon, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would require the implementing agency to apply for and obtain a conditional use permit. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would require the contractor to implement noise-reducing practices that would reduce impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study and to implement findings to reduce HVAC noise.

Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-5 would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused noise study during the final design of the Common Elements Typical Project. Mitigation Measure NOI-6 would require the implementing agency to conduct a noise study, which would provide mitigation to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, should impacts be identified. These mitigation measures would ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects from noise on the nearby community. Mitigation Measure NOI-7 would require the implementing agency to locate any development of the Common Elements Typical Project farther than 200 feet from any occupied structure or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures. Mitigation Measure NOI-8 would require the implementing agency to locate any development of a Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Project outside of a distance of 400 feet from any occupied structure (dependent on phase and construction equipment used) or would require the implementing agency to prepare a focused vibration study that analyzes construction vibration sources and predicts vibration levels at nearby vibration sensitive land uses and apply any relevant mitigation measures. In addition, Mitigation Measure NOI-9 would require implementing agencies to conduct a vibration report and create measures relevant for each project.

Therefore, noise cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on noise when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.

- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on noise when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measure would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if these mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures NOI-1, NOI-2, NOI-3, NOI-4, NOI-5, NOI-6, NOI-7, NOI-8, and NOI-9) are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County. The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.12 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's noise impacts.

9.2.6 Transportation

Past projects in Los Angeles County (cities and unincorporated County areas) have converted undeveloped and agricultural land to urban uses, resulting in residential and employment population increases and associated demand for expansions of roadway systems. The cumulative traffic impact of the County's and individual jurisdictions' general plan build-out will be largely mitigated through a combination of regional programs that are the responsibility of agencies such as cities and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The 2020 RTP/SCS, in addition to other projects from other regional plans (e.g., RTPs of adjacent jurisdictions), could result in additional impacts in the greater Los Angeles and SCAG regions. As noted, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* will allow for an increased share of trips to be completed via active transportation instead of by private vehicle.

Finding: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on transportation when carried out by the County the following finding is made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on transportation when carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Finding (Carried Out by the County)

Mitigation Measure LU-1 will manage construction parking and traffic flows. This mitigation measure will ensure that there would not be substantial adverse effects on transportation. In addition, implementation of a site-specific screening pursuant to County Guidelines Sections 3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.2, and 3.1.2.3 for land use projects and Guidelines Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 for transportation projects and implementation of a TDM and/or site/neighborhood enhancement program for any subsequent project that does not screen out (Mitigation Measure TRA-1a and TRA-1b) would reduce VMT impacts.

As there is no cumulative condition with respect to transportation, the proposed Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to transportation impacts and the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Therefore, transportation cumulative effects would be less than significant with mitigation when carried out by the County.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact (Not Carried Out by the County)

For the above impacts related to cumulative impacts on transportation when not carried out by the County the following findings are made:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts related to cumulative impacts on transportation when not carried out by the County are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for the Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding (Not Carried Out by the County)

Impacts associated with project construction would be significant and unavoidable when later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County because the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the abovementioned mitigation measures would be implemented by the other agencies. However, if the mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures LU-1, TRA-1a, and TRA-1b) are adopted by another agency, the impact would be reduced to less than significant, for the same reasons as discussed above for later activities carried out by the County.

The County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts are within the responsibility and control of other public agencies and not the County. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can adopt the mitigation because it is feasible. Furthermore, other public agencies should adopt the mitigation, as it is in their best interest to reduce potential significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.16 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's transportation impacts.

9.3 Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impacts (Carried Out by the County and Not Carried Out by the County)

The Draft PEIR identifies certain activities that could contribute to a cumulative condition and despite implementation of mitigation measures could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects, these include the following:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Public Services
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities
- Wildfire

These are described in detail below.

