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I INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 for the purpose of providing decision-makers and the public with information regarding environmental effects of proposed projects; identifying means of avoiding environmental damage; and disclosing to the public the reasons behind a project’s approval even if it leads to environmental damage. The Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an Initial Study (IS) is required.

An IS is a preliminary analysis conducted by the lead agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the initial study concludes that the project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared; otherwise the lead agency may adopt a Negative Declaration (ND) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

The IS/ND contained herein has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).
B. Document Format

This ND is organized into eight sections as follows:

Section I, Introduction: provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section II, Project Description: provides a description of the project location, project background, project components, and proposed construction and operation.

Section III, Existing Environment: provides a description of the existing environmental setting with focus on features of the environment, which could potentially affect the proposed project or be affected by the proposed project.

Section IV, Environmental Effects/Initial Study Checklist: presents the City’s Checklist for all impact areas and mandatory findings of significance. Includes discussion and identifies applicable mitigation measures.

Section V, Mitigation Measures: provides the mitigation measures that would be implemented to ensure that potential adverse impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Section VI, Preparation and Consultation: provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of this report and key personnel consulted.

Section VII, Determination – Recommended Environmental Documentation: provides the recommended environmental documentation for the proposed project; and,

Section VIII, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this report.

C. CEQA Process

Once the adoption of a ND (or MND) has been proposed, a public comment period opens for no less than twenty (20) days, or thirty (30) days if there is state agency involvement. The purpose of this comment period is to provide public agencies and the general public an opportunity to review the initial study and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings of the lead agency regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. If a reviewer believes the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the reviewer should (1) identify the specific effect, (2) explain why it is believed the effect would occur, and (3) explain why it is believed the effect would be significant. Facts or expert opinion supported by facts should be provided as the basis of such comments.
After the close of the public review period, the Board of Public Works considers the ND or MND, together with any comments received during the public review process, and makes a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not to approve the project. One or more Council committees may then review the proposal and documents and make its own recommendation to the full City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body and also considers the ND or MND, together with any comments received during the public review process, in the final decision to approve or disapprove the project. During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Board of Public Works or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Public Works, Council committees and City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Board of Public Works Agenda is available via the internet at [http://www.bpw.lacity.org/](http://www.bpw.lacity.org/). The Council agenda can be obtained by visiting the Council and Public Services Division of the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Suite 395; by calling 213/978-1047, 213/978-1048 or TDD/TTY 213/978-1055; or via the internet at [http://www.lacity.org/CLK/index.htm](http://www.lacity.org/CLK/index.htm).

If the project is approved, the City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within 5 days. The Notice of Determination will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

II PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Introduction

The proposed project involves reconstruction of the existing Central Outfall Sewer (COS) located at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street in the City of Los Angeles. At this location, an obstruction in the sewer caused by a City storm drain, results in sewage back up in the 74th Street and Florence Avenue sewers. The proposed project would remove the obstruction by reconstructing both the sewer and the storm drain at this location.

B. Location

The Central Outfall Sewer at 59th Street and 4th Avenue project site is located at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street in the Park Mesa Heights neighborhood within the City of Los Angeles. The Park Mesa Heights neighborhood is located approximately 9 miles directly east of Marina Del Rey and approximately 4 miles southwest of the University of Southern California. The project area is predominantly residential, and at the four corners of the 4th Avenue and 59th Street intersection are four single-family residential homes. Within the vicinity of the project site is 59th Street Elementary School,
located at 59th Street and 3rd Avenue, as well as a commercial corridor along Slauson Avenue, one block north of 59th Street (see Figure 1, Project Location Map and Figure 2, Project Area Map).

C. Setting

The project site, the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street, is located in the Park Mesa Heights neighborhood within the City of Los Angeles. Park Mesa Heights is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Los Angeles and primarily consists of low, medium and high density residential land uses, with community support public and commercial facilities. Within the immediate vicinity of the project site, land use is predominantly low density residential with the 59th Street Elementary School located at the intersection of 3rd Avenue and 59th Street. North of the elementary school is medium density residential.

The proposed project would involve rehabilitation of the Central Outfall Sewer (COS), which was originally constructed in 1907 to convey wastewater from the central portion of the City and adjoining areas to the south and southwest. This sewer originally conveyed wastewater to the Pacific Ocean; however, it now conveys wastewater directly to the Hyperion Treatment Plan (HTP). The COS is approximately 10 miles long, as shown in Figure 3, Central Outfall Sewer Alignment, and is, for the most part elliptical in shape measuring 60 inches wide by 73 inches high, although some portions are 57-inch and 69-inch diameter circular sections. Its original construction was brick and mortar. It was rehabilitated in the 1940s by replacing some of the brick and mortar, and subsequently lining the sewer with steel mesh and gunite. The COS was rehabilitated again in the early 2000s. The sewer can deliver approximately 100 cfs (65 mgd) wastewater to the HTP.

Beneath the project intersection, where the squash box crosses beneath the COS, is a 25.5 foot by 30-foot City of Los Angeles storm drain, as shown in Figure 4, Sewer and Storm Drain Lines at 59th Street and 4th Avenue. This storm drain was originally constructed in 1929 to accommodate a capacity of 660 cfs; however within the project area there have been a number of other storm drains constructed diverting flow and therefore significantly decreasing the total flow through the project storm drain. It is estimated that the current flow through the 4th Avenue City storm drain, during a notable storm, is approximately 660 cfs.

D. Background

The invert elevations of the City storm drain and the COS are at almost the same elevation. To correct this problem, the City storm drain was squashed to pass beneath the COS crossing diagonally at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street. However, the storm drain was unable to be sufficiently squashed, so the COS invert still needed to be raised.

A number of alternatives were evaluated to address this problem, as discussed in the 60th Street Interceptor Sewer/8th-Van Ness Pre-Design Technical Memorandum (January 11, 2010). Ultimately the City has decided to restore the sewer invert, caused by the hump, by installing a siphon in the 13.5-foot by 7-foot Slauson Avenue Storm Drain.
Figure 1 – Project Location Map
Figure 2 – Project Area Map
Figure 3 – Central Outfall Sewer (COS) Alignment
Figure 4 – Sewer and Storm Drain Lines at 59th Street and 4th Avenue
E. Purpose

The primary purpose of the proposed project is to repair the existing Central Outfall Sewer (COS) to reduce backflows within the existing 74th Street and Florence Avenue sewers caused by an obstruction in the COS at 4th Avenue created by the existing City of Los Angeles storm drain. This obstruction has led to a backup within the Slauson Avenue diversion structure which affects upstream sewers connected to this structure.

F. Proposed Project

Sewer

The proposed project would modify the Central Outfall Sewer (COS) as well as other sewers within the immediate project area. Activities associated with the project at COS would include restoring the invert, removing the existing transition structures and reinforced concrete box (RCB) sewer, and installing a new approximately 6-foot high by 5-foot wide elliptical sewer, as shown in Figure 5, COS Plan.

Storm Drain

The project would also involve the reconstruction of the storm drain at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street. A siphon would be constructed using an approximately 30-foot long squash box with three chambers. Each of the three chambers would be 3.5 feet high and nine feet wide with one-foot wide interior walls separating each chamber, as shown in Figure 6, Storm Drain Squash Box Plan. The top slab of the squash box would vary in thickness, ranging from eight inches beneath the COS alignment, to 14 inches elsewhere.

Two transition structures would also be constructed in the storm drain. The inlet transition structure would be approximately 30 feet long and gradually widens to allow flow into all three chambers. Two interior walls will be constructed as part of the inlet transition structure. The outlet transition structure would be approximately 16 feet long, include two interior walls, and taper down in width. Associated appurtenances that would be constructed include one maintenance hole upstream of the siphon and a total of three maintenance holes at the downstream end of the siphon, as discussed below. Additionally, one maintenance hole downstream would be rebuilt. Throughout the project vicinity, new warped gutters for catch basins would be installed, and following completion of construction activities, the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street would be reconstructed.

G. Project Construction

Construction is expected to last approximately two years. Construction activities for the sewer would be performed year-round, while work on the storm drain portions would be
Figure 5 – Central Outfall Sewer Plan Cross-Section
Figure 6 – Storm Drain Squash Box Plan Cross-Section
limited to the dry weather period, April 15 to October 15. During project construction, 5-foot wide sidewalks providing for pedestrian access would be maintained at all times, and only one crosswalk in each direction would be closed at any given point in time. Vehicles would not be able to pass through the intersection. However, residents would have access to their driveways.

