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Notice of Preparation
June 21, 2018

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Stakeholders and Interested Parties

From: City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project

The City of Los Angeles (City) Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE) is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project. The City is proposing to demolish the Celes King III Indoor Pool building and pool (Celes King III Pool) and convert the site into a community front lawn and playground area.

The City requests your agency’s views on the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project, in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15082(b). Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering any permit or other approval that your agency must issue for the proposed project. In addition, the City requests comments from other interested parties, stakeholders, and the general public on the scope of the environmental issues related to the proposed project.

The project site is located in the southeast quadrant of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex at 5001 Rodeo Road in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The project site is bounded by a paved surface parking lot to the west, a tennis shop to the north, tennis courts to the east, and Rodeo Road to the south. Generally, the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex is bounded by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Expo Line light rail transit system to the north (along Exposition Boulevard), Dorsey High School to the east, residential land uses to the south across Rodeo Road, and commercial uses to the west. Regional access to the project area is provided via Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 405 (I-405). The project site is served by Rodeo Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to the south, La Brea Avenue to the west, Exposition Boulevard to the north, and Farmdale Avenue to the east. Figures 1 and 2 attached show the regional location and the project site, respectively.

Implementation of the proposed project would include conducting required hazardous materials abatement, draining water from the existing Celes King III Pool, and demolishing the Celes King III Pool building. Following demolition, construction activities would include infill of the pool pit, rough grading of
the site, utility installations, landscaping and hardscaping, and installation of playground and shade structures.

An analysis of potential environmental effects is provided in the Initial Study Checklist prepared for the Proposed Project. Potential impacts associated with the Proposed Project may include:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Transportation/Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the EIR will include an evaluation of the No Project Alternative, as well as a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives. Potential alternatives will be analyzed at a lower degree of detail than the proposed project.

The Initial Study Checklist is available for review at the following locations:

- Baldwin Hills Branch Library, 2906 S La Brea Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90016
- Jefferson/Wright Memorial Branch Library, 2211 W Jefferson Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90018
- Council District 10 Office, 1819 S. Western Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90006
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, EMG, 1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90015

A copy of the Initial Study Checklist may also be obtained by contacting James R Tebbetts of the Bureau of Engineering at (213) 485-5732 and can also be accessed online at: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg/projects.htm

Comments

Comments will be accepted from June 21, 2018 to July 20, 2018. Please send your comments by mail to:

James R Tebbetts, Environmental Specialist II
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, EMG
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Mail Stop 939
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to James.Tebbetts@lacity.org (please include “Celes King Ill Pool Comments” in the subject line) or by fax to (213) 847-0656.
Scoping Meeting

A scoping meeting will be held to obtain input on the scope of the contents of the EIR, as well as to present information on the proposed project design. This meeting will be held at the following date, time and location:

Thursday, June 28, 2018
6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Rancho Cienega Sports Complex
Ira C. Massey Child Care Center
5001 Rodeo Road
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Scoping Meeting Location
Initial Study
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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 (BOE), Environmental Management Group (EMG) has determined that the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an Initial Study (IS) is required.

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

This 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 IS/MND is organized into seven 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, and proposed construction and operation.

Section III, Existing Environment: provides a description of the existing environmental setting with focus on features of the environment that 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, Preparation and Consultation: provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of this report and key personnel consulted.

Section VI, Determination – Recommended Environmental Documentation: provides the recommended environmental documentation for the proposed project.

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

C. CEQA Process

CEQA applies to proposed projects initiated by, funded by, or requiring discretionary approvals from state or local government agencies. The proposed project constitutes a project as defined by CEQA (California Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.). CEQA Guidelines §15367 states that a "Lead Agency" is “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” Therefore, BOE is the lead agency responsible for compliance with CEQA for the proposed project.

As lead agency for the proposed project, BOE must complete an environmental review to determine if implementation of the proposed project would result in significant adverse environmental impacts. To fulfill the purposes of CEQA, an IS has been prepared to assist in making that determination. Based on the nature and scope of the proposed project, the evaluation contained in the IS environmental checklist (contained herein), and the comments received from agencies and members of the public during review of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR, factors that have potential to involve significant adverse environmental impacts will be determined.

Such factors will become the focus of more detailed analysis in the EIR to determine the nature and extent of any potential environmental impacts and establish appropriate mitigations for those impacts determined to be significant. The EIR will also include an
evaluation of alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce or avoid significant impacts, including a No Project Alternative. Based on the IS analysis and the NOP review, factors for which no significant adverse environmental impacts are expected to occur will be eliminated from further evaluation in the EIR. A preliminary evaluation of the potentially affected factors is included in the IS checklist in Section IV and Appendix A.

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

II. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

A. **Introduction**

The proposed Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project (proposed project) would demolish the Celes King III Indoor Pool building and pool (Celes King III Pool) and convert the site into a community front lawn and playground area. The Celes King III Pool is located within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex in Los Angeles, California, in Council District 10.

B. **Location**

The project site is located in the southeast quadrant of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex at 5001 Rodeo Road in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The project site is bounded by a paved surface parking lot to the west, a tennis shop approved for demolition to the north, tennis courts to the east, and Rodeo Road to the south. Generally, the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex is bounded by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Expo Line light rail transit system to the north (along Exposition Boulevard), Dorsey High School to the east, residential land uses to the south across Rodeo Road, and commercial uses to the west. Regional access to the project area is provided via Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 405 (I-405). The project site is served by Rodeo Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to the south, La Brea Avenue to the west, Exposition Boulevard to the north, and Farmdale Avenue to the east. Figure 1 shows the regional location of the project site. Figure 2 shows the project site within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex.
C. Purpose

The overall purpose for the proposed project is to provide safe and upgraded infrastructure to meet the community’s recreational needs. The existing Celes King III Pool no longer meets the standards for competition pools.

The objectives of the proposed project are:

- To alleviate the maintenance concerns for the existing Celes King III Pool.
- To provide additional upgraded playground facilities in a densely populated area.
- To provide additional landscaping for the park for relaxation and enjoyment.
- To remove and properly dispose hazardous materials used in the construction of the Celes King III Pool.