9.3.1 Air Quality

The cumulative plans and programs within the SCAB would result in the production of significant regional or localized emissions. The regional growth that would occur over the project implementation period would increase both mobile and stationary emission sources and contribute to an adverse cumulative air quality impact. According to the *Los Angeles County General Plan*, the SCAB is designated nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀), particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}), and lead (Los Angeles County only) under the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and nonattainment for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) under the CAAQS. Construction of cumulative projects will further degrade the regional air quality.

The proposed Project would comply with all regulatory requirements and would be required by law to comply with any relevant control measures adopted by the SCAQMD as part of the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The County recognizes the importance of reducing emissions and improving air quality and would adhere to these goals and objectives.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not result in substantial unplanned population growth in the County (see Section 3.13, *Population and Housing*, of the Draft PEIR). The proposed Project would be consistent with goals and policies in the local jurisdictions' general plans, with few, if any, exceptions. Because the proposed Project would be consistent with the anticipated regional growth, it is considered consistent with the region's AQMP. As such, Project-related emissions would be accounted for in the AQMP, which has been developed to bring the SCAB into attainment for all criteria and precursor pollutant standards. Furthermore, specific projects would comply with the applicable SCAQMD Rules. Therefore, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative air quality impact with regard to conflict with the AQMP.

Construction and operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be expected to contribute a substantial level of air pollution such that air quality within the SCAB would be degraded. Criteria pollutant emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or risk. Asbestos emissions would be controlled according to SCAQMD and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. However, without specific details on the locations of building footprints, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from operations could result in cancer or non-cancer health risks that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds. Therefore, operations impacts would be potentially significant and it is possible that mitigation for future project health risks may be inadequate to reduce operations impacts below SCAQMD's threshold level.

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be generally consistent with plans and policies contained in the various applicable general plans related to air quality. Overall, implementation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality impacts within the SCAB.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on air quality, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on air quality are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

Despite implementation of mitigation measures as described in Chapters 7 and 8 of these findings (Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, GHG-1a, GHG-1b, and TRA-1b), the proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects with respect to degradation of air quality in the SCAB.

Without specific details on construction and operation of later activities, emissions were not able to be quantified. Accordingly, it cannot be stated with certainty that impacts would be reduced below applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Mitigation would be implemented for all projects developed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measures GHG-2 and AQ-1 would control construction-period emissions under the KOP categories, and Mitigation Measures GHG-1a, AQ-2, and TRA-1b would control operation-period emissions under the KOP categories. Because these impacts cannot be quantified and the impact reduction achieved from mitigation cannot be quantified, it is conservatively assumed that there may be instances where implementation of mitigation may be inadequate to reduce impacts below thresholds. Despite implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutant. No additional feasible mitigation is known that would reduce the severity or degree of this impact to a less-than-significant level given that mitigation cannot be quantified and compared against the applicable regional or localized emissions thresholds. Furthermore, there are no additional known feasible mitigation measures or alternatives (see Chapter 10 below) that would reduce substantial adverse effects on air quality. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

References

Section 3.2 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's air quality impacts.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities. Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

9.3.2 Cultural Resources

Historic and archaeological resources are important parts of the region's identity. These resources are nonrenewable and irreplaceable. Cumulative land use and transportation projects located in the Southern California region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of cultural resources. Due to the regional scale of the cumulative plans and programs in the Los Angeles region and the potentially large number of cultural resources that could be disturbed as a result of their implementation, a significant cumulative impact would result through the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired (SCAG 2020).

The proposed Project could result in impacts on historic resources or archaeological resources (e.g., uncover buried artifacts or features). Such resources include, but are not limited to, prehistoric stone tools, hearths, and midden soils; historic-period refuse deposits, privies, building foundations, basements, and structural materials; and historic-period infrastructure, such as water and electrical conveyance systems and utility vaults. Deeper excavation may be required for utility relocations and trenching under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. In most cases, a project that follows the Secretary of Interior's (SOI's) standards for an affected historical resource would result in a less-than-significant impact on that historical resource, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. However, although uncommon, there are cases when the SOI's standards cannot be followed or a substantial material change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource occurs even after following SOI's standards. Considering the existing significant cumulative impacts for cultural resources in the greater Los Angeles region, it would be reasonable to infer that the proposed Project could result in localized significant impacts on cultural resources. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the proposed Project's individual impacts (Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-b, CR-2a through CR-2c, CR-3a through CR-3c, CR-4a through CR-4d, CR-5, CR-6, and CR-7).

