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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 (EMG) has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an initial study is required.

An initial study 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 or mitigated negative declaration.

This Initial Study (IS) 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 Initial Study 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, and project components.

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, Potential Environmental Effects: provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the screening checklist in Appendix A.

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

To begin the CEQA process, the lead agency identifies a proposed project. The lead agency then prepares an initial study to identify the preliminary environmental impacts of the proposed project. The Initial Study for the Griffith Park Crystal Springs project determined that the proposed project could have significant environmental impacts that would require further study and/or the implementation of mitigation measures and the lead agency has decided to prepare an EIR. A Notice of Preparation is prepared to notify public agencies and the general public that the lead agency is starting the preparation of an EIR for the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation and initial study are circulated for a 30-day review and comment period. During this review period, the lead agency requests comments from agencies, interested parties, stakeholders, and the general public on the scope of the environmental issues presented in the initial study and to be evaluated in the EIR.

After the close of the 30-day review and comment period, the lead agency continues the preparation of the Draft EIR and associated technical studies (if any). Once the Draft EIR is complete, a Notice of Availability is prepared to inform the public agencies and the general public of the document and the locations where the document can be reviewed. The Draft EIR and Notice of Availability are circulated for a 45-day review and
The purpose of this review and comment period is to provide public agencies and the general public an opportunity to review the Draft EIR and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings of the lead agency regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. After the close of the 45-day review and comment period, responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR are prepared. The lead agency prepares a Final EIR, which incorporates the Draft EIR or a revision to the Draft EIR, Draft EIR comments and list of commentors, and response to comments discussion. In addition, the lead agency must prepare the findings of fact for each significant effect identified, a statement of overriding considerations if there are significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program to ensure that all proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

The Board of Recreation and Parks will consider the Final EIR, together with any comments received during the public review process, and may certify the Final EIR and approve the project or refer the Final EIR and project with a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not to certify the Final EIR and approve the project. If referred to Council, one or more Council committees may then review the proposal and documents and make its own recommendation to the full City Council. The full City Council would consider the Final EIR, together with any comments received during the review and comment process, in the decision to certify the Final EIR and approve or disapprove the project. During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Board of Recreation and Parks or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Recreation and Parks, Council committees and City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Board of Recreation and Parks agenda can be obtained via internet at http://www.laparks.org/commissionerhtm/2012/12agendas.htm. 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 213/978-1055 (hearing impaired); or via the internet at 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 which were 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, 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. Location

The location of the proposed project is 4730 Crystal Springs Drive within the Crystal Springs Picnic Area of Griffith Park (Park) in the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles. The Park is located northwest of downtown Los Angeles just west of the Golden State (I-5) Freeway, roughly between Los Feliz Boulevard on the south and the Ventura Freeway (SR 134) on the north. The project site is approximately 4.0 acres and is located at the northeast section of the Crystal Springs Picnic Area just northeast of the Pote Baseball Field, south of the Harding Municipal Golf Course, and west of the I-5 Freeway. Refer to Figures 1 and 2 for the regional location and the project site location, respectively.

B. Purpose

The City has identified several objectives of the proposed action, including:

- Restoring baseball/softball fields to the Griffith Park area which were removed when the I-5 Freeway was routed through the area and required the removal of the previously existing baseball fields that served the area.
- Increasing access to high quality, affordable recreational programs for youths in the area, especially at-risk boys and girls ranging in age from 6 to 12 years of age,
- Providing area residents with team-sports programming opportunities,
- Helping the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (Recreation and Parks) meet their five-year planning goal to elevate the 1 baseball field per 15,449 persons to 1 baseball field per 12,000 persons by 2012.

C. Description

The City is proposing to construct two new youth baseball fields within the north Crystal Springs Picnic Area northeast of the existing Pote Baseball Field. Each baseball field would include a home plate, bases, pitcher’s mound, batters’ and catcher’s boxes, two dugouts (with two benches with approximately twenty-seats each), two bleachers, outfield/perimeter fencing, natural grass, press box, sports field lighting, and scoreboard. Refer to Figure 3 for the proposed conceptual project layout (Layout A). Landscaping and an irrigation system would also be installed.

To accommodate the proposed project, approximately forty-four trees would be affected. Thirty-two (32) trees may be removed and twelve (12) trees with trunks less than five (5) inches in diameter may be relocated. Removed trees would be replaced in

---

1 A small portion of Griffith Park known as North Atwater Park is located east of the I-5 Freeway at 3900 W. Chevy Chase Drive.
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accordance with City policy. The replaced and relocated trees would be planted at appropriate locations within Griffith Park as determined by Recreation and Parks. Additionally, approximately seven (7) picnic tables would be relocated.

The northeast segment of the access loop driveway which currently allows circulation around the Crystal Springs Picnic Area would be taken out and a cul de sac would be constructed at each terminus of the impacted loop driveway segment (refer to Figure 3). Construction of the northern cul de sac would eliminate five (5) parking spaces and construction of the southern cul de sac would eliminate one sand volleyball court.

Project Alternatives: Layout B and North Atwater Location

Two alternate locations for the baseball fields, both within Griffith Park, are being considered. Layout B would be within Crystal Springs in an area southeast of Pote Field. The other location would be at North Atwater Park, across the I-5 Freeway and the Los Angeles River.