Equipment used during construction would include the following:

- Drill rig (to drill piles for excavation)
- Excavator
- Crane (to lower piles, equipment and materials into drilled holes)
- Backhoe
- Whacker/Compaction equipment
- Concrete trucks
- Concrete pump truck (to fill drilled holes)
- Dump trucks
- Telehandlers
- Water truck
- Concrete saw
- Grader
- Paver

**Drilling & Excavation**

The first part of construction would involve relocating interfering utilities, including those for SoCal Gas Company, AT&T, and Department of Water & Power. Excavation and shoring at the intersection of 4th Avenue & 59th Street would then occur. Following excavation and shoring, a minor by-pass of the COS would be installed, as well as a by-pass for the existing 24-inch VCP sewer east of the main storm drain and the 15-inch VCP within the storm drain. With by-passes in place, both the COS and storm drain would then be removed. Approximately 300 cubic yards (cy) of soil would be excavated at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street. Excavated material would be hauled from the project site to one of several landfills in the greater Los Angeles area.

**Storm Drain Construction**

Storm drain construction would include the construction of a squash box, transition structures, and appurtenant structures. With structures in place, the existing 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) storm drains would be connected into the new inlet structure to direct all flow into the storm drain during the wet weather season.

**COS Construction**

COS construction would involve removing the interfering portion of existing 24-inch vitrified clay pipe (VCP) sewer on the east side of 4th Avenue, constructing a new sewer maintenance hole on the east side of 4th Avenue north of 59th Street, installing the new
COS pipe and the new sewer maintenance hole, and then joining the remaining portion of
the existing 24" VCP sewer to the COS.

**Backfill**

Following installation of the new storm drain and COS and local sewers, backfill to the
storm drain connector pipe elevation would be completed. As part of backfill activities,
the existing catch basins would be removed (completed only during the dry weather
season) and new catch basins would be installed. At this time, 24-inch and 18-inch RCP
connector storm drain pipes would also be installed, after which time backfill activities
would be completed. Approximately 330 cy would be hauled to the project site and used
as backfill upon completion of project construction activities.

**Street Construction**

The final stage of construction would be street construction. New Portland Cement
Concrete (PCC) warped gutters would be installed, and the street and sidewalks at the
intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street would be reconstructed and reopened.
Additionally, new handicapped access ramps would be installed at the intersection.

**H. Operation and Maintenance**

Upon completion of construction, the ongoing operation of both the sewer and storm drain
would allow wastewater and stormwater to move through the collection systems with
fewer obstructions. Existing maintenances holes located up and down stream from both
the sewer and the storm drain would be used to access the facilities and conduct
regularly scheduled maintenance activities and repairs.

**I. Project Actions and Approvals**

The proposed project and environmental documentation, including this Initial
Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration would require approval by the City of Los Angeles
Board of Public Works and City Council. Additional anticipated approvals or permits for
the proposed project include, but are not limited to the following:

- State Water Resources Control Board/LARWQCB project review and NPDES
  General Construction Permit and approval of RAP, as applicable
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works permit to modify storm drains
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, Traffic Control Plan review

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the proposed
project would be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws,
regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards (e.g., *Los Angeles Municipal
Code* and Bureau of Engineering *Standard Plans*). Construction would follow the uniform
practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works
Association (e.g., Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook) as specifically adapted by the City of Los Angeles (e.g., The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications For Public Works Construction [AKA "The Brown Book," formerly Standard Plan S-610]).

III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The proposed project site is located at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street in the Park Mesa Heights neighborhood within the City of Los Angeles. The Park Mesa Heights neighborhood is located approximately 9 miles directly east of Marina Del Rey and approximately 4 miles southwest of the University of Southern California. The project area is predominantly residential, and at the four corners of the 4th Avenue and 59th Street intersection are four single-family residential homes. The zoning within the immediate vicinity of the project site is R1-1, Low Density Residential.

The project site is located within 500 feet of a school zone; one block east is 59th Street Elementary School. Additionally, the project site is identified as a recommended access location for 59th Street Elementary School, according to the Los Angeles Unified School District, Office of Environmental Health and Safety, 59th Street Elementary School Pedestrian Routes to School Map (July 2010), as shown in the attached Figure 7, Pedestrian Routes to School for 59th Street Elementary School. The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan identifies 4th Avenue as a collector street, while the remaining streets in the immediate project vicinity, including 59th Street, 3rd Avenue, and 5th Avenue, are identified as local streets.

The California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey’s Seismic Hazard Zonation Program Map indicates that the project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest active fault to the project site is the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon Fault, which is located approximately 1.5 miles immediately west of the project site. However, no active faults are known to cross the project site. The project site is located within a potentially liquefiable zone as well as a fault rupture study zone due to the site’s proximity to the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon Fault.

According to the Geotechnical Data Report prepared for the project, the site is underlain by lean silts and clays to depths of approximately 25 to 30 feet, underlain then by sands with silts. The fill materials and native soils are considered suitable for support of the planned improvements; however, soft bottoms would need to be excavated and replaced with compacted fill.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS/INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

This section documents the screening process used to identify and focus upon environmental impacts that could result from this project. The IS Checklist below follows closely the form prepared by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research and was used in conjunction with the City’s L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and other sources to
Figure 7 – Pedestrian Routes to School for 59th Street Elementary School
screen and focus upon potential environmental impacts resulting from this project. Impacts are separated into the following categories:

- **No Impact.** This category applies when a project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. A “No Impact” finding does not require an explanation when the finding is adequately supported by the cited information sources (e.g., exposure to a tsunami is clearly not a risk for projects not near the coast). A finding of “No Impact” is explained where the finding is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

- **Less Than Significant Impact.** This category is identified when the project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance, and would therefore be less than significant impacts.

- **Less Than Significant After Mitigation.** This category applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The mitigation measures are described briefly along with a brief explanation of how they would reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be incorporated by reference.

- **Potentially Significant Impact.** This category is applicable if there is substantial evidence that a significant adverse effect might occur, and no feasible mitigation measures could be identified to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. There are no such impacts for the proposed project.

Sources of information that adequately support these findings are referenced following each question. All sources so referenced are available for review at the offices of the Bureau of Engineering, 1149 South Broadway Suite 600 Los Angeles, California 90015. Please call Nicole Cobleigh at (213) 485-5761 for an appointment.
1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections A.1 and A.2); West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan

Comment: A scenic vista generally provides focal views of objects, settings, or features of visual interest; or panoramic views of large geographic areas of scenic quality, primarily from a given vantage point. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduced incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially altered a view of a scenic vista.

The proposed project site is located in a predominantly flat area and does not have scenic or expansive views. Project construction activities would occur at and below grade, and following the completion of project construction, all project-related activities would occur below ground. Additionally, no recognized scenic vistas or views are located in the project area or within the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic vistas.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Reference: California Scenic Highway Mapping System, L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections A.1 and A.2); City of Los Angeles General Plan; Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan; California Department of Transportation, California Scenic Highway Mapping System website (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm)

Comment: A significant impact may occur where scenic resources within a state scenic highway would be damaged or removed as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed project is not along or near a designated California Scenic Highway or locally designated scenic highway. In addition, no scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings are in the project area. The project is located in geographically flat, residential neighborhood. Additionally, project activities would primarily occur below ground. Therefore, no scenic resources would be affected by the project.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections A.1 and A.2)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduced incompatible visual elements to the project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the project site.

The project site is within an intersection in an urbanized residential area of the City of Los Angeles. The site is visible from a number of single family residences located on 4th Avenue as well as 59th Street. Project implementation would involve the closure of the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue for a period of approximately two years. During that time, the use of above-ground construction equipment and would be required. Construction equipment within the residential neighborhood would alter the existing visual character of the project area. However, due to the temporary nature of the construction activities, as well as the fact that upon project completion the project would be located entirely below ground, visual impacts to the
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residential neighborhood would be short term and less than significant.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section A.4)
Comment: A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused a substantial increase in ambient illumination levels beyond the property line or caused new lighting to spill-over onto light-sensitive land uses such as residential, some commercial and institutional uses that require minimum illumination for proper function, and natural areas.

Construction activities for the proposed project would occur during the daytime only; no nighttime lighting would be needed. Upon completion of construction the project would operate entirely below ground and therefore not require any new lighting. No light and glare would occur.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:
   a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
Reference: California State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program website (http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/Pages/Index.aspx); City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element; Zone Information & Map Access System (ZIMAS)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to a non-agricultural use.

No prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance exists within the project area or vicinity. The project site is not located on or near any property zoned or otherwise intended for agricultural uses. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not impact state-designated agricultural land.

   b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
Reference: California State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program website (http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/Pages/Index.aspx); City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element, Zone Information & Map Access System (ZIMAS)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of land zoned for agricultural use, or indicated under a Williamson Act contract, from agricultural use to a non-agricultural use.

No land on or near the project site is zoned for or contains agricultural uses. As the City of Los Angeles does not participate in the Williamson Act, there are no Williamson Act properties in the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, no impact from project construction and operation is anticipated.

   c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)?
References: City of Los Angeles General Plan
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to conflict with an existing
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zoning classification of forest land or timberland, or cause rezoning of an area classified as forest land or timberland.

The proposed project site is located at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Land immediately surrounding the project site is zoned R1-1 (Low Density Residential), with areas of RD5-1 and PF-1, within one block of the project site. There are no forest land or timberland areas in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland resources, and no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

References: See 2 (c) above
Comment: See 2 (c) above.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Reference: See 2 (a) and 2 (c) above
Comment: See 2 (a) and 2 (c) above.

3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections B1 and B2); South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, June 2007; City of Los Angeles General Plan
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

The project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is responsible for administering the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin, which is a comprehensive air pollution control program for attaining state and federal ambient air quality standards. The City has adopted Air Quality Element that is part of the General Plan. The Air Quality Element contains policies and goals for attaining state and federal air quality standards, while continuing economic growth, and includes implementation strategies for local programs contained in the AQMP. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project is inconsistent with the AQMP or the Air Quality Element of the City’s General Plan.

The Final 2007 AQMP describes the SCAQMD’s plan to attain the federal fine particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (µm) in diameter (PM$_{2.5}$) and 8-hour ozone (O$_3$) standards. Long-term operational emissions would not occur as a result of the proposed project; therefore, only construction-related emissions were assessed for compliance with the Final 2007 AQMP. Although the SCAQMD cannot directly regulate mobile source emissions, the Final 2007 AQMP requires the use of cleaner (as compared to “baseline”) in-use off-road equipment. In 2007, CARB adopted a regulation to reduce diesel particulate matter and nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions from in-use (existing) off-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles. Any construction equipment used to complete improvements to the COS and storm drains would operate in compliance with state law and would therefore be consistent with the objectives of the Final 2007 AQMP.
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The City of Los Angeles adopted an Air Quality Element that is part of the General Plan. Objective 1.3 of the Air Quality Element is to reduce particulate matter emissions from unpaved areas, parking lots, and construction sites. The SCAQMD’s Rule 403 contains various control measures that must be implemented on all construction projects under the SCAQMD’s jurisdiction. All construction activities would be compliant with Rule 403; therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the Air Quality Element of the General Plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?


Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

The California Clean Air Act, signed into law in 1988, established the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS); all areas of the state are required to achieve and maintain the CAAQS by the earliest practicable date. Regions of the state that have not met one or more of the CAAQS are known as nonattainment areas, while regions that meet the CAAQS are known as attainment areas.

The proposed project would be located in the Los Angeles County sub-area of the SCAB. Los Angeles County is designated as a state nonattainment area for ozone (O3), PM2.5, inhalable particulate matter less than or equal to 10 µm in diameter (PM10), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and lead; and an attainment or unclassified area for carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility reducing particles.

In determining attainment and maintenance of air quality standards, the SCAQMD has established thresholds of significance for these and other criteria pollutants. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project results in substantial emissions during construction or operation, which would exceed the established thresholds.

The construction air quality analysis was conducted for to determine construction-related emissions using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2011.1.1 (see Appendix A for results). The analysis assumed that construction would occur over a two-year period between 2012 and 2013 with operations commencing in 2014. The main construction activities included drilling and excavation, storm drain construction, COS construction, backfilling, and street reconstruction. Storm drain construction activities were only assumed to occur between the dry season of April and November of each year while all remaining activities would occur year-round. As a result, there would be an overlap of construction equipment, haul/vendor trucks, and construction workers during the storm drain and COS construction phases. Peak daily emissions would occur in 2012 during this overlap. Although it is possible that a single piece of equipment could be used for both the storm drain and COS construction, it was assumed that each phase would have unique equipment, which would serve to maximize results and provide a worst-case estimate of emissions.

Approximately 300 cubic yards of soil would be exported during the drilling/excavation phase and another 330 cubic yards of soil would be imported during the backfilling phase. Assuming that each haul truck would have a 10-cubic yard capacity, there would be a total of 60 one-way trips
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for soil export and 66 one-way trips for soil import. The trips were not phased in CalEEMod because the trucks would only haul material one-way and would return empty. Approximately 1,600 square feet of street would need to be reconstructed and paved at the intersection; volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions would occur from asphalt off-gassing.

A summary of the emissions analysis is provided in Table 1 below. Long-term operational emissions would not occur as a result of the proposed project and were not estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Peak Daily Project Construction Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Emissions (lbs/day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the analysis indicate that project-related construction would not exceed the established SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants, and thus would be less than significant. As such, the proposed project construction would not result in a violation of air quality standards or substantially contribute to existing or projected air quality violations; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?


Comment: A significant impact would occur if the proposed project’s incremental air quality effects are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, present, and future projects.

As discussed in 3(b) above, emissions would not exceed established thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction and would not cause or contribute to local or regional air quality impacts. Therefore, net increases of emissions generated by construction are not considered to substantially exacerbate a violation of air quality standards or significantly contribute to a cumulative air quality impact when combined with the effects of other projects, and the impact is less than significant. No long-term operational emissions would occur as a result of the proposed project.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections B1, B2, and B3)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if construction or operation of the proposed project generated pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors include residences, board and care facilities, schools, playgrounds, hospitals, parks, child care centers, and outdoor athletic facilities.
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As discussed in 3(b) above, the proposed project would not result in a violation of air quality standards or substantially contribute to existing or projected air quality violations during construction. As such, construction is not expected to expose sensitive receptors, including nearby residences, to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, impacts from construction would be less than significant. No long-term operational emissions would occur as a result of the proposed project.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections B1 and B2)
Comment: A significant impact would occur if the project created objectionable odors during construction or operation that would affect a substantial number of people.

Project construction would involve, in part, reconstruction of the existing COS located beneath the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Following excavation, improvements to the sewer and storm drain would occur. The potential for objectionable odors does exist because construction activities would be affecting the existing sewer; however, currently minimal sewer flow is passing through the sewer, and during project construction, flow would be entirely diverted upstream of the COS at this intersection. With little to no flow going through the sewer, there would be no new source of objectionable odor traveling through the pipes.

Odors may currently exist and linger from past use of the COS at this location, and during project construction, cleaning of the sewer system would be performed. The cleaning would specifically focus on the reduction of odor and thus limit the potential for objectionable odors emanating from the COS during construction activities. As such, odor impacts during construction are anticipated to be less than significant.

Following completion of construction, the sewer would be returned to active use and flows through the sewer would be regulated, as with all other sewers in the City, to control the odors emanating from maintenance holes. As such, the potential for objectionable odors during operation would be less than significant.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C); City of Los Angeles General Plan
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would remove or modify habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited.

The proposed project site is located in an urbanized residential area. There is no native habitat for plants or animals within the proposed project area. Associated with the residential area are street trees; however the proposed sewer and storm drain rehabilitation project would not affect the existing street trees in the project area. All activities would occur in and below the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Therefore, no impacts to habitat or candidate, sensitive, or special status species would occur.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive
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natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
Reference: See 4 (a) above
Comment: See 4 (a) above.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
Reference: City of Los Angeles General Plan; L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, would be modified or removed.

The project site is completely developed and not located within the vicinity of any water bodies. No wetlands would be affected by the project; therefore no impact associated with construction and operation of the proposed would occur.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project interfered or removed access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The project area is within an urban setting, and is completely developed with residential uses and a neighboring elementary school. There are no native resident or migratory fish, wildlife species, wildlife corridors, nor native wildlife nursery site located on or in the vicinity of the project site. Construction and operation of the proposed project, therefore, would have no impact related to wildlife corridors or use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause an impact that was inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources.

There are no protected biological resources on or in the vicinity of the project site. There are residential street trees and landscaping in the vicinity of the project site; however, project construction activities would occur entirely within the street at the intersection 59th Street and 4th Avenue and would therefore not affect any vegetation within the project area. Upon completion of project construction, the project would operate entirely below ground and not affect any biological resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
Reference: City of Los Angeles General Plan; L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with the provisions of the adopted habitat conservation plans of the cited type.
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?

   Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section D.3)

   Comment: A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource.

   No local, state or nationally-listed resources exist in the project area. The project involves the replacement of a portion of the deteriorated COS beneath the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Construction and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to affect any historical resources; no impacts would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?

   Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section D.3)

   Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, which falls under the CEQA Guidelines section cited above.

   The project site is located within a portion of the Los Angeles Basin not previously known to contain archaeological resources. However, construction activities associated with the proposed project involve excavation to approximately 20 to 25 feet below ground surface; therefore, the potential does exist to encounter unexpected archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources are encountered during the course of construction activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be suspended until the discovery is assessed by a qualified archaeological monitor working under the direct supervision of a Principal Investigator or Project Manager certified by the Register of Professional Archaeologists (qualifications derived from 36 CFR Part 61) and appropriate treatment is determined. Therefore, potential impacts to archeological resources during construction activities associated with the project would be less than significant. No impact is anticipated from the operation of the proposed project.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

   Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section D.1); Standard Specification for Public Works Construction (“Greenbook”)

   Comment: A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

   The proposed project is not anticipated to affect paleontological resources. The ground at this location has been previously disturbed during construction of the COS and the City storm drain, and construction activities for the proposed project are not expected to occur at depths where paleontological resources would be encountered. However, in the unlikely event that any resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall cease within the vicinity of the find until the paleontological resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section D.2); Standard Specification for Public Works Construction ("Greenbook")

Comment: A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb interred human remains.