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on cultural resources, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on cultural resources are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

Despite implementation of mitigation measures as described in Chapters 7 and 8 of these findings (Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b, CR-2a through CR-2c, CR-3a through CR-3c, CR-4a through CR-4d, CR-5, CR-6, and CR-7), the proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b would minimize potential impacts by requiring a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archeological and Tribal Cultural Resources and Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources. Mitigation Measures CR-2a through CR-2c would minimize potential impacts by avoiding or relocating historical/built resources and implementing a historical resources mitigation plan and a noise and vibration plan for construction. Implementing Mitigation Measures CR-3a through CR-3c would avoid impacts on historical/built resources during operation through a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan and a Noise and Vibration Plan. Potential impacts on historical/built archaeological resource or tribal cultural resource would be minimized through Mitigation Measures CR-4a through CR-4d, which would require the implementing agency to obtain a qualified archeologist, avoid significant archaeological sites or TCRs through establishment of environmentally sensitive areas, provide archaeological and Native American monitoring and establish an archaeological monitoring plan, and establish an archaeological evaluation and treatment plan. Mitigation Measure CR-5 would temporarily halt ground disturbance for unanticipated discoveries per SOI standards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-6 would reduce impacts through avoiding archaeological resources by establishing environmentally sensitive areas during operations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-7 would avoid or minimize impacts on human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Implementation of the mitigation measures described above would minimize potential impacts on historical resources and archeological resources; however, because the size, extent, and specific location of subsequent projects are not known, these activities could substantially impact historical resources. There are no additional feasible mitigation measures that would reduce substantial adverse

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.4 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's cultural resources impacts.

9.3.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The analysis of greenhouse gas emissions is cumulative by its nature, and the geographic context is global. The preceding analysis addresses all cumulative impacts of the proposed Project, and a

separate cumulative discussion is not required. Refer above to Section 8.4, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

The *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan's overall goal of avoiding losses in carbon sequestration and limiting land use emissions. However, it is anticipated that buildings would use natural gas and landscaping equipment would be gasoline powered, both of which are inconsistent with the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2018a) guidance. In addition, daily vehicle trips would exceed the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (2018b) daily trip screening threshold.

Implementation of the proposed Project would increase VMT. Mitigation Measure TRA-1b would require various TDM measures to reduce VMT, which would reduce mobile-source emissions. Nonetheless, given the range in the possible size and programmatic intensity of the project elements/design, significant VMT impacts may not be fully mitigated even with TDM measures. Consequently, while emissions from the land use, energy, area, water, and waste sectors would generally be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan with implementation of mitigation, emissions from the mobile sector would be inconsistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and applicable regulatory programs. No other feasible mitigation measures that would reduce mobile-source VMT emissions to a less-than-significant level are available at this time.

Although Mitigation Measures GHG-1a and TRA-1b would be implemented to ensure that impacts are minimized to the extent feasible, in the absence of specific project design details (e.g., sustainability features, expected VMT, electricity and natural gas consumption), it cannot be stated with certainty that the proposed Project would comply with the long-term GHG reduction targets and goals of applicable regulatory programs. Even with mitigation, both construction and operation impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.7 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

9.3.4 Public Services

Cumulative growth within the greater Los Angeles region would result in increased demand and a need for fire and police services to serve new development and populations. Many areas within the region already have inadequate public services for the existing populations and commercial businesses. Further growth, including implementation of the RTP/SCS, would exacerbate existing needs as well as the expanded needs of cumulative programs and plans (SCAG 2020)

Demand for additional public services is usually created when there is a net increase in population in an area as a result of a project. Construction of the proposed Project would not result in an increase in population because the construction workers would not require relocated housing during construction. No element of the construction activities of the proposed Project has the potential to increase the population, nor would it require the expansion of existing or construction of new fire, police, school, or park facilities. However, there may be localized road closures and detours that could increase response times for emergency services. Additionally, an increase of localized visitor population would increase the demand for public services.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on public services, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

While operation of the proposed Project would not result in permanent population increase, there would be localized visitor population increases that would increase the demand for public services. Increases in the number of visitors and residents could result in an increase in the number of incidents requiring fire or police response, which could affect fire or police provider service ratios and response times and result in a need for additional emergency staff. In order to maintain adequate service capacity, the construction or expansion of public service facilities could be required, which would have the potential to result in an adverse impact on the environment. Although the majority of cumulative projects would involve discretionary actions and therefore would be required to demonstrate compliance with CEQA prior to approval, they would incrementally increase the need for public services, which would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.14 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's public services impacts.

9.3.5 Tribal Cultural Resources

Tribal Cultural Resources in the region are protected by State and regional laws, and projects are required to comply with related federal, State, and local regulations. City, County, and regional goals and policies also aim to preserve and protect TCRs to the extent practicable. Even with regulations in place, individual TCRs could still be affected or degraded (e.g., from demolition, destruction, alteration, structural relocation) as a result of new private or public development or redevelopment and implementation of land use strategies under cumulative plans and projects.

Tribal Cultural Resources may be found throughout the County, and it is difficult to document TCRs with precise locations. Construction activities associated with trenching and deeper excavations, as opposed to more surficial disturbances, have the potential to uncover or disturb TCRs. The *2020 LA River Master Plan* would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the TCR. Implementation of mitigation (Mitigation Measures CR-1a through CR-2b, CR-4a through CR-4d, CR-5, TCR-1, TCR-2, and TCR-3) would help reduce the impacts.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

Considering the existing significant cumulative impacts for TCRs in the greater Los Angeles region, it would be reasonable to infer that the proposed Project could result in localized significant impacts on TCRs. Therefore, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative tribal cultural resources impacts would be considerable, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.17 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's tribal cultural resources impacts.

9.3.6 Utilities

Cumulative growth and development, as well as implementation of transportation infrastructure improvements, would result in additional demands on utilities and services, such as water supplies, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. As the County continues to grow, there will be a continued need for increased landfill capacities. A potential for cumulative impacts for solid waste management exists on a countywide level. Similarly, cumulative impacts could occur for wastewater treatment facilities for wastewater flows.

Under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, insufficiencies in utilities could occur that would require the expansion or construction of new facilities, which could, in turn, result in significant environmental impacts. Extension of water and other utility infrastructure could be required for the proposed Project, which would likely include some trenching activities. These activities would not result in a significant environmental impact. Construction debris would be generated but would be recycled according to State and local regulations; therefore, it would not have a significant impact on landfill

capacity. Solid waste generation during operation would be minimal and would not make a considerable contribution to landfill capacity shortages.

With regard to water supply, during construction, water would be used primarily for pouring and mixing concrete as well as mitigating fugitive dust impacts associated with construction activities. Construction impacts for all projects would be less than significant with mitigation. For operation of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, implementation of Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would reduce the level of impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant levels.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on utilities, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on utilities are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

The proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on water supplies and therefore utilities/service systems, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.18 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's utilities and service systems impacts.

9.3.7 Wildfire

Considering the cumulative condition with respect to wildfire and that the proposed Project would be implemented in VHFHSZs, the proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to wildfire impacts, including with regard to more people being exposed to the effects of wildland fires. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Los Angeles County faces major wildland fire threats due to its hilly terrain, dry weather conditions, and the nature of its plant coverage. Although fires are a natural part of the wildland ecosystem, development in wildland areas increases the danger of wildfires to residents, property, and the environment. Cumulative growth and development within the Los Angeles region would increase the number of wildfire events and increase the exposure of people to risks associated with wildfires. Continued growth and development in Los Angeles County would significantly affect Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) operations, as well as the operations of individual jurisdictions' fire departments. In an effort to reduce the threats to lives and property, LACFD in particular has instituted a variety of regulatory programs and standards for vegetation management, pre-fire management and planning, fuel modification, and brush clearance. In addition to these programs, LACFD and Public Works enforce fire and building codes related to development in VHFHSZs. The LACFD has access requirements for single-family residential uses built in VHFHSZs. Individual jurisdictions in the study area have similar policies and programs related to wildfire management. Any future development would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to wildland fires.

The proposed Project would result in development within urban or suburban areas. However, some projects would occur in areas that are designated as VHFHSZs. Projects constructed within lands designated as VHFHSZs are subject to additional fire safety provisions, including fuel modification plans and review by the State Fire Marshall, and they would comply with the County's VHFHSZ Plan Review. Construction of projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be performed near flammable materials that would exacerbate wildfire risks. Compliance with existing laws for construction sites on, adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of a VHFHSZ would further minimize potential risks. The *Los Angeles County General Plan* policies and conditions of approval for future development projects, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would minimize proposed project impacts related to wildland fires. Implementation of Mitigation Measures WF-1, WF-2, WF-3, and WF-4 would reduce potential impacts on wildfire from the proposed Project, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

For the above cumulative impacts on wildfire, the following findings are made, even with implementation of mitigation measures identified above:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final PEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

The potential impacts on cumulative impacts on wildfire are found to be:

- Significant Not Significant

Rationale for Significant and Unavoidable Impact Finding

Considering the cumulative condition with respect to wildfire and that the proposed Project would be implemented in VHFHSZs, the proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to wildfire impacts, including more people being potentially exposed to the effects of wildland fires, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the County finds that the changes or approved alterations in the form of mitigation measures that could lessen significant impacts would be within the responsibility and control of other public agencies, when the County is not carrying out later activities.

Further, because the County has committed to adopt the mitigation in regard to later activities carried out by the County, other public agencies similarly can and should adopt the mitigation because it is feasible and is in their best interest to reduce potentially significant impacts on later activities.

References

Section 3.19 of the PEIR addresses the proposed Project's wildfire impacts.

Chapter 10

Findings Regarding Project Alternatives in the PEIR

10.1 Alternatives Considered in the PEIR

Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires an evaluation in a Draft EIR of the comparative effects of a reasonable range of alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project. A feasible alternative is one that can be accomplished successfully in a reasonable period of time, taking into consideration economic, legal, social, and technological factors. The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasonable choice. Chapter 5 of the Draft PEIR, *Comparison of Alternatives*, describes the impacts of Alternative A—No Project Alternative, which is required by CEQA, and Alternative B—Channel Avoidance. Chapter 5 of the Draft PEIR also identified eight alternatives that were considered but eliminated from detailed consideration prior to circulation of the Draft PEIR.

10.1.1 Alternative A—No Project

Alternative A—No Project (No Project Alternative) assumes that development along the LA River would continue in accordance with the adopted 1996 Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (the 1996 Master Plan). Under the No Project Alternative, comprehensive improvements, guided by the nine multi-benefit goals of the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan*, consistent with the six KOP categories and common elements, would not occur.

Under the No Project Alternative, the original 1996 Master Plan that was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1996 will continue to serve as the framework for enhancing the LA River. Public Works, Department of Regional Planning, and Department of Parks and Recreation developed the 1996 Master Plan as a multi-objective program for the LA River while recognizing its primary purpose for flood management.

The majority of the projects analyzed in the 1996 Master Plan are similar to those described in KOP Category 1, KOP Category 3, and the Common Elements Typical Project, as they included similar design components. Projects proposed under the 1996 Master Plan that would be similar to the design components of KOP Category 1 include trail improvements, connection of trails, enhancements to access points, landscape improvements, and habitat improvements. The 1996 Master Plan proposed projects that would be similar to the design components of KOP Category 3, including pedestrian and bicycle bridges. Projects that would be similar to the design components of the Common Elements Typical Project would include signage, bike/skate rental facilities, and food concessions. Additionally, some projects would be similar to KOP Category 6 design components because they included components such as nursery gardens, open air markets, and river-adjacent parks.