Layout B

The baseball fields for Layout B would contain the same elements as the proposed project. One field would be located just southeast of Pote Field and the other would be located southeast of this field on the grassy area across the loop driveway and parking (Figure 4).

To accommodate this alternative, fifty-six (56) picnic tables would be relocated (location to be determined) and several trees would be removed and relocated (number of affected trees to be determined). No changes in circulation or parking are anticipated.

North Atwater Location

At the North Atwater location, an existing softball field would be retrofitted and a new youth baseball field would be constructed (Figure 5). The existing backstop, bleachers, and player benches would remain and the rest of the softball field would be upgraded. The new youth baseball field would be constructed just north of the existing softball field. The new bleachers, backstop, and player’s benches would match those of the existing field.

To accommodate this alternative, approximately fifteen (15) trees would be removed and a basketball court would be displaced.

Figures 3, 4, and 5, are conceptual for discussion purposes. The proposed project and alternate layouts are subject to minor modification during the design process.

Construction

Construction is anticipated to last approximately twelve (12) months. Currently, it is
anticipated that Pote Field and portion of the Crystal Springs Picnic Area would remain open under the proposed project and Layout B alternative. Portion of North Atwater Park would also remain open during construction at this alternate site.

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards including but not limited to:

- Los Angeles Municipal Code (Reference 18)
- Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans (Reference 24)
- Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Reference 1)
- Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (Reference 2)

III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

Griffith Park, one the largest municipal parks in the nation, approximately 4,200 acres in size, was established in 1896 by the donation of private land owned by Colonel Griffith J. Griffith. The Park is owned and operated by the City and is located within the eastern edge of the Santa Monica Mountains at elevations ranging from approximately 384 to 1,625 feet above mean sea level (msl) and includes much rugged terrain consisting of rocky hills, canyons, and gullies. The project site is located within an area of gentle rolling hills at elevations ranging from approximately 408 to 420 feet above msl.

Griffith Park is located within the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles and the Griffith Park Master Plan. The City of Los Angeles General Plan designates the project site for open space land uses. The project site is zoned Open Space (OS-1XL), which allows for the development of parks and recreational facilities, natural resource preserves for the managed production of resources, marine and ecological preserves, public water supply reservoirs, water conservation areas and sanitary landfill sites that have received certificates of closure in compliance with federal and state regulations. The project site is located within Height District No. 1, which is designated as being an Extra Limited (XL) Height District. Height District 1-XL allows for the development of buildings or structures that are no more than two stories or 30 feet in height.

Griffith Park is classified as being in a very high fire hazard severity zone due to its high percentage of brush. In 2007, a fire burned a large segment, approximately 817 acres, within the central wilderness portion of the Park. Although most of the structures within the impacted area survived, the majority of the plant life was burned.

Plant communities within the Park include chaparral, oak and walnut woodland, coastal sage scrub, riparian, grassland, ruderal, and lawn and parkland. The Crystal Springs area contains lawn areas and 358 trees, including mature as well as young trees. The project site consists of four-acres of parkland containing grassy areas and forty-four (44)
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trees, including the following species:

- Arizona ash (*Fraxinus velutina*)
- California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*)
- Camphor tree (*Cinnamomum camphora*)
- Canary Island palm (*Pinus canariensis*)
- Chitalpa (*Chitalpa tashkentensis*)
- Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*)
- Lavender trumpet tree (*Tabebuia avellanadae*)
- White mulberry (*Morus alba*)

Alternate Layout B location includes the following tree species:

- California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*)
- Chinese pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*)
- Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*)
- Chitalpa (*Chitalpa tashkentensis*)
- Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*)
- Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*)
- Goldenrain tree (*Koelreuteria paniculata*)
- London plane (*Platanus acerifolia*)
- Shamel ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*)

Alternate North Atwater location includes the following tree species:

- California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*)
- Canary Island palm (*Pinus canariensis*)
- Chitalpa (*Chitalpa tashkentensis*)
- Italian stone pine (*Pinus pinea*)
- London plane (*Platanus acerifolia*)
- Modesto ash (*Fraxinus velutina modesto*)

Several protected and heritage trees are located within the project site and the Alternate Layout B area. California sycamores and coast live oaks\(^2\) are protected under the City’s Native Tree Protection Ordinance. Various types of trees, including heritage trees, are also protected by Recreation and Parks Tree Preservation Policy. The heritage tree classification includes individual trees of any size or species that are specially designated because of their historical, commemorative, or horticultural significance. Refer to Section IV.D, Discussion, for potential environmental effects.

Birds are among the most numerous and conspicuous wildlife species in the Park\(^3\).

---

2 Which measure four (4) inches or more in cumulative diameter and four and one-half (4.5) feet above the ground level at the base of the tree, except any tree grown or held for sale by a licensed nursery, or trees planted or grown as a part of a tree planting program.

Approximately 200 bird species have been recorded. Some lizards and snakes, including the western fence-lizard, the western whiptail, and Pacific rattlesnake are also known to occur at the Park. Mammals, including coyotes, raccoons, striped skunks, mule deer, and rabbits also occur at the Park. Refer to Section IV.D discussion on potential environmental effects.