D. Description

The proposed project would conduct required hazardous materials abatement, drain water from the existing Celes King III Pool, and demolish the Celes King III Pool building. Following demolition, construction activities would include infill of the pool pit, rough grading of the site, utility installations, landscaping and hardscaping, and installation of playground and shade structures.

Demolition and construction activities would last approximately 10 months from December 2019 to August 2020. Approximately 14,000 cubic yards of demolition debris would be exported from the project site. Demolition and construction activities would consist of a maximum of 10 truck trips per day. A total of approximately 20 construction workers would be on-site each day. Demolition and hazardous materials abatement would require approximately four types of equipment, consisting of a demolition excavator, articulating dump truck, street sweeper, and 20 yard roll off bins. Construction activities would require approximately four types of equipment, consisting of a compactor, several 20 yard roll off bins, street sweepers, and several backhoes/skip loaders, as well as concrete trucks as necessary. It is not anticipated that any trees be removed as part of the proposed project.

Following construction, the proposed project would operate similarly to existing conditions, and the community front lawn and playground area would be passive uses.

The existing Rancho Cienega Sports Complex is currently developed as a sports complex. The existing complex contains a variety of facilities, including a gymnasium, basketball courts, baseball diamond, child play area, community room, football field, handball courts, picnic tables, soccer field, skate park, and tennis courts. The Rancho Cienega Sports Complex has been approved for construction and demolition activities as part of the recently approved Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project. Phase 1 of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project would include demolition and construction.
of the indoor gymnasium to the northwest of the project site, demolition of the existing restroom facilities and construction of a new indoor pool, bathhouse facility, and multiuse building to the northwest of the project site, rehabilitation of the tennis shop to the north of the project site, construction of a new stadium overlook and concession stand to the northwest of the project site, and improvements to the primary parking lot along Rodeo Road directly adjacent to the project site on the west. Phase 2 of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project would include demolition of parking lots, outdated electrical and plumbing infrastructure, asphalt maintenance driveways and concrete sidewalks, and construction of a driveway, off street parking, park infrastructure (including landscaping and furniture), a tennis block with bleachers and a shade structure, bleachers and a shade structure for the baseball field, and a stadium block that includes a press box, concession stand, elevated bleachers, and restrooms. Construction of the proposed project would occur following the end of Phase 1 and prior to the commencement of Phase 2 of the approved Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project.

III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The project site consists of the Celes King III Indoor Pool, located within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex at 5001 Rodeo Road, approximately 6.5 miles southwest of downtown Los Angeles in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan and Council District 10 areas of the City of Los Angeles. The project site has historically been used as a recreation facility, with the Celes King III Pool building constructed in the 1960s. The Celes King III Pool building is a cinder-block/concrete walled, steel-supported structure that consists of offices, lock rooms, and support facilities located at the northern end of the building with the pool area located to the south.

The area surrounding the project site is fully developed and highly urbanized. Current land uses in the area consist of residential housing, light industrial and commercial use, and public lands. The project site totals approximately 0.4 acres and is zoned OS-1XL (Open Space).1

The California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey’s Seismic Hazard Zonation Program Map indicates that the project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest fault zone to the project site is the Newport-Inglewood Fault which is located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the site and no active faults are known to cross the project site.2 The project site is located within a designated liquefaction zone.3 The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain, but is located within a 500-year (0.2-percent-annual-chance) floodplain.4,5

1 City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, ZIMAS. Website: http://zimas.lacity.org/, accessed April 26, 2018.
3 Ibid.
4 Federal Emergency Management Agency. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address.
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
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

A. Aesthetics

The project site is not located within a scenic vista nor is it located along or near a designated California Scenic Highway. The proposed project would be consistent with the existing visual character of the project area. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would not result in impacts to aesthetics and visual resources (See Appendix A).

B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would not result in impacts to agriculture and forestry resources. These resources do not occur on or near the project site (See Appendix A).

C. Air Quality

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would generate air pollutants as a result of construction equipment emissions and fugitive dust. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in long-term air quality impacts during operation. An air quality

Firm Panel 06037C1615F, effective on 09/26/2008 Available online at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=los%20angeles%20city#searchresultsanchor; accessed April 30, 2018

Ibid.
and greenhouse gas technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential air quality impacts (See Appendix A).

D. Biological Resources

The project site is located within a heavily-urbanized area and is currently developed with the existing Celes King III Pool. No native vegetation, sensitive communities, wetlands, or wildlife corridors exists within the project site, and there would be no direct impacts to sensitive plants, wildlife, or vegetation communities. The proposed project would not conflict with local policies, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to biological resources (See Appendix A).

E. Cultural Resources

The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential impacts to cultural resources (See Appendix A).

F. Geology and Soils

The project site is located in an area that is susceptible to liquefaction and other geological phenomena. However, the proposed project would not construct any habitable structures that would be susceptible to liquefaction or seismic-related events. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to geology and soils (See Appendix A).

G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Initial screening determined that construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions. It is not anticipated that greenhouse gas emissions would be generated during project operation. An air quality and greenhouse gas technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential greenhouse gas emissions impacts (See Appendix A).

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A preliminary survey conducted for the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project determined that the Celes King III Pool may contain asbestos-containing materials and lead based paint. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts (See Appendix A).
I. Hydrology and Water Quality

The proposed project would not violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirements, or interference with groundwater recharge, substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site, contribute to runoff water, or degrade water quality. Additionally, the proposed project does not include a residential component that would be subject to flooding, impede flood flows, or expose people or structure to flooding, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Initial screening determined that the proposed project result in less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality (See Appendix A).

J. Land Use and Planning

The project site is located in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would not cause a disruption to an established community and no new land uses would be introduced at the project site. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to consistent with applicable land use plans (See Appendix A).

K. Mineral Resources

The project site is not in an area identified as containing significant mineral deposits. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in no impacts to mineral resources (See Appendix A).

L. Noise

Construction activities associated with the propose project may increase noise levels and/or generate groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would potentially result in significant impacts due to construction noise and vibration. A technical noise analysis will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential noise and vibration impacts (See Appendix A).

M. Population and Housing

The project site does not contain any existing housing and the proposed project would not generate new permanent residents. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in no impacts to population and housing (See Appendix A).

N. Public Services

The proposed project would not generate new permanent residents that would increase the demand for public services. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in no impacts to public services (See Appendix A).
O. Recreation

The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the site to a community lawn and playground area. However, construction of the proposed project would not generate new permanent residents that would increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to recreation (See Appendix A).

P. Transportation/Traffic

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate traffic. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would potentially result in significant impacts related to transportation and traffic during the demolition and construction activities. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would generate additional vehicle trips during project operation. A traffic study will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential transportation and traffic impacts (See Appendix A).

Q. Tribal Cultural Resources

The project site is located in an area that may contain Native American cultural resources. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would potentially result in significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, and the EIR will include a detailed analysis of the potential impacts to tribal cultural resources (See Appendix A).

R. Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project would include the installation of new stormwater and drainage infrastructure for the landscaped area. These improvements would not result in the need for new or expanded storm drain facilities elsewhere in the system. Additionally, the proposed project would not generate new permanent residents that would increase the demand for utilities and service systems, and would comply with all federal, state, and local regulations related to the existing wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and solid waste. Initial screening determined that the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to utilities and service systems (See Appendix A).

S. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Based on the foregoing, it has been determined that:

The proposed project would potentially result in significant impacts to cultural resources. A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, and the potential impacts to cultural resources will be further studied in the EIR.

Additionally, the proposed project would potentially result in impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and transportation
and traffic. Therefore, the EIR will also include an analysis of the proposed project's potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts, achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals, and cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. A detailed analysis of these issues will be included in the EIR (See Appendix A).

The EIR will identify feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially reduce any significant adverse impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

V. PREPARATION AND CONSULTATION

Lead Agency

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

James R. Tebbetts, Environmental Specialist II

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, Architectural Division
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Ohaji K. Abdallah, Architectural Associate II/Project Manager

Technical Assistance Provided By:

Fareeha Kibriya, Project Manager (AECOM)
Vicky Rosen, Environmental Analyst (AECOM)
Jang Seo, GIS Specialist (AECOM)

VI. DETERMINATION – RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

This CEQA Initial Study has been prepared to assist the lead agency in determining whether the proposed project would result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Based on the nature and scope of the proposed project and evaluation contained in the Environmental Screening Checklist (contained herein as Appendix A), it was been determined that the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following environmental issue areas: air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, transportation and traffic, and tribal cultural resources.
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:

[Signature]

Fareeha Kibriya
Project Manager
AECOM

Reviewed By:

[Signature]

James Tebbetts
Environmental Specialist II
Environmental Management Group

Approved By:

[Signature]

Maria Martin
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 Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</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>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Explanation: Scenic views or vistas are panoramic public views of various natural features, including the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features. Public access to these views may be available from nearby parklands, private and public-owned sites, and public right-of-way.

The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan does not delineate or designate any specific views as scenic vistas within the project area. The project area is located within an urban setting and is bounded by the Metro Expo Line light rail transit system to the north, Dorsey High School to the east, residential housing to the south across Rodeo Road, and commercial uses to the west. The project site is currently developed with an indoor pool building.

The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the site to a community front lawn and playground area. Construction of the proposed project would result in short-term impacts to aesthetics due to the presence of construction equipment and materials in the visual landscape; however, the project site is not located within a scenic vista. During operation, the proposed project would include landscaping and a playground area, consistent with the current visual elements of the project area. As such, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.
### Issues

| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |

**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.

**Explanation:** The Celes King III Pool is identified as a historic resource; however, the project site is not located along or near a designated California Scenic Highway or locally designated scenic highway. The proposed project would occur within the boundaries of the existing Celes King III Pool. The nearest designated scenic highway is Route 110, also known as the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway, which is located approximately 8.9 miles northeast of the project site. State Highway 1 (Pacific Coast Highway) is located approximately 6 miles southwest of the project site and is an eligible California Scenic Highway. Additionally, a portion of Rodeo Road, located approximately 0.28 miles west of the project site, is a locally designated scenic highway in the *West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan*. However, the project site is not visible from the portion of Rodeo Road which is locally designated as a scenic highway. Additionally, no scenic resources such as groves of trees or rock outcroppings are located on the project site. As such, no impact to scenic resources would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 15 (Mobility Plan 2035), 16 (Community Plan)

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

**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.

**Explanation:** The project site is located in a highly urbanized area in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the site to a community front lawn and playground area.

The proposed project would be consistent with Chapter 3, Land Use & Urban Design, of the *West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan*. As discussed in the plan, the focus of the plan is on “elimination of urban decay through the revitalization of underutilized opportunity sites; conserving prevailing neighborhood character; making walking, bicycling, and public transportation convenient, safe, and enjoyable, and providing strategies to fuse previously disconnected neighborhoods together, socially, culturally, as well as structurally.” The proposed project would adhere to the design guidelines discussed in the *West Adams-
Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan by utilizing the project site as an additional playground area since the existing Celes King III Pool no longer meets the standards for competition pools and a new indoor pool facility would be built as part of the approved Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project.

The proposed project has the potential for short-term aesthetic effects during construction activities due to construction equipment and materials on-site. These effects would be temporary and occur within the project site boundaries. As such, less than significant impacts to visual character would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 16 (Community Plan)

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation</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 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.

Explanation: The project site is currently illuminated by existing lighting on-site, existing lighting within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex, and adjacent street lights along Rodeo Road to the south. Project construction would occur during daylight hours, and therefore, would not require nighttime lighting. The proposed project would include installation of new security lighting in the front lawn and playground area, which would operate regularly, similar to existing on-site lighting. The nighttime lighting fixtures that would be installed would direct the light to within the landscaped and playground area, and no spillover impacts would occur at surrounding properties. As such, the proposed project would not create a substantial source of light or glare that would result in adverse effects to day/nighttime views of the area. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation</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: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance exists within the project area or vicinity. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 5 (Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Important Farmland Finder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No land on or near the project site is zoned for or contains agricultural uses. As the City of Los Angeles does not participate in the Williamson Act, there are no Williamson Act properties within the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 6 (California Department of Conservation Williamson Act Maps)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is zoned OS-1XL (Open Space). The OS Zone allows for natural resource preserves for the managed production of resources, including forest lands. However, there are no forest land or timberland areas in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland resources. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 13 (LAMC), 17 (ZIMAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

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

**Explanation:** Refer to item 2 (c) above. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Explanation:** Refer to items 2 (a) and 2 (c) above. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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).

**Explanation:** The SCAQMD monitors air quality within the project area and the South Coast Air Basin, which includes portions of Los Angeles County containing the project site. The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the site to a community front lawn and playground area. The proposed project would be a passive use during operation, and thus, no long-term air quality impacts are anticipated. An air quality technical report will be prepared for the proposed project to determine whether short-term construction emissions would exceed the emissions budgeted for the project site in the applicable air quality management plan. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR. Reference: 22 (SCAQMD)
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>![☐]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 (NO\(_x\)), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\)) emissions resulting from construction and operation in the South Coast Air Basin.

**Explanation:** The proposed project would generate air pollutants as a result of construction emissions. Short-term impacts may result from construction equipment emissions, such as demolition excavators, dump trucks, graders, and worker vehicle exhaust, and from fugitive dust during demolition activities. The proposed project would not likely result in long-term air quality impacts during operations as the proposed project is intended for passive uses. The air quality technical report prepared for the proposed project will evaluate construction air quality impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>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)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>![☐]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 ozone, particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\)), and fine particulate matter (PM\(_{2.5}\)).

**Explanation:** The SCAQMD recommends that a project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for the project-specific impacts. The air quality technical report prepared for the proposed project will evaluate the potential for cumulative air quality impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![x]</td>
<td>![☐]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if construction or operation of the proposed project generated pollutant concentrations to a degree that would...
## Issues

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

significantly affect sensitive receptors.

Explanation: The SCAQMD indicates that sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Operation of the proposed project would not be anticipated to generate substantial new sources of pollutant concentrations as the proposed project would be a passive use. The air quality technical report prepared for the proposed project will evaluate the potential for individual receptors to be exposed to unhealthful pollutant concentrations during construction. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard: A significant impact may occur if objectionable odors occur that would adversely impact sensitive receptors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include exhaust from diesel construction equipment. Such odors may be a temporary source of nuisance to adjacent uses; however, odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the project site. The odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature, and would not be considered a significant environmental impact. Operation of the proposed project would not add any new odor sources. As a result, the proposed project’s construction and operational activities would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explanation: Special-status plant species include those listed as Endangered, Threatened, Rare or those species proposed for listing (Candidates) by the United }
### Issues

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

States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), or those listed by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS)\(^6\)\(^7\)\(^8\)  Sensitive wildlife species are those species listed as threatened or endangered, proposed for listing, or candidate for listing by USFWS and/or CDFW, or considered special status by CDFW. Sensitive habitats are those that are regulated by USFWS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and/or those considered sensitive by the CDFW.

The project site is located in the heavily-urbanized West Adams-Baldwin Hills- Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The site is currently developed with the Celes King III Pool. Because the proposed project would involve demolition and construction within the existing boundary of the Celes King III Pool and no native vegetation exists within the project site, there would be no direct impacts to sensitive plants, wildlife, or vegetation communities. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that any trees would be removed to accommodate project construction. However, temporary indirect impacts to nesting birds in the vicinity of the project site could occur as a result of noise and dust generated during construction. Disturbances related to construction could result in changes in bird behavior, including nest abandonment or decreased feeding frequency, leading to increased nesting mortality. By avoiding vegetation removal during the nesting bird season or conducting pre-construction surveys to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, indirect impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

### 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community were to be adversely modified.

**Explanation:** Sensitive natural communities are those that are designated as rare in the region by the CNDDB, provide potentially suitable habitat to support special-status plant or wildlife species, or receive regulatory protection (i.e., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code).

---

\(^6\) Species listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (Title 50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 17.12 [listed plants], Title 50 CFR 17.11 [listed animals] and includes notices in the Federal Register for proposed species).

\(^7\) Species listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (Title 14 California Code of Regulations 670.5).

\(^8\) Plants listed as rare under the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code Section 1900 et seq.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code). Rare communities are given the highest inventory priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site occurs in a heavily-urbanized community of the City of Los Angeles and no natural vegetation communities occur on-site. As a result, the proposed project would not adversely affect any sensitive natural community or riparian habitat. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 7 (CDFW CNDDB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site occurs in a heavily-urbanized community of the City of Los Angeles and no federal- or state-protected wetlands or other waters coincide with the project site or would be affected by implementation of the project. As a result, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 24 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: In an urban context, a wildlife migration corridor can be defined as a linear landscape feature of sufficient width and buffer to allow animal movement between two comparatively undisturbed habitat fragments, or between a habitat fragment and some vital resource that encourages population growth and diversity. Habitat fragments are isolated patches of habitat separated by otherwise foreign or inhospitable areas, such as urban/suburban tracts or highways. Two types of wildlife migration corridors seen in urban settings are regional corridors, defined as those linking two or more large areas of natural open space, and local corridors, defined as those allowing resident wildlife to access critical resources (food, cover, and water) in a smaller area that might otherwise be isolated by urban development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site occurs in a heavily-urbanized community of the City of Los Angeles and there are no surface waters, drainages, or other corridors that allow for wildlife movement on or within the vicinity of the project site. The site is not within an established wildlife corridor, and the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native wildlife species. As a result, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and would not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Direct impacts are not anticipated. Additionally, no trees exist within the project site; however, nesting birds may avoid the project vicinity due to increased levels of noise or dust during construction. By avoiding vegetation removal during the nesting bird season or conducting pre-construction surveys to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, indirect impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</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>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources.

Explanation: Native tree species that measure four inches or more in cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground, including native oak (Quercus spp.), southern California black walnut (Juglans californica var. californica), western sycamore (Platanus racemosa), and California bay (Umbellularia californica), are protected by the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Any tree grown or held for sale by a nursery, or trees planted or grown as part of a tree planting program, are not included in the definition of a protected tree. Should any of the species listed above that meet the size requirements need to be removed, relocated, or replaced, the proposed project would comply with the City’s protected tree ordinance.

The City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works tree removal policy requires replacing street trees at a two-to-one ratio for trees that are removed from the right-of-way. Los Angeles Recreation and Parks (LARAP) also has a tree replacement policy that can be found within the LARAP’s Tree Care Manual. The LARAP tree replacement policy requires "whenever trees are removed, the existing trees’ aggregate diameter, measures at breast height shall be replacement at an equal or greater rate of caliper of new trees."

It is not anticipated that any trees would be removed to accommodate project construction. However, should any trees require removal, the proposed project
would comply with the City’s tree removal policies related to protected trees and replacing street trees. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 19 (Urban Forest Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the cited type.

Explanation: The project site is located in a heavily-urbanized community of the City of Los Angeles and does not coincide with the boundaries of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. As a result, the proposed project would not conflict with an approved conservation plan. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 8 (CDFW California Regional Conservation Plans)

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? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Standard: A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource (as identified above).

Explanation: The Celes King III Pool is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. A detailed cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, which will assess any potential impacts to significant historical resources, including the Celes King III Pool, in the project area. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

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

Explanation: A detailed cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, which will assess any potential impacts to archaeological
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resources in the project area. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> A detailed cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, which will assess any potential impacts to paleontological resources in the project area. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb interred human remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> A detailed cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, which will assess any potential impacts to human remains in the project area. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone and appropriate building practices were not followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

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

Explanation: The project site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone/Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The project site is located in a seismically active area, as is most of southern California. The Newport-Inglewood fault is the closest fault to the project site and is located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the site. Additionally, an active trace of the Newport-Inglewood fault may be within approximately 0.5-miles from the southwest portion of the project site. However, no active faults are known to cross the project site. Following demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted to a community front lawn and playground area. The proposed project does not include the construction of any habitable structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from the rupture of a known earthquake fault. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 4 (Seismic Hazard Zone Report)

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.

Explanation: As with most locations in southern California, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during an earthquake. As indicated in item 6 (a)(i) above, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, and thus the potential for hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking, such as ground surface rupture, affecting the site is considered low. Following demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted to a community lawn and playground area. The proposed project does not include the construction of any habitable structures. Therefore, the impact from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Standard: 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.

Explanation: The project site is located within a state- and City-designated liquefaction area. However, the proposed project does not propose to construct any structures that would be susceptible to liquefaction. Following the
### Issues

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

- **demolition of the Celes King III Pool**, the project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted into a community lawn and playground area. Therefore, impacts from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 4 (Seismic Hazard Zone Report), 14 (General Plan)

#### iv) Landslides?

Standard: 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.

Explanation: The project site is located in an area that is relatively flat and is not identified as a potential landslide hazard area by state or City. Additionally, the project site is not located within a City-designated hillside area or earthquake induced landslide area. The proposed project would not include the construction of any habitable structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 2 (Landslide Inventory Map), 14 (General Plan)

#### b) 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.

Explanation: The proposed project would include ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, compaction of soil, and landscaping. These activities could result in the potential for erosion to occur at the project site, though soil exposure would be temporary and short-term in nature. Prior to construction activities, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared and identify structural and non-structural Best Management Practices to be implemented during the construction phase. The SWPPP would be implemented to minimize soil erosion and runoff, and would include stabilizing and protecting disturbed areas, retaining sediment within the construction area, and use of temporary measures (i.e. silt fences, gravel bag barriers, temporary drainage inlet protection). The project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted to a community lawn and playground area following demolition of the Celes King III Pool. No large areas of exposed soil would exist that would be exposed to the effects of erosion by wind or water. The impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

#### c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Explanation: One of the major types of liquefaction induced ground failure is lateral spreading of mildly sloping ground. Lateral spreading involves primarily side-to-side movement of earth materials due to ground shaking, and is evidenced by near-vertical cracks to predominantly horizontal movement of the soil mass involved. As discussed in items 6 (a)(iii) and 6 (a)(iv), the project site is located in an area identified as being at risk for liquefaction, but is not located within a designated hillside area. All demolition and construction work would adhere to the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to liquefaction criteria. Following demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted to a community lawn and playground area. The proposed project does not include any habitable structures. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

Subsidence is the lowering of surface elevation due to changes occurring underground, such as the extraction of large amounts of groundwater, oil, or gas. When groundwater is extracted from aquifers at a rate that exceeds the rate of replenishment, overdraft occurs, which can lead to subsidence. However, the proposed project does not anticipate the extraction of any groundwater, oil, or gas from the project site. Therefore, no impacts to subsidence would occur and no further analysis is required.