The 1996 Master Plan does not include projects that would fall under KOP Categories 2, 4, or 5. Overall, disturbance to the channel under the 1996 Master Plan would be limited to the construction of bridges. Other notable differences are that the 1996 Master Plan only includes 13 cities rather than 17 cities covered under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Furthermore, the 1996 Master Plan

project area extended 0.5 mile on either side of the LA River, whereas the proposed Project includes an area of 1.0 mile on either side of the river. Therefore, the impacts discussed for Alternative A are relevant only for the 13 cities described in the 1996 Master Plan, a smaller geographic area than the proposed Project.

The No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed Project for air quality; cultural resources; energy; geology, soils, and paleontology; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; transportation; tribal cultural resources; utilities/service systems; and wildfire.

Impacts from construction and operation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those analyzed and disclosed for the proposed Project for aesthetics, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and land use and planning.

The No Project Alternative would make improvements to the LA River, but to a lesser extent than the proposed Project and would not meet the basic objectives of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Specifically, under the No Project Alternative, the following objectives identified for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be met:

- **Flood Risk and Resiliency**—In contrast to the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the No Project Alternative does not have consistent floodplain management practices across the region to reduce catastrophic damage from floods nor does it have any consideration of the long-term impacts of climate change and the need to incorporate resilient infrastructure to handle extreme events. The No Project Alternative would not meet this objective.
- **Equitable, Inclusive, and Safe Parks, Open Space, and Trails**—In contrast to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the No Project Alternative does not contain goals to provide facilities (such as signage, benches, water fountains, trash and recycling receptacles, and bicycle repair stations) at a regular cadence along the length of the river. The No Project Alternative would not meet this objective.
- **Healthy, Connected Ecosystems**—The No Project Alternative does include environmental enhancements to restore environmental resources in and along the river. However, the *2020 LA River Master Plan* proposed increased habitat and ecosystem function along the river, including increased plant species biodiversity and a focus on the use of local California native plants. The No Project Alternative does not contain goals to create a connective network of habitat patches and corridors to facilitate the movement of wildlife and support a diverse ecological community. Nor does the No Project Alternative include goals to encourage cities along the river to adopt sustainability strategies.
- **Embrace and Enhance Opportunities for Arts and Culture**—In contrast to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the No Project Alternative does not contain goals to develop a globally significant, comprehensive 51-mile arts and culture corridor along the river that is place-based, community driven, and reflective of the cultural diversity of the County. The No Project Alternative would not meet this objective.
- **Address Potential Adverse Impacts on Housing Affordability and People Experiencing Homelessness**—The No Project Alternative contains goals to enhance property values through the development of parks, greenways, and open space enhancement. The No Project Alternative does not contain goals to increase units of affordable housing within 1 mile of the river and does not contain goals to identify funding necessary to create an affordable housing land bank, land acquisition loan fund, or similar strategy to purchase land in proximity to the river and hold it

for future development as affordable housing or permanent supportive housing. The No Project Alternative would not meet this objective.

- Foster Opportunity for Continued Community Engagement, Development, and Education—In contrast to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the No Project Alternative does not contain goals to engage the Indigenous Peoples of the region to document and celebrate the importance of the indigenous cultures of the LA River. The No Project Alternative would not meet this goal.
- Improve Local Water Supply Reliability—The No Project Alternative does not contain any goals or project components such as diverting and treating stormwater nor does the No Project Alternative contain capture and treatment of stormwater and dry weather flows. The No Project Alternative would not meet this goal.
- Promote Healthy, Safe, Clean Water—In contrast to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, the No Project Alternative does not contain objectives to coordinate water quality improvements with the Safe, Clean Water Program or coordinate with the Watershed Management Program and Enhanced Watershed Management Program groups. The No Project Alternative does not contain actions to ensure that development within the watershed incorporates low impact development techniques to increase infiltration and capture throughout the built watershed. The No Project Alternative would not meet this objective.