Griffith Park is within the Los Angeles River Watershed. The Los Angeles River Watershed is approximately 834 square miles in area and extends from the eastern portions of the Santa Monica Mountains, Simi Hills, and Santa Susana Mountains to the San Gabriel Mountains on the west. The Los Angeles River Watershed encompasses and is shaped by the path of the Los Angeles River, which flows from its headwaters in the mountains eastward to the northern corner of Griffith Park where the channel turns southward through the Glendale Narrows before it flows across the coastal plain toward Long Beach.4

Griffith Park is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), within the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD has established standards for air quality constituents generated by construction and by operational activities for such pollutants as ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulate matter (PM). The SCAQMD maintains an extensive air quality monitoring network to measure criteria pollutant concentrations throughout SCAB. The SCAB is designated a severe non-attainment area for O₃, a serious non-attainment area for particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM₁₀), and a non-attainment area for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM₂.₅). The SCAB is a maintenance area for CO and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and is in attainment for SO₂.

Existing Park facilities within the vicinity of the project site include the Park Ranger’s Headquarters, the Harding and Wilson Golf Courses, Shane’s Inspiration Universally Accessible Playground, the Merry-go-Round, Tennis Courts, the Los Angeles Zoo, the Train and Pony Rides, and equestrian center trails. Refer to Figure 6 for a map with locations of these and other existing facilities within Griffith Park. Specifically, within the Crystal Springs area are two restrooms, Pote Baseball Field (unlighted), 119 picnic tables, barbeque pits (outdoor grills), a children’s play area, volleyball courts (no nets and unlighted), a storage shed, a paved access loop driveway that surrounds the picnic areas, and several parking areas, adjacent to the access driveway, which provide 265 parking spaces.

In 2009, the City designated Griffith Park as Historic-Cultural Monument (HMC) No. 942. Features contributing to this designation include numerous buildings and structures that represent various architectural styles including Spanish Colonial Revival, Moderne, and Second Greek Revival, as well as infrastructure elements designed in the “Park Style”. Natural wilderness areas and designated landscapes also contribute to the Park’s designation. The project site is not identified as a contributing feature of the Griffith Park

http://www.laparks.org/dos/parks/griffithpk/wildlife/index.html

4 Source: City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Watershed Management – Los Angeles River Watershed at http://ladpw.org/wmd/watershed/LA/
Figure 6
Griffith Park Facilities
HCM. However, the site lies within the vicinity of two contributing features: the Feliz Adobe, which houses the Park Ranger Headquarters and Visitor Center, and the Wilson and Harding Golf Courses.

Potable water is provided by the Department of Water and Power and an existing 10-inch sanitary sewer line that traverses the Crystal Springs Picnic area serves the area.

The Park is open to the public from 5:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. daily. Recreational activities conducted at the park include hiking, jogging, cycling, camping, golf, horseback riding, swimming, tennis, soccer, and picnicking. Bridle trails, hiking paths, and mountain roads are closed at sunset.

IV. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist in Appendix A. A detailed discussion of these potential environmental effects follows.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology /Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

A. Aesthetics

The Crystal Springs Picnic Area has partial views of the Santa Monica Mountains to the south and west. The Crystal Springs area is located within parkland developed with two restrooms, a baseball field (unlighted), 119 picnic tables, barbeque pits (outdoor grills), a children’s play area, volleyball courts (no nets and unlighted), a storage shed, a paved access loop driveway that surrounds the picnic areas, and several parking areas adjacent to the access driveway. Specifically within the project site are seven picnic tables, thirty-two (32) mature trees, twelve (12) young oak trees, a volleyball court, a segment of the access driveway, and five parking spaces. The project proposes to remove and replace mature trees, relocate the young oak trees (five inches or less in diameter), relocate the picnic tables and construct two youth baseball fields within the project site. Similarly, Alternate Layout B proposes to remove and relocate trees, relocate picnic tables, and construct two youth baseball fields.
The North Atwater location has views of a riparian creek and the Los Angeles River to the west. Within the vicinity of the North Atwater Park, the Los Angeles River is concrete-lined with a soft bottom and riparian vegetation.

No changes to the view of the Santa Monica Mountains or the Los Angeles River are anticipated as a result of the project or project alternatives. Although the project site and alternate sites are not identified as contributing features of the Griffith Park HCM, the proposed project site and the Layout B area lie within the vicinity of the Feliz Adobe and the Wilson and Harding Golf Courses, which are identified as contributing features. Construction activities would temporarily degrade the scenic quality of the project site from vantage points within the Park. Additionally, the project would change the visual character of the project site with the removal of mature trees and the construction and operation of the youth baseball fields. Project design would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that the project is designed to be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. These issues will be further evaluated in an EIR.

B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project and alternatives would cause no impacts. These issues will not be discussed in the EIR. (See Appendix A.)