No known burial sites are located within the project site; however, it is still possible that human remains could exist in the subsurface. In the event that an unknown burial site or human remains are found during excavation, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, the County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or believed to be Native American, s/he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendents shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains. Therefore, potential impacts to any unknown burial site or human remains being encountered during construction activities associated with the project would be less than significant. No impact is anticipated from the operation of the proposed project.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

   a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.1); Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010); California Department of Conservation Inglewood Quadrangle (July 1986)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone and appropriate building practices were not followed.

The project site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone/Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone; however the site is located within a Fault Rupture Study Zone and within a state designated liquefaction area. Additionally, the project site is located in a seismically active area, as is most of southern California. However, no active faults are known to cross the project site.
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The Geotechnical Design Memorandum prepared for the project details design considerations and recommendations, during both construction and operation, to account for the soil conditions at the project site, in the project vicinity, and the overall seismic concerns associated with the project area. Through implementation of the recommendations and guidance within the Geotechnical Design Memorandum, construction and operation of the project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from the rupture of a known earthquake fault; impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.1); Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010); California Department of Conservation Publication 42

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project design did not comply with building code requirements intended to protect people from hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

As with most locations in southern California, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking emanating from causative faults during an earthquake. As indicated in 6(a)(i) above, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, and thus the potential for hazards associated with strong seismic ground-shaking such as ground surface rupture affecting the site is considered low. Known regional faults that could produce significant ground shaking at the project site include the Santa Monica, Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon, Malibu Coast, Palos Verdes, Hollywood, and Puente Hills Blind Thrust Faults, among others. The closest of these is the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon Fault. Seismic activity along any of the above-mentioned faults could affect the proposed project, and is considered during the design of proposed structures.

The proposed project involves replacement of the existing sewer at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Currently, the sewer crosses beneath this intersection and requires rehabilitation. Therefore, the project will merely replace the existing sewer. Consideration for the potential for strong seismic ground shaking has occurred, and the Geotechnical Design Memorandum prepared for the proposed project includes construction and operation recommendations and guidance to ensure the structural integrity of the sewer during seismic events. As such, implementation of the proposed project does not have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with seismic ground shaking; impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.1); General Plan Safety Element; California Department of Conservation Publication 42; Los Angeles, California; Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and appropriate design measures required
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within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project.

Liquefaction typically occurs when near-surface (usually upper 50 feet) saturated, clean, fine-grained loose sands are subject to intense ground shaking. The project site is located within a potentially liquefiable zone (as mapped by the California Division of Mines and Geology), with the depth to groundwater beneath the site at approximately 36 feet below the ground surface; historic high groundwater is approximately 15 feet below ground surface. However, consideration for the potential for liquefaction has been taken into account, and the Geotechnical Design Memorandum prepared for the proposed project includes construction and operation recommendations and guidance to ensure the structural integrity of the sewer during seismic events. As such, implementation of the proposed project does not have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with liquefaction; impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.1); City of Los Angeles General Plan (Landslide Inventory and Hillside Areas in the City of Los Angeles Map); Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010); California Department of Conservation Publication 42

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be located in an area identified as having a high risk of landslides and appropriate design measures required within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project.

The project is located in an area that is flat and is not identified as a potential landslide hazard area by the California Department of Mines and Geology. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides and no impacts would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.2)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to expose large areas to the erosion effects of wind or water for a prolonged period of time.

The proposed project is located below the existing ground surface at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. Construction would include ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation, trenching, grading, and landscaping. These activities could result in the potential for erosion to occur at the proposed project site, though soil exposure would be temporary and short-term in nature. Additionally, during construction the construction site would be a pit.

In accordance with standard specifications for public works construction and building code requirements, the proposed project would require implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for erosion and sedimentation control. Construction BMPs would also be undertaken to control runoff and erosion from any earthmoving activities that would occur. Implementation of such control measures would prevent substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil from exposed soils.
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Following completion of construction, the replaced sewer would be covered and the intersection would be repaved and return to an active roadway. Therefore, operation of the proposed project the site would be covered by paving and no large areas of exposed soil would exist that would be exposed to the effects of erosion by wind or water. As such, construction or operation of the project would have less than significant impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landside, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section C1); Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project was built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property.

Two subsurface evaluations have been performed in the vicinity of the project site. In 2009, as part of the COS Rehabilitation, two borings were conducted at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street to depths of 15 feet and 26 feet below ground surface. In May 2010, additional borings in the project vicinity were conducted to depths of 36 feet, where groundwater was encountered. The Geotechnical Data Report and Geotechnical Design Memorandum prepared for the project indicates the site is underlain by lean silts and clays to depths of approximately 25 to 30 feet below ground surface underlain by sands with silts. The soils were generally moist and firm or dense, though some of the shallow clays were considered soft.

Based on the soil conditions identified in the Geotechnical Data Report, the Geotechnical Design Memorandum was prepared. According to the Geotechnical Design Memorandum, excavations may encounter soft and/or wet soils at the planned subgrade which would be unsuitable for the placement of pipe bedding, new structures, or other improvements. Soft subgrades shall be over-excavated to suitable material and backfilled with property compacted fill soils in order to support the new structures. Bedding shall be placed on firm soil to reduce the potential for settlement of the sewer structures. With the incorporation of these features, the proposed project would be built on suitable soils and would not have the potential to post hazards to life or property; impacts would be less than significant.

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

Reference: Uniform Building Code; Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a risk to life and property.

The Expansion Index (EI) presented below in Table 2 is used to measure a basic index property of soil and therefore, the EI is comparable to other indices such as the liquid limit, plastic limit, and plasticity index of soils. The classification of a potentially expansive soil is based on the following table:
Table 2: Classification of Expansive Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion Index</th>
<th>Expansion Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–20</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-90</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-130</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;130</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the recommendations in the Geotechnical Design Memorandum for the project site, any existing fill soils considered to be soft should be removed and recompacted during grading and import material should consist of clean, non-expansive material that conforms with the latest edition of the “Greenbook” Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction for structure backfill. Non-expansive soil has an EI of 20 or less. With use of nonexpansive soils, no impacts would occur.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Reference: None applicable

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built on soils that were incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system, and such a system were proposed.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact associated with construction and operation of any phase of the proposed project is anticipated.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?


Comment: SCAQMD developed a recommended interim threshold for assessing the significance of potential GHG emissions that uses a tiered approach to determining significance. The preferred significance threshold for GHG emissions from industrial projects is < 10,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) per year, which includes construction emissions amortized over 30 years and then added to operational GHG emissions. The SCAQMD also proposed a screening level for significance for residential/commercial projects of 3,000 MTCO2e per year, which also includes construction emissions amortized over 30 years and then added to operational GHG emissions to determine total project GHG emissions. On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Board adopted the industrial source threshold of 10,000 MTCO2e per year, but did not vote on the residential/commercial threshold because SCAQMD staff needed additional time to complete analysis on the threshold.

While the proposed project involves the reconstruction of the existing COS and storm drain at the intersection of 4th Avenue and 59th Street in the City of Los Angeles and is not an industrial project, in the absence of more applicable thresholds, the SCAQMD’s recommended threshold of
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10,000 metric tons CO2e provides a benchmark for comparison purposes to assess the project's relative contribution of GHG emissions.

Total CO2e construction emissions were estimated to be 687 metric tons (Appendix A) over the two year construction period. Total CO2e emissions would be approximately seven percent of SCAQMD’s recommended threshold of 10,000 MTCO2e for industrial projects. No long-term operational GHG emissions would occur as a result of the proposed project.

As described above, while SCAQMD’s 10,000 MTCO2e threshold would not apply to the proposed project, it is presented here as benchmark for comparison purposes to demonstrate that the proposed project would not result in substantial amounts of GHG emissions that could potentially have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, emissions of GHG associated with the construction of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?


Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG.