Rationale for Finding of Infeasibility of Alternative A—No Project

As identified above, although Alternative A could reduce some of the construction and operation impacts of the proposed Project for aesthetics, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and land use and planning, it would not meet the basic project objectives or provide all of the benefits that could occur under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. The No Project Alternative would fail to meet the objectives of prioritizing flood risk management while enhancing the environment and strengthening communities through multi-benefit investment as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution, and as defined by the project objectives, it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

10.1.2 Alternative B—Channel Avoidance Alternative

Under the Channel Avoidance Alternative, no channel modification associated with the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would occur. As such, no improvements would occur within bank-to-bank of the LA River. Later activities under the Channel Avoidance Alternative would occur from top of levee up to the 1-mile study area boundary on each side of the LA River. There would be no *2020 LA River Master Plan* projects within the channel.

Alternative B would include implementation of only five of the six KOP categories compared to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*; these include KOP Category 1: Trails and Access Gateways, KOP Category 3: Crossings and Platforms, KOP Category 4: Diversions, KOP Category 5: Floodplain Reclamation, and KOP Category 6: Off-Channel Land Assets.

Under the Channel Avoidance Alternative, a total of 107 projects would be implemented, similar to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*; however, none of these would include any activities within bank-to-bank of the LA River. Similar to the proposed Project, this alternative would also incorporate common elements along the LA River and would be subject to the relevant *2020 LA River Master Plan* Design Guidelines recommendations and BMPs.

Alternative B would make improvements to the LA River, but to a lesser extent than the proposed Project and would not meet the basic objectives of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Specifically under the Channel Avoidance Alternative, the following objectives identified for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be met:

- **Flood Risk and Resiliency**—In contrast to the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan*, Alternative B would not implement capacity-increasing measures, such as modifying the channel, deepening the channel, raising levees, building bypass channels or tunnels, removing invasive plants, or removing sediment from the channel. Alternative B would not increase capacity of existing dams and detention basins through measures such as clearing debris, deepening basins, increasing dam and levee heights, and improving real-time controls. Alternative B would not evaluate critical infrastructure and facilities located in the floodplain and encourage the use of best practices to reduce vulnerability to flood hazards. Alternative B would not meet this goal.
- **Healthy, Connected Ecosystems**—Alternative B does not include goals to actively manage and remove invasive species from the river corridor utilizing best management practices.
- **Improve Local Water Supply Reliability**—Alternative B does not contain goals to implement stormwater and dryweather runoff capture projects throughout the watershed and along the main stem and tributaries of the LA River. Implement direct diversion and treatment projects for recharge in the Central Basin and the San Fernando Basin. Implement direct diversion and treatment projects for use as recycled water where cost effective.
- **Promote Healthy, Safe, Clean Water**—In contrast to the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, Alternative B does not contain goals to expand stormwater capture for groundwater recharge, increase distributed stormwater capture, and reduce effective imperviousness in the watershed, prioritizing nature-based solutions where possible. Alternative B does not prioritize the removal of pollutants of concern according to timelines contained within the WMP and EWMP plans and the Clean Water Act permits. Prioritize catchments where needs are greater than can be met with planned or developed projects.

Rationale for Finding of Infeasibility of Alternative B—Channel Avoidance Alternative

This alternative would not encourage projects that would modify the existing channel to improve access and safety or improve channel capacity to reduce flood risk.

As identified above, although Alternative B could reduce biological resources impacts due to the elimination of in-channel construction activities, avoiding the largest concentration of biological resources throughout the project area, it would not meet the basic project objectives or provide the benefits that could occur under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. Alternative B would not include modifying the existing channel to improve access and safety, or improve channel capacity to reduce flood risk. Additionally Alternative B would fail to meet the goals of prioritizing flood risk management while enhancing the environment and strengthening communities through multi-benefit investment as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution, and as defined by the project objectives, it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.