C. Air Quality

As indicated above, the SCQMD has established standards for air quality constituents generated by construction and operational activities. Construction emissions may be generated by grading activities, construction workers traveling to and from the project site, delivery and hauling of construction supplies and debris, and fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment. Construction emissions would be short-term in nature and would be limited only to the time period when construction activity is taking place. Due to the nature of the project, construction emissions are anticipated to be below SCAQMD thresholds. However, an evaluation is needed to determine if construction-related emissions are potentially significant. This issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

Operation emissions would be primarily generated by vehicle trips associated with the operation of the baseball fields. Although not anticipated to increase significantly, depending upon proposed trip generation (of the proposed project or alternatives), the proposed project or alternatives may increase vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the project site or alternate sites. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.
D. Biological Resources

The City of Los Angeles has a Native Tree Protection Ordinance that protects native oak species, black walnut, California bay, and California sycamore which measure four inches or more in cumulative diameter, and four and one-half feet above the ground level at the base of the tree. The project site includes areas of grass and trees that may potentially provide habitat for sensitive species, especially nesting birds. The proposed project and alternatives would remove both young and mature trees, including several protected California sycamores and heritage trees. Heritage tree removal must follow the Recreation and Parks Tree Removal Procedure. Construction activities, especially tree removal, may impact sensitive species. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

E. Cultural Resources

As indicated above, in 2009, the City designated the Park as HCM No. 942. Although the project site and alternate project locations are not identified as contributing features of the HCM, Crystal Springs lies within the vicinity of two contributing features, the Feliz Adobe, which houses the Park Ranger Headquarters and Visitor Center, and the Wilson and Harding Golf Courses. Additionally, a significant archaeological site is located within Griffith Park and the general area between Griffith Park and the Los Angeles River is considered a potential area in which Native American village(s) was/were located. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIR.

F. Geology and Soils

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

SCAQMD has recommended a greenhouse gas significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons per year of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂) for assessing the significance of potential GHG emissions. Greenhouse gas emissions may be generated by grading activities, construction workers traveling to and from the project site, delivery and hauling of construction supplies and debris, and fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment. Construction emissions would be short-term in nature and would be limited only to the time period when construction activity is taking place. Due to the nature of the project, construction emissions are anticipated to be below SCAQMD recommended threshold. However, an evaluation is needed to determine if construction-related emissions are potentially significant. This issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

Operation emissions would be primarily generated by vehicle trips associated with the operation of the baseball fields. Although not anticipated to increase significantly, depending upon proposed trip generation (of the proposed project or alternatives), the
proposed project or alternatives may increase vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the project site or alternate sites. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

I. Hydrology and Water Quality

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

J. Land Use and Planning

The project site is within the Hollywood Community Plan area and the Griffith Park Master Plan. The City of Los Angeles General Plan designates the project site for open space land uses. The project site is zoned Open Space (OS-1XL), which allows for the development of parks and recreational facilities. The proposed project and project alternatives would not alter the land use. The location of the proposed project and the alternate locations are consistent with Griffith Park facility planning guidelines that call for new projects to be sited within already developed areas.

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

K. Mineral Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

L. Noise

Noise within the vicinity of the project site and alternate sites is dominated by traffic noise, especially from the adjacent I-5 Freeway. Construction and operation of the proposed project could potentially expose nearby Park users to increased noise levels. Construction of the baseball fields would create noise on a short-term basis due to the use of construction equipment. Long-term operational impacts could be associated with potential increase of traffic in the area and operation of the baseball fields. Analysis of the proposed project’s consistency with local noise ordinances and guidelines based on existing and proposed uses within and surrounding the project site and alternate sites will be completed. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.
M. Population and Housing

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

N. Public Services

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

O. Recreation

The proposed project would construct two youth baseball fields in an area currently used for picnicking or passive recreation, thus converting a passive recreation area to an active recreation area. To accommodate the proposed project, several mature trees would be removed. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIR.

P. Transportation/Traffic

The proposed project would result in increased vehicular trips during construction and operation which could have potentially significant impacts on the capacity of the existing circulation system. During construction, these would primarily be the private vehicles of construction workers, and the use of heavy trucks and equipment for earthwork and other activities. Operation of the proposed project could also increase the number of trips to the project site.

The access loop driveway that currently allows circulation around the perimeter of the Crystal Springs Picnic area is shared by automobiles and cyclists. The proposed project would remove the northeast segment of the access loop driveway modifying circulation.

These issues, as well as consistency with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program, will be further evaluated in the EIR.

Q. Utilities and Service Systems

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (See Appendix A.)

R. Mandatory Findings of Significance

See Appendix A.
V. MITIGATION MEASURES

Any applicable mitigation measures are to be identified in the EIR.

VI. NAME OF PREPARER

Maria Martin, Environmental Supervisor II
Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering
Environmental Management Group

In coordination or consultation with:

Cathie Santo Domingo, Project Manager
Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering
Recreational and Cultural Facilities Division

Paul Davis, Environmental Specialist III
Department of Recreation and Parks

VII. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

As described in this Initial Study, the environmental factors listed below would be potentially affected by the proposed Griffith Park Crystal Springs Baseball Fields project and will be further evaluated in the EIR.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Noise
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
B. **Recommended Environmental Documentation**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

**Prepared By:** Maria Martin
Environmental Supervisor II

**Approved By:** Gary Lee Moore, P.E.
City Engineer

**By:** James E. Doty
Environmental Affairs Officer
Environmental Management Group
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APPENDIX A
ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING CHECKLIST

A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially alters a view of a scenic vista. Reference: 18(Thresholds A.1 &amp; A.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Refer to Section IV.A of the Initial Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds A.1 &amp; E.3), 18(General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No state-designated scenic highways are located within the vicinity of the project site or alternate sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements to the project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the project site. Reference: 18(Thresholds A.1 and A.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Refer to Section IV.A of the Initial Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds A.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Sports field lighting is proposed and may cause changes to ambient illumination levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Issues

#### 2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Reference: 14) A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use. Reference: 4(Ag. Land Eval.)

**Explanation:** The project site and alternate sites do not contain Farmland. Reference: 8(Farmland Map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** 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 another non-agricultural use.

**Explanation:** The project site and the alternate sites are not zoned for agricultural uses and not subject to a Williamson Act contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Reference: 8)

**Explanation:** There is no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production on or near the project site and alternate sites. Reference: 10(BIOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Reference:

**Explanation:** There is no forest land on or near the project site. Reference: 10(BIOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project results in the conversion of farmland to another non-agricultural use.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**agricultural use.**

Explanation: Refer to discussion under 2 (a) and 2 (b) above.

### 3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

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

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project was inconsistent with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Element of the City's General Plan or the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Reference: 18(Thresholds B.1 to B.3), 31(AQMD Handbook)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.C of the Initial Study.

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

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project violated any SCAQMD air quality standard. The SCAQMD has set thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), and particulate matter (PM10) emissions resulting from construction and operation in the South Coast Air Basin. Reference: 18(Thresholds B.1, B.2), 31(AQMD Handbook)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.C of the Initial Study.

**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)? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the South Coast Air Basin exceeds federal and state ambient air quality standards and has been designated as an area of non-attainment by the USEPA and/or California Air Resources Board. The South Coast Air Basin is a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5). Reference: Reference: 18(Thresholds B.1, B.2), 31(AQMD Handbook)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.C of the Initial Study.

**d)** Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**Standard:** 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. Reference: 18 (Thresholds B.1 to B.3)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.C of the Initial Study.

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

**Standard:** During construction, sources of odor are diesel emissions from construction equipment and volatile organic compounds from sealant applications or paving activities. However, these odors would be temporary and localized. Nonetheless, applicable best management practices such as those in SCAQMD Rule 431 (Diesel Equipment) would, in addition to minimizing air quality impacts, also help minimize potential construction odors. Reference: 18 (Thresholds B.1 & B.2)

**Explanation:**

---
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### 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard: 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. Reference: 18 (Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation: Reference: 9(CNDDB), 10(BIOS). See discussion in Section IV.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community were to be adversely modified. Reference: 18(Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation: See discussion in Section IV.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be modified or removed. Reference: 18(Thresholds C), 32(Nat. Wetlands Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation: There are no wetlands within or adjacent to the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project interferes or removes access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impedes the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Reference: 10(BIOS), 18(Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation: See discussion in Section IV.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. Reference: 10 (CDFG), 27(Tree Policy), 28(Urban Forest Program), 25(PW Tree Policy), 18(Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation: Heritage and protected tree species are present within the boundaries of the proposed project. Removal of these trees would be in accordance with City policy. Although no conflict is anticipated with local policies, this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with mapping or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies in any conservation plans of the cited type. Reference: 9(CNDB), 18(Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No habitat conservation plan, or any plan as cited above, is known to exist for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the project site or immediate vicinity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

**Explanation:** See discussion in Section IV.D.

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

**Explanation:** See discussion in Section IV.D.

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

**Explanation:** See discussion in Section IV.D.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- [ ] Potentially Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

**Explanation:** See discussion in Section IV.D.

#### 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?

- [ ] Potentially Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] Less Than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

**Explanation:** 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
## Issues

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

not followed. References: 6(CDC Publ. 42), 18(Thresholds E.1)

Explanation: The project site and alternate sites are not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly known as an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone). The City of Los Angeles Safety Element (1990), however, indicates that the site is located in a fault rupture study area, associated with the Benedict Canyon fault and the Hollister fault. As part of building code and BOE Standard Project Specifications, construction measures are prescribed that enable safe and efficient project implementation within areas subject to seismic movement. Per standard practice, site-specific geotechnical and geological investigations that focus on these potential hazards are performed as part of project design studies.

### ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Standard: 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. Reference: 6(Seismic Hazard Map Burbank Quad.), 18(Thresholds E.1)

Explanation: In general, the Los Angeles region is subject to the effects of seismic activity. The proposed project will construct two baseball fields. The project does not involve “structures” within the meaning of this section and construction will comply with applicable requirements. See explanation 6(a)(i).

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

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 within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project. Reference: 6(Seismic Hazard Map Burbank Quad.), 18(Thresholds E.1)

The project site is in an area identified as being susceptible to liquefaction. However, construction would have to comply with Best Management Practices. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts related to liquefaction beyond those that already exist.

### iv) Landslides?

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding and appropriate design measures were not implemented. Reference: 6(Seismic Hazard Map Burbank Quad.), 18(Thresholds E.1)

The project site is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to landslides.

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

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds E.2)

Explanation: The project site and alternate project locations contain grassy areas and trees and would contain the baseball fields, including natural grass turf after the project is completed. The sites are not located in high wind areas. Construction would result in ground surface disruption, such as grading and excavation. These activities could result in potential erosion at the proposed project site and alternate project locations. However, soil exposure would be temporary and short-term and applicable Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion. All future construction would need to comply with Best Management Practices to prevent erosion or loss of topsoil.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were 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. Reference: 6(Seismic Hazard Map Burbank Quad.), 18(Thresholds E.2)

**Explanation:** See 6 (a) (iii) and (iv) above.

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?

**Standard:** Reference: 18(Thresholds E.2), 30(Diblee)

**Explanation:** The proposed project and alternate sites are located in areas identified as having quaternary alluvium, stream channel gravel and sand sediments. These soils typically have low expansive potential. Prior to construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation and report would be prepared which would provide conclusions and recommendations to be used for methods and techniques for: site preparation, treatment of site of soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils, as applicable. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation; therefore, impacts from potentially expansive soil would not be significant. Reference: 18(Thresholds E.2), 30(Diblee)

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?

**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 was proposed. Reference: 18(Thresholds E.3)

The project area is served by the City’s wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment systems. Reference: 26(NavigateLA wye map)

### 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?

**Standard:** Reference:

**Explanation:** See discussion in Section IV.G.

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

**Standard:** Reference:

**Explanation:** Both the state and the City have adopted targets for limiting greenhouse gas emissions over the next few decades. Neither construction nor operation of the baseball fields is expected to conflict with any of these targets or other applicable plans, policies, or regulations related to reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas. Although a less than significant impact is anticipated, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.
### Issues

#### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unnamed Cell</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

- **Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved the use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions. Reference: 18(Thresholds F.1, F.2)

- **Explanation:** Construction activities would be short-term and limited in nature and may involve limited transport, storage, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Some examples of hazardous materials handling include fueling and servicing construction equipment on-site, and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated.

No sites with known hazardous materials releases were identified within the project area or vicinity. A site with a solvent release case under assessment is located within the vicinity of North Atwater Park. The nature or extent of the release is unknown. However, if unknown contamination were identified during project construction or a spill were to occur during construction, agencies with jurisdiction would be notified and immediate measures would be taken to ensure the health and safety of the public and workers and to protect the environment. Any excavation, treatment, and/or disposal of contaminated soils would be conducted to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory agencies, which could include LAFD, LACoFD, LARWQCB and/or DTSC. Adherence to regulations set forth by local, state, and federal regulatory agencies would reduce the potential for hazardous materials impacts to less than significant levels.

| 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? |   |   | ☒ |   |

- **Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved a risk of accidental explosion or utilized substantial amounts of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations that could potentially pose a hazard to the public under accident or upset conditions. Reference: 15(Geotracker), 16(LAMC), 18(Thresholds F.1, F.2), 33(USGS Burbank Quad)

- **Explanation:** The proposed project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials. Refer to discussion under 7 (a) above.

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

- **Standard:** 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds F.2)

- **Explanation:** There is no school within one quarter mile of the project site or alternate sites. The project site does not contain hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Construction and operation of the project will not involve substantial quantities of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Reference: 15(Geotracker), 13(Envirostor), 26(NavigateLA Schools)

| 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? |   |   |   | ☒ |

---
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### Issues

| Reference: 18(Thresholds F.2), 15(Geotracker), 13(Envirostor), 37(Transaction Screen) |

**Comment:** In June 2009, Recreation and Parks conducted an environmental screening analysis which included a “Transaction Screen” (Initial Site Investigation for Hazardous Materials) that found no recognized environmental conditions associated with the property at 430 N. Crystal Springs Drive, which includes the Crystal Springs Picnic Area. As of September 10, 2012, neither the project site nor the alternate sites is listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites and Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups sites; or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System which includes CORTESE sites, or the Environmental Protection Agency’s database of regulated facilities.

| 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? |

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds F.1, K.2)

Explanation: The project is not located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport. Reference: 20(ZIMAS), 15(Geotracker), 13(Envirostor), 26(NavigateLA)

| 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? |

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area because of its location near a private airstrip. Reference: 18(Thresholds F.1, K.2)

Explanation: No private airstrip is located within the vicinity of the project site. Reference: 26(NavigateLA)

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

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

Standard: 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 such plan. Reference: 18(Thresholds F.1, K.2)

Explanation: The proposed project would not alter the adjacent street system. As applicable, any traffic detour plans during construction would address emergency response or emergency evacuation for implementation during construction.

| 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? |

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a wild land area and poses a significant fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.2)

Explanation: Most of Griffith Park, including the Crystal Springs Picnic Area, is located in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Although Crystal Springs is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone, the project site consists of lawn and trees and not the brush that characterize other areas in the Park. There is no housing within the vicinity of the project site. The project would remove several trees and construct...
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two baseball fields, including natural grass; it does not construct any habitable structures. 26(NavigateLA Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone)

### 9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

#### a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Standard: 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 storm-water drainage systems. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.2)

Explanation: The proposed project will comply with applicable storm water management requirements for pollution prevention (for example, compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts). Short-term impacts to water quality due to construction activities would be regulated under California State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 99-08-DWQ (General Construction Permit). Under this permit, the City of Los Angeles would implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan and Best Management Construction Practices would be implemented to ensure no significant impacts to water quality occur during construction.

#### 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)?

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.2, G.3)

Explanation: The proposed project would not utilize existing groundwater resources nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. Changes to the groundwater supply are not anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

#### 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?

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.1, G.2)

Explanation: The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. No streams or rivers cross the proposed project site or alternate locations. The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. As discussed in comment 8 (a), the project would result in temporary soil disturbance activities during construction during which time a storm water pollution prevention plan for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented. The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable requirements of the municipal code, including grading requirements.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>d)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f)</strong> Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h)</strong> Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. See comments for 8 (a) and 8 (c) above.