Collapsible soils consist of loose dry materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Collapsible soils are prevalent throughout the southwestern United States, specifically in areas of young alluvial fans. Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events. According to a geotechnical investigation conducted for the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project, the portion of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex where the project site is located is mapped as clay and sand of pre-development marshlands. Nonetheless, the proposed project would not include the construction of any habitable structures. As such, impacts associated with on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapses would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

Reference: 12 (IS/MND for Rancho Cienega)
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</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>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project would generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions during construction or operation.
### Issues

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

**Explanation:** The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions as a result of demolition of the Celes King III Pool and grading activities. Construction-related emissions would be generated from off-road demolition equipment and on-road vehicle exhaust. The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions during operations as the proposed project is intended for passive uses. The greenhouse gases technical report prepared for the proposed project will evaluate construction-related greenhouse gas emissions impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

| Yes | No | No | No | No |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project would conflict with adopted plans, policies, or regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Explanation:** As discussed in item 7(a), the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions during demolition and grading activities. In addition to analyzing impacts related to such emissions, the EIR will also include a detailed analysis of the proposed project’s compliance with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

---

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

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

| Yes | No | No | No | No |

**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.

**Explanation:** A preliminary survey conducted for the *Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project* determined that the Celes King III Pool may contain asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead based paint (LBP). As such, a detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

Operation of the proposed project would not require routine transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials as the community front lawn and playground area would be passive uses. Therefore, project operation would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No operational impact related to hazardous materials would occur. Reference: 12 (IS/MND for Rancho Cienega)
### Issues

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

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.

Explanation: Refer to item 8 (a) above.

ACMs are materials that contain asbestos, a naturally-occurring fibrous mineral that has been mined for its useful thermal properties and tensile strength. When left intact and undisturbed, these materials do not pose a health risk to building occupants. There is, however, potential for exposure when ACMs become damaged to the extent that asbestos fibers become airborne and are inhaled. These airborne fibers are carcinogenic and can cause lung disease. The age of a building is directly related to its potential for containing elevated levels of ACMs. Asbestos was utilized routinely in many building materials until 1978.

LBP, which can result in lead poisoning when consumed or inhaled, was widely used in the past to coat and decorate buildings. Lead poisoning can cause anemia and damage to the brain and nervous system, particularly in children. Like ACMs, LBP generally does not pose a health risk to building occupants when left undisturbed; however, deterioration, damage, or disturbance could result in hazardous exposure. In 1978, the use of LBP was federally banned by the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Therefore, structures built before 1978 are likely to contain LBP, as well as those built shortly thereafter, as the phase-out of LBP was gradual. The Celes King Pool III building was constructed in the 1960s.

A preliminary survey conducted for the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project determined that the Celes King III Pool may contain ACMs and LBP. As such, a detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR. Reference: 12 (IS/MND for Rancho Cienega)

| 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.
### Issues

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

**Explanation:** There are two schools located within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site: Dorsey High School, located east of the project site at 3537 Farmdale Road, and View Park Continuation High School, also located east of the project site at 4701 Rodeo Road. In addition, a child care facility, the Ira C. Massey Child Care Center, is located directly north of the project site within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex. A preliminary survey conducted for the *Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project* determined that the Celes King III Pool may contain ACMs and LBP. As such, a detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR. Reference: 12 (IS/MND for Rancho Cienega)

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?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires various State agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized release from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells, and solid waste facilities from which there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the state Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. A significant impact may occur if the project site is included on any of the above referenced lists and, therefore, would pose an environmental hazard to surrounding sensitive uses.

**Explanation:** The project site is not 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. Although no hazardous materials sites exist on the project site, the Rancho Cienega Recreation Center is listed as a land disposal site with a completed cleanup status as of May 26, 2016. In addition, several leaking underground storage tank cleanup sites, two school investigation sites, and one cleanup site exist in the project vicinity. While unlikely, should contaminated soils be encountered during construction of the proposed project, excavated material (e.g., soil) would be monitored and tested prior to disposal. Excavated material that is deemed hazardous would be subject to strict federal, state, and local regulations for its handling, transport, and disposal. These activities would occur under the oversight of the Department of Toxic Substances Control, State Water Resources Control Board, and City of Los Angeles Fire Department. Adherence to federal, state, and local standards would minimize the risk to the public or the
environment. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 10 (EnviroStor), 11 (Geotracker), 23 (Envirolfacts)

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?

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.

Explanation: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project site is located approximately 5.3 miles east of the Santa Monica Municipal Airport and 5.6 miles northeast of the Los Angeles International Airport. Therefore, no safety hazard associated with proximity to an airport is anticipated for the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 1 (AirNav)

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?

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.

Explanation: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no safety hazard from proximity to a private airport or airstrip is anticipated from the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 1 (AirNav)

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

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.

Explanation: During construction activities, vehicles and equipment would access the project site via the entrance off Rodeo Road. No road or lane closures are anticipated during demolition and construction activities. Project activities would
beconfinedtotheprojectsitewiththeexceptionofhaultrucksanddumptrucks.
Duringconstruction,ingressandegresstothesiteandsurroundingarea,
particularelyforemergencyresponsevehicles,wouldbemaintainedatalltimes.
In
addition,operationofthe-proposedprojectwouldnotaltertheadjacentstreet
system.Therefore,constructionandoperationofthe-proposedprojectwouldnot
impairofferinterferewithimplementationofanadoptedemergencyresponseplanor
emergency evacuation plan. The impact would be less than significant, and no
further analysis is required.

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

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?

| 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. Explanation: The project site is not located within a designated High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to the City of Los Angeles General Plan. The project site and surrounding areas are completely developed and there are no wildlands adjacent to the site. Therefore, no impact related to wildland fires would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 14 (General Plan) |
|---|---|---|---|

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

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

<p>| 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. Explanation: The proposed project would not violate a water quality standard or waste discharge requirement. Demolition and construction activities, such as grading, would result in the disturbance of soil and temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion. Additionally, construction activities and equipment would require the on-site use and storage of fuels and lubricants. Storm events occurring during the construction phase would have the potential to carry disturbed sediments and spilled substances from construction activities off-site to nearby receiving waters. However, BOE or its contractor would prepare a SWPPP prior to construction that would identify standard Best Management Practices to control runoff from the project site. Therefore, impacts on water quality from construction |
|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>activities would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the proposed project, storm flows would be directed to the existing municipal storm drain system. There would be no exposed soil remaining at the completion of landscaping activities; therefore, there would be no potential for soil erosion or contamination. No long-term impact to water quality would occur during project operations.

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)?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

Explanation: The proposed project includes the demolition of the Celes King III Pool and installation of a community front lawn and playground area following demolition activities. The proposed project would not require excavation that would encounter groundwater or affect the rate of groundwater recharge, or involve the extraction of groundwater. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

Explanation: There are no streams or rivers located nearby that would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would be located within previously developed and disturbed areas. Construction activities would temporarily increase the potential for erosion due to excavation. However, the proposed project would implement standard Best Management Practices that would minimize impacts.
Issues

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

- Construction of the proposed Project would include installation of storm water and drainage infrastructure in the playground area. However, all drainage flows, including storm water that would infiltrate directly into the soil in the community lawn area, would be routed through on-site storm water facilities which would connect to the existing storm water infrastructure. As such, operation of the proposed project would not result in alteration of the existing drainage pattern that would result in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation. Impacts associated with altering the existing drainage pattern of the site would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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.

Explanation: As discussed in item 9 (a), there are no streams or rivers located nearby that would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would be located within previously developed and disturbed areas. Construction activities would temporarily increase the potential for erosion due to excavation. However, the proposed project would implement standard Best Management Practices that would minimize impacts during construction. Construction of the proposed Project would include installation of storm water and drainage infrastructure in the community lawn area. However, all drainage flows would be routed through the on-site storm water facilities which would connect to the existing storm water infrastructure. As such, operation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase alteration of the existing drainage pattern that would result in on- or off-site flooding. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Explanation:** Prior to demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the existing pool would be drained into the existing sewer system. Demolition and construction water needs would generate minimal quantities of discharge water, which would drain into storm drains located within or adjacent to the project site. As discussed in item 9(c), following the demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the proposed project would install storm water and drainage infrastructure in the community lawn area, which would connect to existing storm water infrastructure. During operation, the proposed project would result in a decreased amount of impervious surfaces as the project site would contain a landscaped area. The landscaped area would require routine watering, similar to other landscaped areas within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute runoff water exceeding the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. As discussed, Best Management Practices would be implemented to control runoff from the project site during the construction phase. The impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project included potential sources of water pollutants and potential to substantially degrade water quality.

**Explanation:** Other than the construction sources of pollutants described previously (i.e., fuels from construction equipment, etc.), the proposed project would not include other potential sources of contaminants that could degrade water quality. Additionally, as discussed in above, standard Best Management Practices would be implemented to control runoff from the project site during construction to prevent the degradation of water quality. Therefore, impacts to water quality would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project placed housing within a 100-year flood zone.

Explanation: No 100-year flood zones coincide with the project site. According to Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 06037C1615F, the entire project site is located within an area designated as Zone X, which is categorized as an area that is within a 500-year flood zone. Notwithstanding, the proposed project does not include construction of housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood zone. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 21 (FEMA)

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

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.

Explanation: As noted in item 9 (g) above, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project includes the demolition of the Celes King III Pool and installation of a community front lawn and playground area following demolition activities. As such, no structures would be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area as part of the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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?

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.

Explanation: According to the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element, the project site is located within the potential inundation area of the Hollywood Reservoir and the Silver Lake Reservoir. The inundation area is based on an assumed catastrophic failure of dams during peak storage capacity. The inundation boundary shown on the map encompasses all probable routes that a flood might follow after exiting a dam; thus, the map shows a very large and conservative inundation area. However, all dams are continually monitored by various governmental agencies (such as the State of California Division of Safety of Dams and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to guard against the threat of dam failure. Catastrophic failure of a major dam as a result of an earthquake is regarded as unlikely. Current design and construction practices and ongoing review, modification, and dam reconstruction programs are intended to ensure that
all dams are capable of withstanding the maximum magnitude earthquake for the site. Therefore, the potential for the project site to be inundated as a result of a dam failure, and potential exposure of people and structures to flooding due to dam failure, is low. Impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, the proposed project would not construct any habitable structures that would be vulnerable to flooding or inundation in the event of a dam break, and would not impede or redirect flood flows in the project area. In the event of an emergency, the City has adopted emergency evacuation procedures that would be implemented in the case of a dam break. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death related to flooding or dam inundation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 14 (General Plan)

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area with inundation potential due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Explanation: Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. The project site is not located near an enclosed large body of water that could experience seiches during an earthquake. Thus, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

Tsunamis are tidal waves generated in large bodies of water caused by fault displacement or major ground movement. Hazardous tsunamis, which are rare along the Los Angeles coastline, have the potential to cause flooding in the low-lying coastal area. The project site is located approximately 7.2 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not located within a tsunami hazard area. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

As discussed in item 6 (a)(iv), the project site is not located within a City-designated hillside area and would not be subject to a landslide. Therefore, no impact associated with inundation from mudflow would occur, and no further analysis is required.
### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

#### 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.

Explanation: The proposed project is located within the existing Rancho Cienega Sports Complex in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community of the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool, cover the project site with landscaping, and convert the area to a playground area. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would include features such as a highway, above-ground infrastructure, or an easement that would cause a permanent disruption to an established community or would otherwise create a physical barrier within an established community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

#### 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.

Explanation: The project site is located entirely within the City of Los Angeles in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area. The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan is one of 35 community plans that comprise the land use element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. The community plan establishes the goals, objectives, policies, and programs applicable to the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area.

The City’s current zoning designation for the project site is OS-1XL (Open Space). The site is designated as Open Space by the General Plan. No new land uses would be introduced at the project site. Following demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be landscaped and converted to a community lawn and playground area. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning or General Plan designations for the project site. No impact would
The proposed project is also consistent with the goals and policies set forth in the City’s community plan. The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan advocates improving the utilization and development of recreational facilities at existing parks as well as accommodating active parklands. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with land use plans and policies contained in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan. Accordingly, no impacts to applicable land use plans would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 16 (Community Plan)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Explanation: As previously discussed in item 4 (d), the project site is not located in a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan area. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an approved conservation plan. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Explanation: No mineral resources are identified within the project site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 3 (California Department of Conservation Mineral Lands Classification)
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</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 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.

