Chapter 1 Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project Title:

North Atwater Park

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Los Angeles, Public Works 1149 S. Broadway St Los Angeles, CA 90015

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Kosta Kaporis 1149 S. Broadway St, 10Th fl Los Angeles, CA 90015 213-485-0586

4. **Project Location:**

The project would be located in the City of Los Angeles and in the County Los Angeles.

5. Project Sponsor's Name:

City of Los Angeles

6. General Plan Designation:

7. Zoning:

Open Space

8. Description of Project:

The North Atwater Park Project will construct water quality physical and structural improvements to an area along the Los Angeles (LA) River. The project will restore wetlands for stormwater runoff capture and treatment and provide habitat linkage to the LA River. This will begin a restoration and revitalization of the LA River and its vicinity where wetlands existed along the riverbanks. During dry periods water for irrigation of the site will be pumped from the LA River. This will directly benefit the East and Northeast LA communities, which are predominately low income and minority.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.

Public facilities, agricultural, and residential

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

United States, Army Corps of Engineers

☐ Mineral Resources

☐ Utilities / Service Systems

☐ Public Services

Chapter 1 Environmental Checklist Form

☐ Population / Housing

☐ Transportation / Traffic

DRAFT

Environmental	Factors	Potentiall	y Affect	ed
---------------	----------------	-------------------	----------	----

The key environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the Project. However, as described in the checklist below, the Project would not cause significant impacts in any of these areas and would have beneficial impacts.						
☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality				
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	Geology / Soils				
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Material	s 🔀 Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning				

☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

☐ Noise

□ Recreation

June 1, 2006 City of Los Angeles 2

1.1 Aesthetics

Wou	ıld 1	the Project:	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\boxtimes
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\boxtimes
		griculture Resources the Project:	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
	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?				\boxtimes
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes

1.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
Would 1	the Project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				\boxtimes
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				\boxtimes
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)?	П	П	П	\boxtimes
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				\boxtimes
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\boxtimes

Biological Resources

		Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
Would	the Project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				\boxtimes
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				\boxtimes
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				\boxtimes
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Conservation Community Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP?				\boxtimes

1.5 **Cultural Resources**

Wo	uld f	the P	Project:	Potentially Significant _Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Cau sign	use a substantial adverse change in the nificance of a historical resource as defined \$15064.5?				\boxtimes
	b)	sign	use a substantial adverse change in the nificance of a unique archaeological purce pursuant to \$15064.5?				\boxtimes
	c)	pale	ectly or indirectly destroy a unique eontological resource or site or unique logic feature?				\boxtimes
	d)		turb any human remains, including those erred outside of formal cemeteries?				\boxtimes
1.6		Geo	logy and Soils				
Wo				Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo		t he P Exp sub	Project: cose people or structures to potential stantial adverse effects, including the risk oss, injury, or death involving:	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	
Wo	uld t	the P Exp sub of l	Project: cose people or structures to potential stantial adverse effects, including the risk coss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	Impact
Wo	uld t	the P Exp sub of l	Project: Dose people or structures to potential estantial adverse effects, including the risk oss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	
Wo	uld t	the P Exp sub of l i)	Project: cose people or structures to potential stantial adverse effects, including the risk coss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	Impact

	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				
	c)	Be located on 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?				\boxtimes
	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?				\boxtimes
	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?				\boxtimes
1.7	ı	Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
				Less Than Significant		
			Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
Wo	uld 1	the Project:	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	
Wo	uld t a)	the Project: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	
Wo	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport,	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	<u>Impact</u>
Woi	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? 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	Significant	Significant With Mitigation	Significant	<u>Impact</u>

 \boxtimes

have been granted)?

Chapter 1 Environmental Checklist Form

DRAFT 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 of siltation on- or off-site? \boxtimes d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? \boxtimes e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? \boxtimes f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (erosion potential) \boxtimes g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? Xh) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? \boxtimes 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? \boxtimes j) Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? \boxtimes

DRAFT

1.9 Land Use and Planning

Would	the Project:	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
a)	Physically divide an established community?				\bowtie
b)				_	
	mitigating an environmental effect?				
c)	Conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP?				\boxtimes
	Mineral Resources	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
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?				
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?				\boxtimes

1.11 Noise

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				\boxtimes
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				\boxtimes
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?				\boxtimes
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes

1.12 Population and Housing

a)

es Than nificant No npact <u>Impact</u>	-
ss Than nificant No npact <u>Impact</u>	-
nificant No	
nificant No	
nificant No npact <u>Impact</u>	
nificant No npact Impact	
nificant No npact Impact Impact Impact	

1.14 Recreation

Would	the Prejects	Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
vv outa	the Project:				
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?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
1.15	Transportation/Traffic				
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would	the Project:	mpaci	Incorporation	Impaci	Impact
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)?				
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				\boxtimes
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?				\boxtimes
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous				

Chapter 1 Environmental

Checklist Form

Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

Project Title: North Atwater Park

Chapter 1 Environmental

Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration