

**BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
MEMBERS**

VALERIE LYNNE SHAW
PRESIDENT

ELLEN STEIN
VICE-PRESIDENT

JANICE WOOD
PRESIDENT PRO-TEMPORE

RONALD LOW
COMMISSIONER

YOLANDA FUENTES
COMMISSIONER

JAMES A. GIBSON
SECRETARY

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



JAMES K. HAHN
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

BUREAU OF
ENGINEERING

GARY LEE MOORE, P.E.
CITY ENGINEER

650 SOUTH SPRING ST., SUITE 200
LOS ANGELES, CA 90014-1911
213-847-8766

<http://eng.lacity.org>

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE VENICE PUMPING PLANT DUAL FORCE MAIN PROJECT**

Date: May 2, 2005

To: Interested Persons

The City of Los Angeles (City) will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the Venice Pumping Plant Dual Force Main Project (proposed project). The proposed project is located in the Venice and Westchester/Playa Del Rey community planning areas of the City of Los Angeles within Council District 11 (refer to project location map).

The proposed project includes the construction and installation of a new 54-inch diameter force main sewer extending from the Venice Pumping Plant at 140 Hurricane Avenue in Venice to a junction structure on the North Outfall Sewer in Vista del Mar near Waterview Street in Playa Del Rey. The existing 48-inch diameter Venice Pumping Plant force main was built in 1958 and is a pressurized pipeline that conveys wastewater flows to the Hyperion Treatment Plant located in Los Angeles.

The project's intent is to construct a second force main to be used in tandem with the existing force main for the purpose of fulfilling two key objectives:

- (1) To expand the capacity of the Coastal Interceptor Sewer's force main segment from the Venice Pumping Plant to a connection in Playa Del Rey in the vicinity of Waterview Street, such that all project wet weather flows can be safely conveyed without future threats of spilling onto City streets and adjacent surface waters; and,
- (2) To provide force main redundancy to allow for much needed maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing force main and future reciprocal cleaning of each force main during dry weather periods.



Proposed Alternatives:

Marquesas Way/Via Marina. From the Pumping Plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed east under the Grand Canal and along Marquesas Way, then southeasterly on Via Marina to the Marina Del Rey entrance channel. It would then cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels and continue south within Pacific Avenue to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview street. This alignment is about 10,400 feet long. This is the staff's preferred alignment.

Pacific Avenue Alignment. From the pumping plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed westerly to Pacific Avenue, then turn south and proceed along Pacific Avenue, cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels, and continue south within Pacific Avenue to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview street. This alignment is the shortest route – about 10,000 feet.

Dockweiler Beach to Pacific Avenue Alignment. From the pumping plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed westerly to the existing 20-foot wide sewer easement in Dockweiler State Beach, then turn south and cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels, and continue south within the Pacific Avenue alignment to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview street. This alignment is about 10,400 feet long.

Construction Methods: The alignments under consideration cross the Marina entrance channel and Ballona Creek channel, requiring about 1,800 feet of micro-tunneling under the two channels. Elsewhere along each alignment, two alternative construction methods are under consideration: open trench and micro-tunneling. While open trench construction costs less, micro-tunneling would eliminate the majority of traffic and parking impacts to residential areas both north and south of the channels and can facilitate mitigation of other impacts such as noise.

We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. We also need to know the views and concerns of interested organizations and persons in order to properly analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed project. Potential environmental impacts that may occur as a result of the proposed project include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology, land use/planning, noise, public services, and transportation/circulation impacts. An analysis of these potential environmental impacts and other potential impacts that could be mitigated to a less-than-significant-level is provided in an Initial Study Checklist, which is attached or can be reviewed at the following: Venice-Abbot Kinney Memorial Library, 501 South Venice Boulevard, Venice, CA 90291; Westchester-Loyola Village Library, 7114 West Manchester Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90045; or online at http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg/Environmental_Review_Documents.htm

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to: James E. Doty
 City of Los Angeles
 Public Works, Bureau of Engineering
 Environmental Management Group
 650 South Spring Street, Room 574
 Mail Stop No. 939
 Los Angeles, CA 90014

Figure 1





CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INITIAL STUDY
(Article 1 – City CEQA Guidelines)

Date: May 2, 2005

Project Title: Venice Pumping Plant Dual Force Main

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering

Contact Person: James E. Doty, Environmental Supervisor II
Environmental Management Group
650 Spring Street, Room 574
Los Angeles, CA 90014
(213) 847-8694

Project Location: The proposed Venice Pumping Plant Dual Force Main is located in the Venice and Westchester/Playa del Rey community planning areas of the City of Los Angeles (Figure 1: Project Location Map).

Project Sponsor: City of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering

General Zoning: General land use designations in the proposed project area are residential with corresponding residential and commercial zoning. Ballona Lagoon, Del Rey Lagoon, and Dockweiler Beach are lands designated as conservation and open space.

Council District: 11

Project Description:

The City of Los Angeles is proposing to construct and install a new force main sewer extending from the Venice Pumping Plant at 140 Hurricane Avenue in Venice to a

junction structure on the North Outfall Sewer in Vista del Mar near Waterview Street in Playa Del Rey. The existing 48-inch diameter Venice Pumping Plant force main was built in 1958 and is a pressurized pipeline that conveys wastewater flows to the Hyperion Treatment Plant located in Los Angeles.

Project Need:

The existing force main sewer can handle only about sixty percent of the flows that could otherwise run through the Venice Pumping plant when all five of its pumps are running at full speed. When flows into the Venice Pumping exceed flows out of the plant, levels at the plant rise and will overflow directly into Ballona Lagoon if the exceedance continues. During the heavy storms, such as those that occurred in the winters of 1994-95 and 2004-05, the excess at the plant has come within minutes of overflowing into Ballona Lagoon.

The project's intent is to construct a second force main to be used in tandem with the existing force main for the purpose of fulfilling two key objectives:

- (1) To expand the capacity of the Coastal Interceptor Sewer's force main segment from the Venice Pumping Plant to a connection in Playa Del Rey in the vicinity of Waterview Street, such that all projected wet weather flows can be safely conveyed without future threats of spilling onto city streets and adjacent surface waters; and
- (2) To provide force main redundancy to allow for much needed maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing force main and future reciprocal cleaning of each force main during dry weather periods.

Proposed Alternatives:

Marquesas Way/Via Marina. From the Pumping Plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed east under the Grand Canal and along Marquesas Way, then southeasterly on Via Marina to the Marina Del Rey entrance channel. It would then cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels and continue south within Pacific Avenue to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview Street. This alignment is about 10,400 feet long. This is the staff's preferred alignment.

Pacific Avenue Alignment. From the pumping plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed westerly to Pacific Avenue, then turn south and proceed along Pacific Avenue, cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels, and continue south within Pacific Avenue to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview Street. This alignment is the shortest route – about 10,000 feet.

Dockweiler Beach to Pacific Avenue Alignment. From the pumping plant on Hurricane Street, the alignment would proceed westerly to the existing 20-foot wide sewer easement in Dockweiler State Beach, then turn south and cross under the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels, and continue south within the Pacific Avenue alignment to a junction structure in Vista Del Mar near Waterview Street. This alignment is about 10,400 feet long.

Construction Methods: The alignments under consideration cross the Marina entrance channel and Ballona Creek channel, requiring about 1,800 feet of micro-tunneling under the two channels. Elsewhere along each alignment, two alternative construction methods are under consideration: open trench and micro-tunneling. While open trench construction costs less, micro-tunneling would eliminate the majority of traffic and parking impacts to residential areas both north and south of the channels and can facilitate mitigation of other impacts such as noise.

Unless otherwise stated, it is assumed that the project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and other formally adopted City standards (e.g., *Los Angeles Municipal Code* and Bureau of Engineering *Standard Plans*). Also, this analysis assumes that construction will follow the uniform practices established by the Southern California Chapter of the American Public Works Association (e.g., *Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* and the *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook*) as specifically adapted by the City of Los Angeles (e.g., The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works *Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications For Public Works Construction* (“The Brown Book,” formerly Standard Plan S-1610).

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.

Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located on the immediate coastline and inland adjacent to the coastline in the southern portion of the community of Venice and in the community of Playa Del Rey (Figure 1: Project Location Map). The primary land uses in these areas are medium to high density residential with some light commercial designations, particularly in the Playa Del Rey and Marina Del Rey areas. Two Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA's) are located in close proximity to most of the potential alignments; the Grand Canal/Ballona Lagoon in the Venice and Marina Del Rey area, and the Del Rey Lagoon situated in Playa Del Rey. A large protected breeding ground of the Least Tern exists on Venice Beach just north of the Marina Del Rey entrance channel and adjacent to one of the proposed alignments – this species is both a state and federally listed endangered species. The birds use the area between the months of March and September to raise their young. The colony is one of the most successful and important California Least Tern colonies on the west coast.

Previous CEQA Documentation:

In January 2001, the City completed a Consistency Assessment, which analyzed a proposed sewer main installation along Pacific Avenue and found it to be consistent with the City's Programmatic Environmental Impact Report certified in 1994 for the Wastewater Collection System Improvement Program. On February 10, 2001, City staff made a presentation to citizens and the Marina Peninsula Neighborhood Association. During the public review of the Consistency Assessment, citizens expressed concern about the potential impacts of the Pacific Avenue Alignment. Concerns over potential

impacts of the Pacific Alignment were stressed again by the Marina Peninsula Neighborhood Association during their briefing and in subsequent community meetings in the ensuing 18 months. Many requested that the City consider other alignment alternatives, including the Beach alignment, which the City had previously considered in 1996. Due to public concerns, City staff decided to halt the Consistency Assessment and prepare a full Environmental Impact Report.

In February of 2003, the City's Bureau of Engineering publicized a Notice of Preparation for the Pacific Avenue sewer alignment which stated that other alternatives would be addressed in an Environmental Impact Report. Subsequent to concerns identified by citizens and agencies, the City of Los Angeles investigated and identified several alternative alignments and construction methods for the placement of a new force main. An examination of open-trench method of construction and/or micro-tunneling are currently proposed for the roadway portions of the project, and micro-tunneling is proposed as the method to pass beneath the Marina Del Rey and Ballona Creek channels.

Other Public Agencies whose approval maybe required:

- City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
- City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
- City of Los Angeles Police Commission
- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors
- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Conservation
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California State Lands Commission
- California Department of Recreation and Parks
- California Department of Transportation
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Others may be identified in the EIR as necessary

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Introduction

The following is the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, as updated to reflect the Resource Agency's September 7, 2004 amendment of the State CEQA Guidelines, including Section 15065, Mandatory Findings of Significance. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist that describes the potential impacts related to the Proposed Project. For potentially significant impacts, project-specific mitigation measures are recommended that will reduce the adversity of these impacts.

For this checklist, the following designations are used:

- **Potentially Significant Impact:** An impact that could be significant and for which no adequate mitigation measure has been identified. Significant impacts that cannot be mitigated will require the preparation of an EIR.
- **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact:** Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA relative to existing standards.
- **No Impact:** The project would not have any adverse impact.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>	X			
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway? <small>Reference: 16, 20, and Caltrans web site:</small>	X			

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
www.dot.ca.gov				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? Reference: 16, 20	X			
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Reference: 20		X		

Discussion

a-c. The project is located in a scenic coastal area surrounded by a unique and diverse range of visual areas including the Pacific Ocean, The Playa Del Rey Channel, the Ballona Lagoon Reserve, Venice and Dockweiler Beaches and residential communities. The visual character of the alignment area and its surroundings will be adversely affected during the course of construction. Although the impacts are only temporary and will not result in long-term adverse harm to the area, construction is expected to last for eighteen to twenty-four months, therefore, the impact would be ***Potentially Significant.***

d. Impacts due to light will be based upon location of the pipeline alignment. Evening construction requiring night lamps are not anticipated in residential areas due to the close proximity of construction to homes, however, construction along the proposed beach front could lend to the potential use of night light during evening construction. Glaring impacts to possible aircraft and/or residents and/or scenic night viewing from upland areas to the beach front can be mitigated through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Potential light impacts would be temporary and would not result in long-term adverse harm to the area. Since construction is expected to last for eighteen to twenty-four months, these impacts would be ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</i></p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? Reference: 5,16, 21</p>				X
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? Reference: 5,16, 21</p>				X
<p>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in loss of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? Reference: 5,16,21</p>				X

Discussion

a-c. All proposed improvements are located on City of Los Angeles and/or County of Los Angeles-owned land, and no existing agricultural operations would be displaced through this project. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program does not designate the lands where the project is located as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **No Impact.**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3. AIR QUALITY <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i></p>				
<p>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Reference: 19, 20</p>			X	
<p>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? Reference: 19, 20</p>	X			
<p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? Reference: 19, 20</p>	X			
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Reference: 20</p>	X			
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? Reference: 20</p>		X		

Discussion

- a. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) is the air pollution control district with jurisdiction over the South Coast Air Basin, which includes the proposed project site. The South Coast AQMD is responsible for the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin, which is a comprehensive air pollution control program for attaining the state and federal ambient air quality standards. The proposed project is therefore subject to the AQMP. The City has an adopted Air Quality Element that is part of the General Plan. The Air Quality Element contains policies and goals for attaining state and federal air quality standards, while simultaneously facilitating local economic growth, and it includes implementation strategies for local programs contained in the AQMP. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project was inconsistent with the AQMP or the Air Quality Element of the City's General Plan.

The Venice Community Plan, one of the City's 35 community plan areas of the General Plan, recognizes the need for enhancing public services and infrastructure. Since the proposed project would serve the existing and intended future demand of the regional population, the project would be consistent with the community plan's objectives. Furthermore, the proposed project would not induce regional employment or population growth which might serve to exacerbate local concentrations of air pollutants. The project would not require an amendment to the Community or General Plan and would therefore be consistent with the Air Quality Element. The project will result in a ***Less-Than-Significant Impact***.

- b. The City of Los Angeles is in the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD). The South Coast AQMD is a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, and fine particulate matter. In determining attainment and maintenance of air quality standards, the South Coast AQMD has established thresholds of significance for these and other criteria pollutants. A significant impact would occur if the project resulted in substantial emissions during construction or operation which would exceed the established thresholds.

Potential adverse air quality impacts could occur during the course of construction. Construction related air quality impacts may include emissions from heavy duty equipment and off-road mobile sources (construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, materials transport, etc). Operation related impacts due to equipment may potentially exceed South Coast AQMD thresholds for emissions due to the estimated construction schedule. Other air quality impacts could result from airborne dust. Under these circumstances, there could be ***Potentially Significant Impacts***.

- c. A significant impact would occur if the project's incremental air quality effects are viewed in connection with the effects of past, present, and future projects. As indicated in 3(b) above, the proposed project is located within the South Coast Air Basin which is a non-attainment area for ozone, fine particulate matter, and carbon monoxide. The potential for the project to exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) thresholds during some stages of construction may occur and is specific to conditions during construction as well as location. High levels of emissions may be released from construction related equipment over an extended

period of time. Under these circumstances there could be **Potentially Significant Impacts**.

- d. A significant impact would occur if the project subjected sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants such as a localized carbon monoxide (CO) hot spot. Sensitive receptors include residences and schools. Under these circumstances there could be **Potentially Significant Impacts**.
- e. Odors associated with the existing sewer pipeline may be released during tie-in activities associated with construction on the new pipeline. Objectionable odors such as fuel odors released from equipment during construction may occur, however due to the linear nature of the project, concentrated odors over an extended period of time are not anticipated. Under these conditions, impacts could be **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated**.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? <small>Reference: 13, 14, 20</small>	X			
b. Have a substantial adverse impact 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? <small>Reference: 13, 14, 20</small>	X			
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,	X			

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? Reference: 22				
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites? Reference: 14, 20	X			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? Reference: 16, 20		X		
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? Reference: 16, 20		X		

Discussion

a - d. The project resides in an area of significant biodiversity due to the physical characteristics of the land. The Venice Pumping Plant is located adjacent to Grand Canal and Ballona Lagoon. A portion of one of the alternative pipeline alignments runs easterly under Grand Canal. Impacts associated with construction noise and possible channel intrusion would be significant during the course of construction. Both the east and west banks of the Ballona Lagoon, as well as portions of lands along Pacific Avenue are within the bounds of the sixteen acre Ballona Lagoon Marine Preserve. The west bank has been regularly disturbed by human activity and contains vacant lots purchased by the City for habitat protection, and open space. Site vegetation includes a mixture of predominantly exotic vascular plant species, including a number of invasive weedy species. Ruderal plant species are prominent in this area. The east bank has been restored and re-vegetated with native California plant species.

The beach-front contains one of the west's most significant Least Tern habitats and nesting grounds. The nesting area is protected by fencing and a buffer zone and is located north of the Marina Del Rey entrance channel. The birds use this area for breeding, nesting and raising their young between the months of March and September. This area could be impacted by construction noise and activity causing an adverse effect to this endangered species.

Although construction activities would not impose long-term or lasting impacts to vegetation and/or wildlife in the project area, impacts from the eighteen to twenty-four month construction duration may cause **Significant Impacts**.

- e.-f. The project is subject to specific requirements outlined in applicable resource plans, policies and Land Use Plan regulations. Mitigation measures would be implemented, thus, this project would be **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated**.

Other biological and ecological species residing in the project areas will be addressed in the EIR.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? <small>Reference: 4, 7, 14</small>		X		
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? <small>Reference: 1, 14</small>		X		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature? <small>Reference: 1, 14</small>		X		
d. Disturb any human		X		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p> <p>Reference: 1, 14</p>				

Discussion

- a. Impacts to potential historic sites within the alternatives project areas could result from extensive exposure to vibration during construction and would be specific to location and the existing condition of an exposed building and its proximity to the construction activity. Since structural impacts are possible under certain conditions, impacts could be ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***

- b-d. Although no archaeological or paleontological resources are anticipated within the project areas, it is possible that they may be unearthed during excavation of the project. Therefore, the construction of the proposed project could have a ***Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist - Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. Reference: 6, 14, 17	X			
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? Reference: 6, 14, 17	X			
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Reference: 6, 14, 17	X			
iv. Landslides? Reference: 14, 17		X		
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Reference: 14, 17		X		
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Reference: 6, 14, 17	X			

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <small>Reference: 3, 14, 17</small>				X
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? <small>Reference: 17</small>				X

Discussion

- a. & c. The proposed project sewer alignments are located approximately 3.5 miles from the Palos Verdes Fault Zone. A movement magnitude of 7.1 (M) and peak ground acceleration of 0.4g were used as seismic parameters in a year 2000 liquefaction analysis conducted for the City Bureau of Engineering by Dames and Moore to identify seismic conditions. Studies indicated that the Pacific Avenue area contains a liquefaction zone, which could result in settlement and lateral spread. Groundwater is likely to be encountered at invert depths associated with placement of the sewer main depending on which alignment is chosen for the project. The significance of impacts associated with construction activities to the geologic integrity of the soils is specific to the alignment chosen for placement of the sewer main. Although the overall results of the geotechnical investigation concluded that it is feasible to construct within the area provided recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the sewer design and are implemented during construction, the project may be ***Potentially Significant in certain areas and means should be taken to insure geotechnical stability prior to the installation of the chosen alignment.***
- b. Impacts associated with soil erosion would be specific to the chosen alignment for the sewer main, however with proper construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), impacts would be ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***
- d. During construction, construction workers could potentially be exposed to seismic hazards in open trenches and access shafts and tunnels. Standard shoring and support practices as well as compliance with Cal-OSHA requirements would reduce any potential hazards to less than significant levels. Any potential impacts would be discussed in the EIR. ***No impacts are anticipated.***

- e. Soil and geologic conditions associated with risk to property will be addressed in the EIR. This project does not contain areas where septic systems are used and is therefore considered as **No Impact**.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS <i>Would the project</i>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Reference: 20		X		
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? Reference: 20		X		
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Reference: 20		X		
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Reference: California Department of Toxic Substances Control web site: www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Index.cfm ; www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/CorteseList.cfm ; and California Regional Water Quality Control Board web site: www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/meeting/tmd/Basin_plan/basin_plan_doc.html		X		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not		X		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p> <p>Reference: 16</p>				
<p>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?</p> <p>Reference: 16</p>				X
<p>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p>Reference: 20</p>		X		
<p>h. Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</p> <p>Reference: 14</p>				X

Discussion

- a, b, c, & d. The project's channel alignment is located mostly within the administrative bounds of the Playa del Rey oil field. There are numerous plugged and abandoned wells within the project's boundaries, particularly in the Northern portions of the project. Potential adverse impacts to public safety or the environment could occur from the exposure or damaging of plugged and abandoned oil wells during project excavation and/or micro-tunneling, therefore impacts would be ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***
- e. The proposed project is within two miles of the Los Angeles International Airport. The EIR will further address this issue in detail.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
- g. Potential for the project to physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is specific to the chosen alignment. Coordination with the local jurisdiction and emergency response teams will be required prior to

pre-construction and construction activity, therefore impacts would be **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated**.

h. There are no designated wild-lands in the project area, therefore there is **no impact**.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? <small>Reference: 1, 20</small>			X	
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)? <small>Reference: 18, 20</small>			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <small>Reference: 1, 20</small>			X	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? Reference: 1, 20</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to control? Reference: 20</p>			X	
<p>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Reference: 1, 20</p>			X	
<p>g. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? Reference: 15, 20</p>				X
<p>h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? Reference: 15, 20</p>				X
<p>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? Reference: 15, 20</p>				X
<p>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? Reference: 14, 20</p>				X

Discussion

- a. Water quality standards are set based on the beneficial uses of the receiving water in which the City’s treated effluent is discharged and the water quality objectives or criteria that are associated with protecting the particular beneficial uses designated for that receiving water. See 33 U.S.C. §1313(c)(2)(A); Water Code §§13241 and 13263. Water quality standards for the waters into which the City discharges are found in the Regional Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Basin (Basin

Plan). The Basin Plan is routinely updated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The Regional Board assures that discharges do not result in the violation of applicable water quality standards by placing effluent and receiving water limitations in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs).

Increase in capacity will not result in violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, as the City will comply with all conditions of the City's permit. Therefore, the proposed project will result in **Less-Than-Significant Impacts** to water quality.

- b. The purpose of the proposed project is to increase the capacity of the existing sewer system, to reduce potential overflows and provide pipeline redundancy for potential maintenance and repairs. The project will not create change in the amount of impervious surface, however there may be changes to modify existing drainage patterns if the beach alignment is chosen. The project would not significantly change absorption rate or the rate and amount of surface runoff, and will not substantially affect groundwater recharge in the project area. Therefore, this impact is considered **Less-Than-Significant**.
- c, d, e & f. Any impact would be limited to dewatering. If dewatering is necessary, discharges would be regulated by a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit. Therefore, impacts would be **Less Than Significant**.
- g, h & i. The proposed project does not involve the construction of housing, and therefore will not directly result in any housing being placed within a 100-year floodplain. Nor does the project have any indirect or cumulative effects on housing within the floodplain. The project will not change the Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map. The project will not involve new development into undeveloped floodplain areas. Therefore, **No Impact** is anticipated.
- j. The project involves a subterranean sewer that will have no effect on impacts caused by potential inundation due to seiche or tsunami. The geologic impacts (such as mudflow) of the project are addressed in VI., above.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community? <small>Reference: 16</small>				X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations 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? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>		X		
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>		X		

Discussion

- a. Construction activities could temporarily alter the physical layout of streets in the project area, but the project will not cause a permanent division or disruption within the community.
- b. See comment in 4 (f), above.
- c. See comment in 4 (f), above.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>				
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? <small>Reference: 14, 20</small>				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? <small>Reference: 14, 16, 20</small>				X

Discussion.

There are no known mineral sources in the project areas, therefore, the proposed project would have **No Impact** on known mineral resources or resource recovery sites.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
11. NOISE <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
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? <small>Reference: 1, 10, 16</small>	X			
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? <small>Reference: 16</small>	X			
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? <small>Reference: 20</small>				X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? <small>Reference: 20</small>	X			
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? Reference: 16, 20				X

Discussion

a.b.d. Construction activities (e.g., earthmoving activities such as trenching and boring) will result in a temporary increase in groundborne noise levels. Increased traffic from construction vehicles will also generate additional noise. Although noise dissipates exponentially over distance, there are residences and other sensitive noise receptors located close to some of the proposed alignments. Therefore, impacts of short-term noise levels would be **Significant**.

c. Operational noise levels may increase significantly in some areas as a result of the project. Boring equipment, pumps installed for potential dewatering or generators used during construction activities could run for extended periods of time. Impacts associated with noise are specific to the chosen alignment and may effect sensitive receptors in some areas but are expected to be temporary, Therefore, long-term noise levels would be **Less-Than-Significant**.

e. & f. The proposed project is within two miles of the Los Angeles International Airport. However, the project will not increase the exposure of residents or workers to airport noise. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Induce substantial 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)? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>				X
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <small>Reference: 16, 20</small>				X

Discussion

a.-c. The Venice Community Plan, one of the City’s 35 community plan areas of the General Plan, recognizes the need for enhancing public services and infrastructure. Since the proposed project would serve the existing and intended future demand of the regional population, the project would be consistent with the community plan’s objectives. Furthermore, the proposed project would not induce regional employment or population growth which might serve to exacerbate local concentrations of air pollutants. The project would not require an amendment to the Community or General Plan and would therefore be consistent with the Air Quality Element. **No impact**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a. Fire protection? Reference: 20		X		
b. Police protection? Reference: 20		X		
c. Schools? Reference: 20		X		
d. Parks? Reference: 20	X			
e. Other public facilities? Reference: 20	X			

Discussion

- a, b The project will not require the provision of increased or new public services. Potential temporary impact to fire and police response times could occur without adequate traffic control planning and are specific to the chosen alignment.
- c. Construction could impact transportation safety and traffic near schools temporarily and is specific to the chosen alignment.
- d, e Impact on public access and recreation may occur during construction and are specific to the chosen alignment. The beach alternative could have adverse impacts on public parking and access to the beach and recreation during construction due to staging of construction equipment. Impacts to parking and traffic could occur on upland alignment areas, therefore could cause **Potentially Significant Impacts**.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
14. RECREATION				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? <small>Reference: 20</small>				X
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? <small>Reference: 20</small>				X

Discussion

- a. Since the project will not include residential uses, there will be no increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or the requirement for the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have **No Impact**.
- b. Since the project will not include residential facilities, there will be no requirement for the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, therefore the proposed project would have **No Impact**.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? <small>Reference: 20</small>	X			
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? <small>Reference: 20</small>	X			
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? <small>Reference: 20</small>				X
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? <small>Reference: 20</small>		X		
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? <small>Reference: 20</small>	X			
g. Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <small>Reference: 20</small>				X

Discussion

- a,b,f. The proposed project would result in a slight increase in traffic levels due to construction. Although impacts will be temporary in nature, the duration of construction is estimated to take eighteen to twenty-four months. The project may impose a change on traffic circulation specific to the chosen alignment. Adequate parking would be significantly impacted at and near proposed construction equipment lay-down areas both north and south of the channel. Parking available to Dockweiler beach south of the Ballona Creek would be adversely effected during construction. Traffic in the upland areas may cause congestion in and around the construction area and is specific to the chosen alignment therefore, the project would result in ***Potentially Significant Impacts.***
- c. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that could result in substantial safety risks do not apply to this project. ***No Impact***
- d. The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. ***No Impact***
- e. Impact resulting in inadequate emergency access would occur without proper coordination prior to construction and are specific to the chosen alignment therefore, impacts are ***Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Is Incorporated.***
- g. The project would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation such as bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc. ***No Impact.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <i>Would the project:</i></p>				
<p>a. Exceed wastewater treatment or water quality requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? Reference: 20</p>				X
<p>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Reference: 20</p>				X
<p>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Reference: 20</p>			X	
<p>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Reference: 20</p>				X
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has</p>				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? Reference: 20				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Reference: 20				X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? Reference: 20				X

Discussion

- a. The proposed project is an upgrade to an existing major interceptor sewer that outlets at Hyperion Treatment Plant. It is not expected to alter or exceed the wastewater treatment requirements currently in place.
- b. No water or wastewater facilities would be required in addition to the proposed project. **No Impact.**
- c. The proposed project will not alter storm water infiltration or runoff. Any impact would be limited to dewatering. If dewatering is necessary, discharges would be regulated by a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit. Therefore, impacts would be **Less Than Significant.**
- d. The operation of the expanded sewer main would require no increase in water usage. Therefore, **No Impact** is anticipated.
- e. The project itself involves the expansion of the existing capacity of the sewer system to handle the peak overflows and is in accordance with the City's General Plan. Therefore, **No Impact** has been identified.
- f. Construction of the proposed project may require the net export of soil from open trench and/or tunneling. Excavated soil is typically taken to landfills which use the soil as waste-cell covering, or is sold to brokers to be used as fill. **No Impacts have been identified.**

- g. Standard City of Los Angeles provisions governing construction projects require full compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including those related to solid waste. **No Impacts** have been identified

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</p>				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Reference: 13, 14, 20</p>	<p>X</p>			
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? Reference: 20</p>	<p>X</p>			

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Reference: 20		X		

Discussion

- a. The proposed project has the potential to significantly degrade the environment or result in impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology, land use/planning, noise, public services, and transportation/circulation.
- b. The project has the potential to result in cumulative air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and traffic impacts during construction when taken together with future planned projects in the area. The EIR will evaluate temporary and short-term impacts related to construction in the surrounding area. The EIR will also identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a level of insignificance.
- c. Surrounding land uses in the immediate vicinity would be affected by short-term air quality, noise, and traffic impacts during construction. The EIR would evaluate these impacts and will identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a level of insignificance.

DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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.

Reviewed By: James E. Doty 4/28-05
 James E. Doty Date
 Environmental Supervisor II

Approved By: Ara J. Kasparian 4/28/05
 Ara J. Kasparian, Ph. D., Manager Date
 Environmental Management Group

REFERENCES

Sources of information that adequately support findings of no significant impact are referenced by number after each question in the Initial Study Checklist. All sources so referenced are cited below and are available by appointment for review at the offices of the Bureau of Engineering, 650 South Spring Street, Suite 574, Los Angeles.

1. American Public Works Assoc. S. California Chapter. Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction.
2. American Public Works Assoc. S. California Chapter Work Area Traffic Control Handbook.
3. California Building Standards Commission, 1994. Uniform Building Code, [California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2]. Table 18-1-B.
4. California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 "Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources."
5. California Dept. of Conservation, 1997. California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model.
6. California Dept. of Conservation, Div. of Mines and Geology. Official Map of Seismic Hazard Zones.
7. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works, Bur. Engineering. Historic Resources Inventory. Electronic data base.
8. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works. Standard Plan S-610.
9. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works. Standard Plans.
10. City of Los Angeles. Municipal Code.
11. City of Los Angeles. Policies for the Installation and Preservation of Landscaping and Trees on Public Property. Adopted by the City Council on September 21, 1971.
12. City of Los Angeles. Tree Removal Mitigation Agreement Between the Bureaus of Engineering and Street Maintenance. Adopted by the Board of Public Works October 15, 1990.
13. Diversity Database. California Dept. of Fish and Game, October 1995. California Natural Diversity Database. Internet version at www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/cnddb.htm
14. Environmental Atlas. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of City Planning. Environmental Data Atlas.
15. Flood Map. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Insurance Rate

Maps. Community Panel number 060137 00__ C. MAPLA internet version at <http://www.cityofla.org/>

16. General Plan. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of City Planning. General Plan. Including community plans and technical elements.
17. Geologic Map. California Dept. of Conservation, Div. of Mines and Geology. Geologic Map of California: Los Angeles Sheet.
18. Groundwater Map. Upper Los Angeles River Area Watermaster, Spring 1990. Upper Los Angeles River Area Groundwater Contour Map.
19. SCAQMD. South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.
20. Thresholds. City of Los Angeles, Dept. of Environmental Affairs. L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide: Your Resource for Preparing CEQA Analyses in Los Angeles. 1998 Draft.
21. U.S.G.S. Topo. U.S. Dept. Interior Geological Survey. 7.5-minute Map Series (Topographic).
22. Wetlands Inventory. U.S. Dept. Interior Fish & Wildlife Service. National Wetlands Inventory. Overlays for U.S. Dept. Interior Geological Survey. 7.5-minute Map Series (Topographic).