**Standard:** 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.1)

**Explanation:** The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. See comments for 8 (a) and 8 (c) above.

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the volume of runoff were to increase to a level which exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A significant impact may also occur if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.2)

**Comment:** A significant impact may occur if a project included potential sources of water pollutants and potential to substantially degrade water quality. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.3)

**Explanation:** No potential sources of water quality degradation are anticipated.

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project placed housing within a 100-year flood zone. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.1 to G.4)

**Explanation:** The proposed project does not include housing.

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone and would impede or redirect flood flows. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.4)

**Explanation:** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. Reference: 34(FIRM Panel 060137 0056C), 26(NavigateLA Flood Plains)

**Standard:** 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds E.1, G.3)
**Issues**

Explanation: The project site is not located in an area subject to this risk. Reference: 19(Los Angeles City General Plan. Safety Element. Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G)), 26(NavigateLA Inundation Areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area with inundation potential due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Reference: 18(Thresholds E.1)

Explanation: The project site is not located in an area subject to this risk. Reference: 19(Los Angeles City General Plan. Safety Element. Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G)), 26(NavigateLA Tsunami Area and Landslides)

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were sufficiently large or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community. Reference: 18(Thresholds H.2)

Explanation: The proposed project would not introduce a physical barrier. The project site is confined to approximately four acres within Griffith Park and no large structures are planned.

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?

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds H.1, H.2)

Explanation: The City of Los Angeles General Plan designates the project site for open space land uses. The project site is zoned Open Space (OS-1XL), which allows for the development of parks and recreational facilities. The proposed project and project alternatives would not alter the land use. The location of the proposed project and the alternate locations are consistent with Griffith Park facility planning guidelines that call for new projects to be sited within already developed areas. Reference: 20(ZIMAS), 18(General Plan)

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Standard: 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds H.1, H.2)

Explanation: See discussion under 4(f) above.

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?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project were located in an area used or available for
### Issues

**Extraction of a regionally important mineral resource, if the project converted an existing or potential present or future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if a project affected access to such a site.** Reference: 18(General Plan), 18(Thresholds E.4)

**Explanation:** The project site is not located within an area that contains known mineral resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?**

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project were located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource and the project converted such a resource to another use or affected access to such a site. Reference: 18(General Plan), 18(Thresholds E.4)

**Explanation:** The project site is not located within an area that contains known mineral resources.

### 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?**

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project generated noise levels exceeding the standards for ambient noise as established by the General Plan and Municipal Code or exposed persons to that increased level of noise. Reference: 18(General Plan Noise Element), 18(Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.L of the Initial Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?**

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project were to expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Reference: 18 (General Plan Noise Element), 18(Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** Construction activities associated with the project could generate ground-borne vibration from use of heavy equipment. These effects would be temporary and short-term in nature and would comply with applicable noise standards. Excavation is anticipated to be shallow. Construction is not anticipated to require blasting or pile driving, which could potentially cause significant vibration impacts at close distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project were to substantially and permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. Reference: 18 (General Plan Noise Element), 18(Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.L of the Initial Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project were to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. Reference: 18 (General Plan Noise Element), 18(Thresholds Section I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.L of the Initial Study.

**Standard:** Reference: 18(Thresholds Section I), 26(NavigateLA)

**Explanation:** The project is not located within two miles of an airport.

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Standard:** Reference: 18(Thresholds Section I), 26(NavigateLA)

**Explanation:** No private airstrips are located within the vicinity of the project area.

### 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)?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if population growth is induced in an area, either directly or indirectly, such that the population of the area may exceed the planned population of that area. Reference: 18(Thresholds Section J.1)

**Explanation:** Population density is managed by the City's land use and planning designations (see above) and building codes. The proposed project will not involve changing the City's land use and planning designations to a more intense use and therefore will not induce substantial population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**Standard:** Normally, there would be no significant impact if the project will not result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing. Reference: 18(Thresholds J.1 and J.2)

**Explanation:** The proposed project will not displace any housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**Standard:** Normally, there would be no significant impact if the project will not result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing. Reference: 18(Thresholds J.2)

**Explanation:** The proposed project will not displace any housing.

### 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?
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project based on response time, access, or fire hydrant/water availability. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.2)

**Explanation:** The Crystal Springs Picnic Area is served by the City of Los Angeles Fire Station 56, located at 2759 Rowena Avenue, about 1.6 miles away. North Atwater Park is served by Fire Station 50, located at 3036 Fletcher Drive, about 2.3 miles away. The proposed project would not result in an increase in population and thus would not generate a need for new or altered fire protection facilities. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes set forth by the state Fire Marshall and Los Angeles Fire Department. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered a fire hazard and would not exceed the capacity of the Los Angeles Fire Department to serve the site or other areas with existing fire protection services. The nearest local fire responders would be notified, as appropriate, of traffic control plans during construction so as to coordinate emergency response routing during construction work.

| ii) Police protection? | | | | |

**Standard:** 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.1)

**Explanation:** Neither the proposed project nor alternatives would require additional police protection beyond what is currently provided. The Crystal Springs area and the North Atwater site are both served by the Northeast Community Police Station at 3353 San Fernando Rd. This police station would be notified, as appropriate, of traffic control plans during construction so as to coordinate emergency response routing during construction work.

| iii) Schools? | | | | |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.3)

**Explanation:** Construction of the baseball fields would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and would therefore not increase the demand for schools in the area.

| iv) Parks? | | | | |

**Standard:** 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. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.4)

**Explanation:** The proposed project will not cause a population increase. (see Item 13 above)

| v) Other public facilities? | | | | |

**Standard:** Projects that do not result in a net increase of 75 residential units normally would not have a significant impact on public libraries. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.5)

**Explanation:** The project would not result in a net increase of 75 residential units or more. No increase in residential units is anticipated.