As described below, several initiatives, plans, policies, and regulations have been adopted at the state and local level related to reducing GHG emissions. In general, California’s goals and strategies for the systematic statewide reduction of GHG emissions are embodied in the combination of Executive Order S-3-05 and Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which call for the following reductions of GHG emissions:

- 2000 levels by 2010 (11 percent below business-as-usual)
- 1990 levels by 2020 (25 percent below business-as-usual)
- 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050

As discussed in item 7(a), GHG emissions that would occur from the reconstruction of the sewer and storm drains would be substantially less than the SCAQMD’s significance criteria. The significance criteria established by the SCAQMD is sufficient to capture projects that represent approximately 90 percent of GHG emissions from new sources. In other words, 90 percent of total emissions from all stationary sources would be captured by this threshold. SCAQMD staff indicated that this threshold would be sufficient to prevent new development from substantially hindering progress towards achieving the goals of Executive Order S-3-05. GHG emissions would not conflict with AB 32 or S-3-05 and would be less than significant.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections F.1 & F.2); Geotechnical Data Report – 60th Street Interceptor Sewer (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, June 2010); 60th Street Interceptor Sewer – Geotechnical Design Memorandum (City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, July 2010)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project utilizes substantial amounts of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and could potentially pose a hazard to the
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The proposed project involves excavation of earthen materials and replacement of a portion of the COS beneath 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve the routine use of hazards or hazardous materials. During construction, excavation of soils would be required. Although encountering contaminated soils is not anticipated, in the event that contaminated soils are encountered, the contaminated materials would be hauled off the site as “waste protect” and be classified as hazardous waste. A hazardous waste manifest would be prepared by the contractor and the material would be transported to an appropriate facility for handling hazardous materials. Operation of the proposed project would return sewer flow beneath the existing street to original design capacity. No new hazards to the public or environment would occur from project operation; impacts would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?


Comment: Refer to 8(a) above.

As discussed under Item 8(a) above, the proposed project site is not anticipated to contain contaminated soils, and operation of the project would not involve the use of hazards or hazardous materials. During construction, excavation of soils would be required. Although encountering contaminated soils is not anticipated, in the event that contaminated soils are encountered, the contaminated materials would be hauled off the site as “waste protect” and be classified as hazardous waste. A hazardous waste manifest would be prepared by the contractor and the material would be transported to an appropriate facility for handling hazardous materials. Operation of the proposed project would return sewer flow beneath the existing street to original design capacity. No new hazards to the public or environment would occur from project operation; impacts would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section F.2)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and were projected to release toxic emissions which pose a hazard beyond regulatory thresholds.

There are two schools located within a 0.25-mile radius of the proposed project site: LAUSD’s 59th Street Elementary School located one block east of the project site and a private elementary school, Marcus Garvey Elementary School, located approximately three blocks west of the project site.

As discussed in 8(a) above, the proposed project involves excavation of earthen materials and replacement of a portion of the COS beneath 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve the routine use of hazards or hazardous
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materials. During construction, excavation of soils would be required. Although encountering contaminated soils is not anticipated, in the event that contaminated soils are encountered, the contaminated materials would be hauled off the site as "waste protect" and be classified as hazardous waste. A hazardous waste manifest would be prepared by the contractor and the material would be transported to an appropriate facility for handling hazardous materials. Operation of the proposed project would return sewer flow beneath the existing street to original design capacity. No new hazards to the public or environment would occur from project operation. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not emit or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that would be projected to release toxic emissions and the impact would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which 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?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section F.2); EnviroStar Database www.envirostar.dtsc.ca.gov, accessed October 20, 2011
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located on a site which 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.

According to the EnviroStar Database, no listed or hazardous materials sites are located within the vicinity of the project site. Additionally, as discussed in 8(a) above, the proposed project will not involve the use of hazardous materials. As such, no significant hazards impacts to the public or environment would occur from project construction or operation.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project site were located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would create a safety hazard.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport of public use airport. The nearest airport to the project site is Los Angeles International Airport, which is located approximately 9 miles west of the project site. Therefore, no safety hazard associated with proximity to an airport is anticipated for the proposed project.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project is in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no safety hazard
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from proximity to a private airport or airstrip is anticipated from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section F.1); City of Los Angeles General Plan  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to substantially interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of these plans.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would require the closure of the 59th Street and 4th Avenue intersection, which has the potential to negatively affect emergency access to residences and streets immediately surrounding the intersection. Neither 59th Street nor 4th Avenue would provide through access in the neighborhood. However, streets immediately north, south, east and west of these would remain open and accessible. Closure of this intersection, however, does have the potential to significantly affect emergency response activities.

As part of standard specifications, contractors are required to coordinate with the commanders of potentially affected fire and police stations prior to construction so that alternative route planning can occur and can be implemented if required. Additionally, with implementation of the Mitigation Measure HAZ-17, emergency access to the properties immediately surrounding the project site, and the project site itself, can be maintained such that potentially significant impacts could be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is required as follows:

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to the start of construction and prior to closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, and continuing throughout the entire duration of construction, the Contractor shall post detour ahead signs posted as well as marked detour route signs within two blocks in every direction to guide pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and emergency vehicles to the alternative routes open during the intersection’s closure.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section F.1); City of Los Angeles General Plan  
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a wildland area and poses a significant fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire.

The project site is not located within a designated High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element. The project site and surrounding areas are completely developed and there are no wildlands adjacent to the site. Therefore, no impact involving wildland fires is anticipated from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
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Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section G.2)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project discharged water which did not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems such as the LARWQCB. These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS. During project construction, excavation would occur at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue in order to replace this portion of the sewer. During the approximately two-year construction period, the wastewater currently flowing through the deteriorated portion of the COS will be rerouted such that no discharges occur. Additionally during construction, BMPs outlined within a SWPPP will be incorporated into the construction process. Once construction is complete, the sewer would operate underground and the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue would be repaved. The existing drainage patterns at the site would be restored upon construction completion. As such, no significant impacts associated with discharged water would occur.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections G.2 and G.3)
Comment: A project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater supplies if it were to result in a demonstrable and sustained reduction of groundwater recharge capacity or change the potable water levels sufficiently that it would reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies or storage of imported water, reduce the yields of adjacent wells or well fields, or adversely change the rate or direction of groundwater flow.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a portion of the deteriorated COS at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Project construction and operation will not require the use of groundwater, nor will construction or operation affect groundwater recharge. As such, no groundwater impacts would occur.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections G.1 and G.2)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that resulted in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project.

The project site is predominately flat and completely paved (impervious). The project would not alter the course of a stream or a river. Construction would require demolition of the existing ground surface and excavation, leaving the site as stabilized pervious surface. The replacement of impervious surfaces with a stabilized pervious surface at the site would have the effect of reducing the rate of runoff from the project site, which is considered a beneficial impact to the storm drain system. Construction activities could result in the potential for erosion to occur at the project site; however, soil exposure would be temporary and short-term in nature and applicable...
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Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion. Following completion of construction, the site would be repaved and drainage patterns would return to original, pre-construction, conditions. Therefore construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation off-site, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section G.1)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the proposed project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties.

As discussed in 9(c) above, the project site is predominately flat and completely paved (impervious). The project would not alter the course of a stream or a river. Construction would require demolition of the existing ground surface and excavation, leaving the site as stabilized pervious surface. The replacement of impervious surfaces with a stabilized pervious surface at the site would have the effect of reducing the rate of runoff from the project site, which is considered a beneficial impact to the storm drain system. Construction activities could result in the potential for erosion to occur at the project site; however, soil exposure would be temporary and short-term in nature and applicable Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion. Following completion of construction, the site would be repaved and drainage patterns would return to original, pre-construction, conditions. Therefore construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in flooding, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Reference: Refer to 9(a) above

Comment: Refer to 9(a) above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Reference: Refer to 9(a) above

Comment: Refer to 9(a) above

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections G.1 to G.3); FIRM FEMA Map Number 06037C1628F Panel No 1628F

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not result in the construction of new housing. No impacts would occur.
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h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections G.1 & G.3); FIRM FEMA Map Number 06037C1628F Panel No 1628F

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and would not result in the construction of structures within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts would occur.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections E.1 & G.3); City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area where a dam or levee could fail, exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death.

As indicated above, the project site is not located within the 100-year flood zone. In addition, the site is not located within an inundation area of a dam or levee as identified on the Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G) of the Safety Element of the General Plan. The project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS beneath the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. No people or structures would be exposed to risks from flooding; no impacts would occur.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E.1); City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause or accelerate geologic hazards, which would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury.

Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. The project site is not located near any bodies of water capable of producing seiches; as such no impacts would occur.

Tsunamis are waves generated in large bodies of water by fault displacement or major ground movement. Hazardous tsunamis, which are rare along the Los Angeles coastline, have the potential to cause flooding in the low-lying coastal area. The project site is not located within tsunami hazard area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

The project site is not located in an area considered susceptible to seismically-induced landslides. Therefore, no impact associated with inundation from mudflow would occur.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section H.2); City of Los Angeles General Plan; West
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Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan
Comment: A significant impact would occur if the project includes features such as a highway, above-ground infrastructure, or an easement that would cause a permanent disruption to an established community or would otherwise create a physical barrier within an established community.

The proposed project would occur within the intersection of two streets – 59th Street and 4th Avenue. Per the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan, 59th Street is designated as a local street and 4th Avenue is designated as a collector street. This intersection is located within a residential community and located one block from the 59th Street Elementary School. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require the temporary closure of the entire intersection to vehicles, as well as up to two crosswalks at the intersection, for a period of two years. The closure of this intersection will alter the travel pattern for drivers, cyclists, and walkers, including the students traveling to and from the neighboring elementary school. While travel patterns within the community would be disrupted for this temporary period of time, no permanent disruption or physical barrier would be established such that the community would remain permanently divided. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections H.1 & H.2); City of Los Angeles General Plan; Zone Information & Map Access System (ZIMAS)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were inconsistent with the General Plan, or other applicable plan, or with the site’s zoning if designated to avoid or mitigate a significant potential environmental impact.