15. RECREATION –
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes substantial employment or population growth that may generate demand for public park facilities that exceed the capacity of existing parks. Reference: 18(Thresholds K.4)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.O of the Initial Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Reference: 18(Thresholds K.4)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.O of the Initial Study.

### 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- **a)** Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersection, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Reference: 18(Thresholds L.1 to L.4, L.8)

**Explanation:** Refer to Section IV.P of the Initial Study.

- **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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes a conflict with an applicable congestion management program. Reference: 18(Thresholds L.1 to L3)

**Comment:** Refer to Section IV.P of the Initial Study.

- **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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project changed air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location the resulted in substantial safety risks.

**Explanation:** There would be no impact to air traffic patterns.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project substantially increased road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Reference: 18(Thresholds L.5)
Issues

Explanation: The project is compatible with the land use and would not include any design features that would result in a safety hazard to pedestrians, personnel, visitors, or nearby neighbors.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate emergency access. Reference: 18(Thresholds L.5, L.8, and J2)

Explanation: The proposed project does not propose any permanent changes to the surrounding street system and would not introduce incompatible vehicles to surrounding roadways. The proposed project would modify the northeast segment of the access loop driveway that currently allows circulation around the Crystal Springs Picnic Area. However, access would be maintained. Temporary traffic control elements during construction would be subject to review, including safety, and approval by Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Reference 18(Thresholds L.6)

Explanation: Refer to Section IV.P of the Initial Study.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the local regulatory governing agency. Reference: 18(Thresholds M.2), 40(Hansen Dam Baseball Field Renovation Draft Environmental Assessment)

Explanation: The project site and alternate sites are located within the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP) service area, which is approximately 328,000 acres in size. The project site and alternate sites are not located within a sewer capacity threshold area. The proposed project is anticipated to generate minimal amounts of wastewater and the existing restroom facilities are anticipated to serve the proposed project. In the absence of a site- or land use-specific wastewater usage factor associated with the baseball fields, the area associated with each baseball field that would be designated for spectator/public use (i.e., bleacher area) was used as the area that would generate wastewater (approximately 500 square feet assumed for each of the three baseball fields, for a total of 1,000 square feet). Using the City of Los Angeles usage factors, the most similar usage factor associated with the baseball fields was the “gymnasium” land use type, which considers recreational activity that includes large open space with low occupational density (i.e., the baseball fields). Based on the City’s usage factor (average daily flow of 250 gallons per day per 1,000 square feet), and the area being used by the public, the estimated wastewater generation associated with the proposed project (or alternatives) is an average daily flow of 250 gallons per day. This generation rate does not include any off-sets due to passive recreation use that would be displaced. The HPT and associated sewer system would have the capacity to accommodate the proposed project.

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?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in the need for new construction or
Issues

expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities that could result in an adverse environmental effect that could not be mitigated. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.1, M.1 and M.2), 40(Hansen Dam Baseball Field Renovation Draft Environmental Assessment)

Explanation: As indicated in 17(a), the proposed project would not generate additional wastewater that would exceed existing capacity as such no new water or wastewater treatment facilities would be required.

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?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the volume of storm water runoff from the proposed project increases to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site. Reference: 18(Thresholds G.1 and M.2)

Explanation: The storm water facilities in the area are adequate to serve the proposed project. The proposed project would not increase the volume of storm water runoff.

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

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project’s water demands would exceed the existing water supplies that serve the site. Reference: 18(Thresholds M.1)

Explanation: The City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power provides potable water to the project area and vicinity. In the absence of site-specific water usage factors, or standard water usage factors for specific on-site uses, current water consumption estimates were assumed to be about 10 percent greater than wastewater for an estimated average of 275 gallons per day of water consumption for the new restrooms. During construction, there would be a temporary minor increase in water usage. This increase in water consumption would be minor and would not substantially affect potable water resources in the area.

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?

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. Reference:

Explanation: See 17 (a) above.

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

Comment: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacities would be insufficient to accommodate the additional waste. Reference: 18(Thresholds M.3), 29(Countywide Siting Report)

Explanation: City standard for public works require demolition debris to be recycled where feasible; therefore, impacts associated with construction debris would be less than significant. After construction, the project may result in minor increase in solid waste generation. However, the project would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacities
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would be insufficient to accommodate the additional waste.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Reference: 18(Thresholds M.3), 29(Countywide Siting Report)

Explanation: The project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards.

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?

Comment:

Explanation: The proposed project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment during construction and operation with regard to several resource areas as indicated in Section IV of the Initial Study. These issues will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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)?

Comment:

Explanation: The proposed project, in conjunction with other related projects, has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts. The potential for cumulative impacts will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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

Reference:

Explanation: The proposed project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment during construction and operation with regard to several resource areas as indicated in Section IV of the Initial Study. The project’s potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals will be further evaluated in the EIR.

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

Comment:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The proposed project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment during construction and operation with regard to several resource areas as indicated in Section IV of the Initial Study. The proposed project could have environmental effects that have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either indirectly or directly. This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.