The project site is located within a residential community and is immediately surrounding by single family residences. The project itself, however, would be constructed below the existing street at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. The zoning for the project area is R1-1. Project implementation, which involves improvements to an existing sewer, would not conflict with the existing land use or zoning designations for the project area and once implemented would serve the residences in the project area. Additionally, construction and operation of the project would occur beneath the existing roadways; as such, no land use conflicts would occur and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections H.1 & H.2); City of Los Angeles General Plan; Los Angeles County Draft General Plan, Figure 6.3 Significant Ecological Areas
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and would conflict with such plan.

As previously discussed in 4(d), the project site is not located in a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan. As such, construction and operation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an approved conservation plan and no impact would occur.
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11. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:
   a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
      Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section E4); City of Los Angeles General Plan
      Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally important mineral resource, if the project converts a regionally important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the project affects access to such use.

      No mineral resources are identified within the project area. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a valuable known mineral resource and no impact would occur.

   b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
      Reference: Refer to 11(a) above
      Comment: Refer to 11(a) above.

12. NOISE – Would the project result in:
   a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
      Reference: City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (Chapter IV, Article 1, Section 41.40; Chapter XI, Article 2, Section 112.05); L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section I); Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction noise Model User’s Guide (2006)
      Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

      The City regulates construction noise via the LAMC (Chapter IV, Article 1, Section 41.40; Chapter XI, Article 2, Section 112.05). Under the noise provisions, construction equipment noise levels are limited to a maximum noise level of 75 dBA (A-weighted decibel) at 50 feet from the noise source if technically feasible. The City allows construction during the week between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. and specifically prohibits night construction if related noise can disturb persons occupying sleeping quarters in any dwelling, hotel, or residence. In addition, construction within 500 feet of a residence is restricted to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and national holidays, and prohibited on Sundays. Major public works project conducted by the City is exempt from this weekend and holiday restriction.

      The City’s standard construction specifications require construction equipment to have noise suppressing devices and requires noise controls such as placement of noise barriers, use of low-noise generating equipment, maintenance of mufflers and ancillary noise abatement equipment, scheduling high noise producing activities during periods that are least sensitive, routing construction-related truck traffic away from noise-sensitive areas, and reducing construction vehicle speeds. Despite the required noise controls, construction equipment noise levels can exceed the 75 dBA limit established in the LAMC. Maximum noise levels of construction equipment identified for this project, such as concrete saws, backhoes, dump trucks, cranes, and graders, range from 77 and 90 dBA at 50 feet (FHWA, 2006). The equipment generally only operates at the maximum noise levels for a fraction of the operating time, resulting in an average
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noise level of 72 to 83 dBA per equipment at 50 ft. The City’s guide on CEQA thresholds shows that the use of mufflers on construction equipment only reduces ground clearing and excavation phase noise levels by 2 to 3 dBA. Therefore, it would not be technically feasible for most construction equipment to meet the 75 dBA maximum noise level. However, as stated within the City regulations for noise, if not technically feasible to maintain the 75 dBA maximum noise level, construction hours within 500 feet of residences shall be limited.

All phases of project construction would occur Monday through Friday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., although daily construction would not likely occur after 6:00 p.m. On Saturdays, project construction would occur between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. No construction would occur during prohibited hours.

Where technically feasible, construction equipment noise will be maintained at or below the 75 dBA maximum threshold level, and where not technically feasible, construction hours will occur within the allowed times, per City regulations. Therefore, standards and ordinances would not be violated by the project; therefore, the noise impacts would be less than significant.

Once construction is complete, operation of the sewer and storm drains would not generate noise. Operations and maintenance would result in periodic inspections of the facilities and use of a vacuum truck to clean the trash and solids removal devise as needed based on inspections. These activities are minor and would not result in substantial increases in the ambient noise level. Therefore, a less than significant noise impact is anticipated during project operation.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?


Comment: A significant impact may occur if the project were to expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Construction activities associated with the project could generate vibration. Construction equipment such as drill rigs, compaction equipment, and haul trucks would generate vibrations that could result in groundborne noise or vibration that may affect nearby structures or residents. Vibration levels greater than 0.3 inches per second (in/sec) have potential to damage older residential structures and levels greater than 0.4 in/sec would be severely noticeable to a human (Caltrans, 2004). All phases of the construction involve multiple trucks and other vibration producing equipment resulting in vibration levels approximately up to 0.07 in/sec at the residences closest to the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection. Excessive groundborne vibration and/or groundborne noise are not anticipated. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur during project construction.

Project operations would not involve activities that could generate vibrations or groundborne noise, or otherwise expose persons to such impacts. Therefore, project operation would not result in significant impacts related to groundborne vibration or noise.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section I)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the project were to substantially and permanently
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increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.

Construction activities for the proposed project would occur over a period of approximately 18 to 24 months. Upon completion of construction, operation of the proposed project and flows through the COS and the City storm drain would not generate any noise. As such, project implementation would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project area. No permanent noise impacts would occur.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? □ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☒


Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to create a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels. For construction projects that last more than 10 days within a three month period, the City recommends using the threshold of significance of 5 dBA or more increase in noise levels over existing ambient community noise equivalent level (CNEL), which is a type of a 24-hour average noise level.

Construction noise could result in a significant temporary impact to the ambient noise environment. All phases of the construction are expected to generate on 83-87 dBA of noise at 50 ft from the construction site. The drilling and excavation phase is anticipated to produce the most noise. Because the residences closest to the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection would be on average approximately 60 ft from the construction zone, the outdoor noise level at the nearest residences would be approximately 87 dBA during the drilling and excavation phase when all anticipated equipment are operating, resulting in a CNEL of 82 dBA. Assuming an existing ambient noise level of 50 dBA (City of LA, 2006), the drilling and excavation phase would be 32 dBA above the existing level. Approximately a 7 dBA decrease would be anticipated from the use of mufflers and sound barriers at the construction site (City of LA, 2006; FHWA, 2006) as required by the City’s standard construction specifications, resulting in a CNEL of 75 dBA. As this is a conservative analysis assuming that all anticipated equipment will be operating at the same time for the entire duration of drilling and excavation, the actual average noise levels would be lower. To reduce noise levels, Mitigation Measure N-1 is required as follows:

Mitigation Measure N-1: Daily construction activities shall be scheduled such that a minimum number of equipment required to complete the task without significantly impacting the construction schedule is in operation any given time.

Traffic noise increase along haul and commute routes is anticipated to be negligible.

It is unlikely that a person would be standing outside of their house for a prolonged period during construction. A resident inside a house would experience lower noise levels. A building with open windows would provide approximately 10 dB reduction, and a building with closed windows could expect an additional 10-25 dB reduction depending on window type, and building type. (FHWA, 2011) For example, a light frame building with a closed ordinary sash window would reduce the noise levels by 20 dB. The CNEL for a person inside a house at the intersection of 59th Street/4th Avenue would be less than 55 dBA, which would be a less than significant impact. This noise level would still allow conversation in a normal voice between people 10 feet apart and is not
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expected to cause hearing loss (EPA, 1974).

Construction noise level impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
Reference: Google Maps (2011)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to the project site being located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport where such a plan has not been adopted.

The project site is located approximately 22 miles south of the Burbank Airport, 7.5 miles northwest of the Los Angeles International Airport, 22 miles southwest of the El Monte Airport, and 10 miles southeast of the Santa Monica Airport. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to the project site being located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport where such a plan has not been adopted. No impact would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
Reference: Google Maps (2011)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to the vicinity to a private airstrip.

No private airstrips are located within the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, no impact associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project would occur.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section J.1); General Plan, including the West Adam-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project induced substantial population and housing growth through new development in undeveloped areas or by introducing unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted community plan or general plan.

The proposed project involves replacing existing infrastructure. Replacing this deteriorated infrastructure would allow the sewer system to return to functioning as originally designed and would not increase sewer conveyance or treatment capacity. The proposed project would not induce population growth through the expansion or extension of sewer infrastructure; no impacts would occur.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections J.1 and J.2)
Issues

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project displaced substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

No housing would be displaced or changed as a result of the proposed project; therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
Reference: See 13(b) above.
Comment: See 13(b) above.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES –

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

i) Fire protection?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section K.2); City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the project required the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation or relocation of an existing facility to maintain service.

The project site and surrounding area is currently served by the LAFD’s local Fire Station No. 66, located at 1909 West Slauson Avenue, Los Angeles, which is approximately 0.7 mile driving distance from project site. Additional fire stations within the project area include Fire Station No. 57, located at 7800 South Vermont Avenue (approximately 3.0 miles driving distance from the project site), Fire Station No. 94, located at 4470 Coliseum Street (approximately 3.0 miles driving distance from the project site), and Fire Station No. 34, located at 3661 7th Avenue (approximately 2.9 miles driving distance from the project site). The proposed project consists of replacing a portion of the COS at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue; therefore, during construction, the intersection would be closed to vehicular traffic, including fire protection vehicles. Only this intersection would be closed, however; access to the project area would remain along 59th Street, 4th Avenue, and all other surrounding streets. During construction, the fire hydrant located at the southwest corner of the 59th Street and 4th Avenue intersection would remain operational and available for use by the LAFD. Once completed, the project would not require the addition of a new fire station or the expansion or the existing fire protection services in the project area. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Police protection?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section K.1); City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in an increase in demand for police services that would exceed the capacity of the police department responsible for serving the site.

The project site and surrounding area is served by the Los Angeles Police Department 77th Street Community Police Station located at 7600 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Los
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Angeles (approximately 3.7 miles driving distance from the project site). The proposed project consists of replacing a portion of the COS at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue; therefore, during construction, the intersection would be closed to vehicular traffic, including police protection vehicles. Only this intersection would be closed, however; access to the project area would remain along 59th Street, 4th Avenue, and all other surrounding streets. Once completed, the project would not require generate additional demands for police protection services, and therefore would not exceed the capacity of services currently provided by the local police department. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### iii) Schools?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section K.3)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project included substantial employment or population growth that could generate demand for school facilities that exceeded the capacity of the school district responsible for serving the project site.

Two schools are located less than 0.25-mile from the project site: LAUSD’s 59th Street Elementary School located at 5939 2nd Avenue, and a private elementary school, March Garvey Elementary School, located at 2916 West Slauson Avenue. Replacement of the deteriorated portion of the COS beneath 59th Street and 4th Avenue would not result in population growth or generate an increased demand for school capacity. As such, no impacts to school capacity would occur from the proposed project.

### iv) Parks?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section K.4)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the recreation and park services available could not accommodate the population increase resulting from the implementation of the proposed project and new or physically altered facilities were needed.

As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would not result in population growth. Therefore, no increased demand for parks and recreational services would occur and no impacts would occur.

### v) Other public facilities?

Reference: None applicable
Comment: A significant impact would occur if the project results in the need for new or altered public facilities, such as libraries, due to population or housing growth.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the demand for or use of libraries or other public facilities in the area. Therefore, no impact would occur from the proposed project.

### 15. RECREATION –

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

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section K.4)
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Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project included substantial employment or population growth that generated demand for public park facilities that exceed the capacity of existing parks or that substantially affected the level or service of existing park facilities.

The proposed project is not a growth-inducing project, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the demand for parks or other recreational facilities in the area. No impacts to recreation services would occur.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
Reference: See 15(a).
Comment: See 15(a).

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L)
Comment: A project would have a significant traffic impact if the traffic volume to roadway capacity ratio is increased, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment Condition</th>
<th>Project-Related Increase in V/C Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Project* Traffic</td>
<td>Volume/Capacity Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>(V/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 0.701 – 0.800</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0.801 – 0.900</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, F &gt; 0.900</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including project, ambient and related project growth.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate minimal new trips. No more than 15 construction workers would be traveling to the project site on any given weekday, and throughout the day during the excavation phase of construction a total of 30 truck trips over the course of several weeks would be required to haul away approximately 300 cubic yards of soil. Following completion of sewer and storm drain replacement, backfill would be required. During the backfill phase of construction, a total of 33 truck trips would be required to bring approximately 330 cubic yards of soil to the project site. The number of trips generated by construction activities associated with the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic impact; impacts would be less than significant. During operation, no new trips would be required; operation of the project would result in no traffic impacts.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with an applicable
congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

The roadways in the project vicinity are not listed on the 2004 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County as Congestion Management Program roadways. Additionally, the proposed project would generate minimal numbers of new trips during the approximately two-year construction period. Because project construction and operation would not result in significant traffic impacts on local roadways, significant impacts on Congestion Management Program roadways are not anticipated.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project results in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks.

The proposed project is an underground sewer improvement project, and neither construction nor operation of the project would affect air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impacts to air traffic patterns would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L.5)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project substantially increased road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

During project construction the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue would be closed to through traffic. However, following the completion of construction, the intersection would be returned to pre-construction condition and would operate in the same capacity as it is currently. No new design features would be incorporated into the intersection, and no impacts would occur.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L.5 and L.8)
Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate emergency access.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would require the closure of the 59th Street and 4th Avenue intersection, which has the potential to negatively affect emergency access to residences and streets immediately surrounding the intersection. Neither 59th Street nor 4th Avenue would provide through access in the neighborhood. However, streets immediately north, south, east and west of these would remain open and accessible. Closure of this intersection has the potential to significantly impact emergency access.

As part of standard specifications, contractors are required to coordinate with the commanders of potentially affected fire and police stations prior to construction so that alternative route planning can occur and can be implemented if required. Additionally, with implementation of the following mitigation, emergency access to the properties immediately surrounding the project site, and the project site itself, can be maintained such that potentially significant impacts could be reduced to
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a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures TRAF-1 and TRAF-2 are required as follows:

Mitigation Measure TRAF-1: Prior to the start of construction and prior to closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, the construction contractor shall provide notification to local fire stations and police stations of the construction schedule and closure of the intersection throughout the duration of construction.

Mitigation Measure TRAF-2: Prior to the start of construction and the closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, and continuing throughout the entire duration of construction, the Contractor shall post detour ahead signs posted as well as marked detour route signs within two blocks in every direction to guide pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and emergency vehicles to the alternative routes open during the intersection’s closure.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section L); City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation Pedestrian Routes to School Map, 59th Street Elementary School

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

A number of Metro bus lines serve the project area; however the bus lines themselves do not travel along 59th Street or 4th Avenue. These streets do, however, provide local bicycle and pedestrian access throughout the community, and the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue includes two City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation Pedestrian Routes to School crossings. These two crossings are along 59th Street crossing over 4th Avenue and provide pedestrian access to and from 59th Street Elementary School. The temporary closure of this intersection during the approximately two-year construction period, and the inability to use these school crossings, would conflict with the adopted Pedestrian Routes to School for the 59th Street Elementary School. However, the contractor will be required to maintain 5-foot wide sidewalks and at least one crosswalk in each direction throughout the full duration of construction.

Additionally, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-2, as identified above, impacts associated with the temporary closure of this intersection during construction can be reduced to a less than significant level.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section M.2)

Comment: A significant impact would occur if the proposed project discharges wastewater, which would exceed the regulatory limits established by the LARWQCB.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS beneath the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue. The wastewater currently flowing through the COS would be diverted away from this portion of the sewer during project construction, and upon completion of construction, the wastewater flow within the sewer would be similar to the designed capacity. Because wastewater associated with the project site would continue to flow to the Hyperion Treatment Plant via the sewer system, the proposed project would not adversely affect treatment plant capacity or its ability to meet treatment and discharge requirements. Impacts
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would be less than significant.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Sections M.1 and M.2)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in the need for new construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities that could result in an adverse environmental effect that could not be mitigated.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS, wastewater conveyance infrastructure. As discussed within this document, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. Additionally, the proposed project is not growth inducing; replacement of this portion of the COS would allow the sewer to operate more similarly to its designed and intended capacity. As such, no significant environmental effects would result from project construction and operation.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section M.2)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the volume of stormwater runoff from the proposed project increases to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS and would not permanently alter the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area such that additional stormwater runoff would be generated and exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system. During project construction the existing impervious surface covering the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue, which lies directly atop the portion of the COS to be replaced, would be removed. During construction there would be a short term increase in the amount of pervious surface; therefore, no additional stormwater runoff would be generated. Following completion of project construction, the intersection would be repaved and the existing impervious surface would be returned. The existing drainage within the project vicinity would remain unchanged. As such, no significant impacts to the capacity of the storm drain system would occur.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section M.1)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project’s water demands would exceed the existing water supplies that serve the site.

The proposed project involves the replacement of a deteriorated portion of the COS. Neither project construction nor project operation would have a water demand. As such, the project would not result in the exceedence of existing water supplies and no impacts would occur.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section M.2)
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Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project results in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. Refer to 17(a) and 17(b) above

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?


Comment: The management of solid waste in the City involves public and private refuse collection services as well as public and private operation of solid waste transfer, resource recovery, and disposal facilities. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project results in solid waste generation of five tons or more per week.

The City’s Bureau of Sanitation and private refuse companies manage the collection, transfer, and disposal of municipal solid waste. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project results in solid waste generation of five tons or more per week. The sole source of solid waste generated by the proposed project would be the excavated materials at the project site. Excavated soils may be retained on-site, at staging areas, or hauled off-site. The estimated about of soil to be excavated from the site is 300 cy, or 81 tons.

Given the residential nature of the project area and results from soil borings performed at the project site and in the surrounding area, it is assumed that the soils will not contain hazardous materials and would therefore be disposed of at one of the facilities listed below, or identified by the contractor in accordance with the City’s project specifications.

- Sunshine Canyon Landfill is located at 14747 San Fernando Road, Sylmar, CA, approximately 25 miles from the project site. This facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 12,100 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 112,300,000 cubic yards (as of July 31, 2007), and has an estimated closure date of 2037. The waste types accepted at this facility include construction and demolition debris, green materials, industrial, inert, and mixed municipal.

- Calabasas Sanitary Landfill is located at 5300 Lost Hills Road, Agoura, CA, approximately 34 miles from the project site. This facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 3,500 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 18,100,000 cubic yards (as of March 31, 2008), and has an estimated closure date of 2025.

- Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill is located at 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Castaic, CA, approximately 38 miles from the project site. This facility has a maximum permitted throughput of 6,000 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 29,300,000 cubic yards (as of November 23, 2006), and has an estimated closure date of 2019. The waste types accepted at this facility include mixed municipal, green materials, construction and demolition debris, industrial, and inert.
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- Azusa Land Reclamation Co. Landfill is located at 1211 West Gladstone Street, Azusa, CA, approximately 25 miles from the project site and consists of several units (active and closed). For purposes of the proposed project, only Unit 1 of this facility may be used for the disposal of asbestos, and is therefore described herein. Unit 1 has a maximum permitted throughput of 6,500 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 34,100,000 cubic yards (as of March 31, 1995), and has an estimated closure date of 2025. The waste types accepted at Unit 1 of this facility include asbestos, friable, inert, and tires.

- Clean Harbor Buttonwillow Landfill is located at 2500 West Lokern Road, approximately 132 miles from the project site. This facility has a maximum permitted capacity of 10,482 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,293,760 cubic yards (no date available), and has an estimated closure date of 2040. The waste types accepted at this facility (classified as Class I) includes contaminated soil, industrial, other designated, and other hazardous. The excavated soils from the Remedial Action Areas (RAA-1 and RAA-2) would be disposed of at this facility, as well as any other waste considered as hazardous during construction, demolition, and/or remediation activities.

The excavated material would be recycled whenever possible, or disposed of at an appropriate facility. As demonstrated above and according to the CalRecycle’s SWIS database, there is sufficient inert waste disposal capacity available in Los Angeles County to adequately accommodate the anticipated excavated material, as demonstrated above. Further, certain landfills accept wastes considered to be beneficial-use materials, such as soil, green waste, and asphalt. Soils are used as part of regular landfill operations and also are used to cap closed landfills. Several landfills in the greater Los Angeles area accept excavated soil, including those that otherwise are restricted by ordinances from accepting municipal solid waste generated in the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, impacts associated with solid waste generation and disposal during project construction would be less than significant. Operation of the proposed project would not generate any solid waste; no operational impacts would occur.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Reference: L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Section M.3)

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would generate solid waste that was in excess of or was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.

The City of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Policy Plan (SWMPP) is the long range solid waste management policy plan for the City. The objective of the SWMPP is to reduce at the source or recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the City’s waste and calls for the disposal of the remaining waste in local and possibly remote landfills. The SWMPP establishes citywide diversion objectives, including diversion of 75 percent by 2013. While the SWMPP is the long-range solid waste management policy plan for the City, the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) is the strategic action policy plan for diverting solid waste from landfills. The source reduction, recycling, composting, special waste, and public education goals are defined by specific programmatic elements including tasks, roles, responsibilities, and an implementation schedule. The SRRE provides solid waste diversion objectives in accordance with the requirement of AB 939. It is updated annually and is based on an ongoing evaluation of programs and waste analysis. Guidance for, and implementation of, the solid waste diversion programs identified in the SRRE are administered by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Solid Resources Citywide Recycling Division. The City’s Bureau of Sanitation presently operates other solid waste reduction and recycling programs, such
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as its Curbside Recycling Program, which was designed to promote source reduction to achieve the goals established by AB 939 and associated City programs (e.g., the SRRE).

As discussed above in 17(f), construction activities would generate an estimated total of 81 tons of excavated materials, considered to be solid waste; project operation would not generate any solid waste. Solid waste generated on-site would be disposed of by permitted solid waste haulers to regulated sites that have adequate capacity and are in compliance with all applicable regulations related to solid waste collection and disposal. Solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Reference: Preceding analyses

Comment: No plant or animal species listed on any state or federal lists for endangered, threatened or special status species were identified on-site. There are no known cultural resources located on-site. Excavation and replacement of deteriorated sewer and storm drain infrastructure would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project area is not considered sensitive for cultural resources, and there is known cultural resources within the immediate vicinity; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Reference: Preceding analyses

Comment: All project-level impacts are either less than significant or can be mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, construction of the project would not result in a cumulative considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to construction. Operation of the project would improve sewer system flows and not result in any impacts. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in a cumulative considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to operation.

c) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Reference: Preceding analyses

Comment: The purpose of proposed project is to improve both the short-term and long-term functionality of the existing COS and City storm drain located beneath the intersection of 50th Street and 4th Avenue. Therefore, the overall project is anticipated to have positive long-term impacts to sewer and storm drain flows. No impact is anticipated.

d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Reference: Preceding analyses

Comment: With implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Section V below, construction
and operation of the project is not anticipated to have significant impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, all potentially significant environmental effects associated with the project can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

V. MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures form the foundation of a mitigation monitoring program (MMP) for the proposed project. CEQA requires public agencies to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that have been adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). The program must be adopted by the public agency at the time findings are made regarding the project. The State CEQA Guidelines allow public agencies to choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both (14 CCR Section 15097(c)).

The mitigation measures described herein are supplemental to those required as standard procedure for the City and its contractors. The City and its contractors are the parties responsible for: (1) the necessary implementing actions; (2) verifying that the necessary implementing actions are taken; and (3) the primary record documenting the necessary implementing actions.

The mechanisms for verifying that mitigation measures have been implemented include design drawings, project plans and specifications, construction documents intended for use by construction contractors and construction managers, field inspections, field reports, and other periodic or special reports. All records pertaining to this mitigation program will be maintained and made available for inspection by the public in accordance with the City’s records management systems.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to the start of construction and prior to closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, and continuing throughout the entire duration of construction, the Contractor shall post detour ahead signs posted as well as marked detour route signs within two blocks in every direction to guide pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and emergency vehicles to the alternative routes open during the intersection’s closure.

Noise:

Mitigation Measure N-1: Daily construction activities shall be scheduled such that a minimum number of equipment required to complete the task without significantly impacting the construction schedule is in operation any given time.
Transportation and Traffic:

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-1:** Prior to the start of construction and prior to closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, the construction contractor shall provide notification to local fire stations and police stations of the construction schedule and closure of the intersection throughout the duration of construction.

**Mitigation Measure TRAF-2:** Prior to the start of construction and the closure of the 59th Street/4th Avenue intersection, and continuing throughout the entire duration of construction, the Contractor shall post detour ahead signs as well as marked detour route signs within two blocks in every direction to guide pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and emergency vehicles to the alternative routes open during the intersection’s closure.

VI. PREPARATION AND CONSULTATION

A. Preparers

*Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc.*
523 West 6th Street, Suite 400
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Nicole Cobleigh, Project Manager
Gwen Pelletier, Senior Air Quality Analyst
Asami Tanimoto, Air & Noise Analyst

B. Coordination and Consultation

*City of Los Angeles*
*Department of Public Works*
*Bureau of Engineering*
1149 South Broadway
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Jim Doty, Acting Environmental Affairs Officer
Claudia Haskett, Project Manager

VII. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

The proposed project site consists of removing and replacing a deteriorated portion of the COS, which also requires reconfiguring a portion of a City storm drain located above the deteriorated portion of the COS at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue in the Park Mesa Heights neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles. Construction would last approximately two years and require full closure of the 59th Street and 4th Avenue
intersection to vehicles; partial access through the intersection would remain for bicyclists and pedestrians. Funding is currently available for this project.

The primary purpose of the proposed project is to repair the existing COS to reduce flows within the existing 74th Street and Florence Avenue sewers caused by an obstruction in the COS at 4th Avenue created by the existing City of Los Angeles storm drain. This obstruction has led to a backup within the Slauson Avenue diversion structure which affects upstream sewers connected to this structure. This objective can be accomplished by replacing the deteriorated sewer and modifying the design of the existing City storm drain at the intersection of 59th Street and 4th Avenue.

B. Recommended Environmental Documentation

On the basis of this initial evaluation, I find that the project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be adopted.

Prepared by: __________________ _____________
Nicole Cobleigh

Approved by: __________________ _____________
James E. Doty
Acting Manager
Environmental Management Group
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