**Explanation:** No mineral resources are identified within the project site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required and the EIR will include a brief discussion of this issue. Reference: 14 (General Plan)

### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</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 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.

**Explanation:** The proposed project may generate increased noise levels during demolition and grading activities. A technical noise analysis will be prepared for the proposed project that will assess the potential for short-term increases in noise levels and any associated impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</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 project were to expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

**Explanation:** Construction activities associated with the proposed project may generate groundborne vibration from the use of heavy equipment. The technical noise analysis prepared for the proposed project will evaluate the potential for groundborne noise and vibration, as well as any associated impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

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

**Standard:** No significant impact may occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Refer to item 12 (a) above. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Refer to item 12 (a) above. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project site were located within two miles of an airport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The project site is located approximately 5.3 miles east of the Santa Monica Municipal Airport and 5.6 miles northeast of the Los Angeles International Airport. Due to the distance from the nearest airport, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the project area to excessive noise. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 1 (AirNav)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project site were located within two miles of a private airstrip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation: The project site is not located near a private airstrip. The closest private airstrip, the Goodyear Blimp Base Airport, is located approximately 12.1 miles south of the project site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 1 (AirNav)

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.

Explanation: The proposed project would demolish an existing building and convert the area to a community lawn and playground area. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth because it does not include a residential or commercial element. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project would result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing.

Explanation: The project site does not contain any housing or residential uses. As such, no housing would be displaced or changed as a result of the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project would result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing.

Explanation: No housing currently exists on the project site and the proposed project would not displace any population. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.
### 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significantly With Mitigation</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.

Explanation: The proposed project does not include new housing or non-residential development that would substantially increase the residential or employee populations in the area; thus, the demand for fire protection services would not substantially increase. The proposed project would demolish the Celes King III Pool in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code. As such, the proposed project would not increase fire hazards or substantially increase the demand for fire protection services. Therefore, no impact to fire protection services would occur, and no further analysis is required.

| 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.

Explanation: As previously stated in item 14 (a)(i), the proposed project would not directly result in an increase in residential populations or a substantial increase in employee populations. During demolition activities, BOE would implement standard site security features, such as fencing, to secure the project site. Following the demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be graded, landscaped, and converted to a playground area and is not expected to generate additional calls for police protection service as the project site would be a passive use. As such, implementation and operation of the proposed project would not increase the need for additional police protection services or adversely affect service ratios or response times. No impact to police protection services would occur, and no further analysis is required.
### Issues

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

#### 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.

**Explanation:** The proposed project would not induce employment or population growth, either directly or indirectly, and would therefore not increase the demand for schools in the area. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

#### 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.

**Explanation:** The project site is currently developed with an indoor pool. The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a community front lawn and playground facilities. As previously discussed, the construction of the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and therefore, would not increase the demand for recreation in the area. In addition, the approved *Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project* would construct a new indoor pool facility. There are three additional indoor pools located within a five-mile radius of the project site, including Laces Aquatic Center, Eleanor Green Robert Aquatic Center, and LA84 Foundation/John C. Argue Swim Stadium. Therefore, no impacts to parks would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 20 (LARAP)

#### 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.

**Explanation:** Construction and operation of the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the demand for or use of libraries or other public facilities in the area. Therefore, no impact to other public facilities would occur, and no further analysis is required.
### 15. RECREATION –

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

**Explanation:** The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool. As previously discussed, the approved *Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project* would construct a new indoor pool facility, and there are three indoor pools located within a five-mile radius of the project site, including Laces Aquatic Center, Eleanor Green Robert Aquatic Center, and LA84 Foundation/John C. Argue Swim Stadium. The demand for parks and recreational facilities is generally associated with an increase in housing or population. Construction workers would be drawn from the existing workforce in the region. As such, construction of the proposed project would not generate new permanent residents that would substantially increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities. Following demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the project site would be landscaped and be a passive use. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the demand for parks or other recreational facilities in the area. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is required.

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project includes the construction or expansion of park facilities and such construction would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

**Explanation:** The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a community front lawn and playground facilities. Current playground facilities at the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex are planned to be demolished as part of the *Rancho Cienega Sports Complex Project* due to the age and dilapidated state of the playground. Therefore, the proposed project would improve the recreational services available within the local community by providing a new playground facility. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.
### Issues

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

#### 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- | | | | |**X** |

**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.

**Explanation:** The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a community lawn and playground area. Traffic may be affected temporarily due to construction activities. A traffic study will be prepared for the proposed project, including an analysis of construction traffic impacts. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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?

- | | | | |**X** |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes a conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

**Explanation:** The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a playground area with landscaping. Project-related traffic impacts may potentially occur during construction activities only. The County of Los Angeles Congestion Management Program level of significance thresholds are not intended to be applied to construction activities. No traffic impacts are anticipated to occur during project operation due to the passive nature of the project. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.

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?

- | | | | |**X** |

**Explanation:**
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Submits for Decision: 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is located approximately 5.3 miles east of the Santa Monica Municipal Airport and 5.6 miles northeast of the Los Angeles International Airport. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would affect air traffic patterns. No impact to air traffic patterns would occur, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project substantially increased road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is located entirely within the existing site of the Celes King III Pool at the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex. The proposed project would demolish the existing Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a playground area with landscaping. No roads would be constructed as part of the proposed project and the proposed project would be consistent with the existing land use. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards to a design feature or have any incompatible uses. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate emergency access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Rodeo Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard have been designated as “selected disaster routes” in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element. However, construction of the proposed project would occur completely within the boundaries of the project site located within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex. No road or lane closures are anticipated during demolition and construction activities. During construction, ingress and egress to the site and surrounding area, particularly for emergency response vehicles, would be maintained at all times. In addition, operation of the proposed project would not alter the adjacent street system. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect emergency access or result in inadequate emergency access. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 14 (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site lies entirely within the boundaries of the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex. The existing sidewalk fronting the project site along Rodeo Road and any bus stops would remain accessible during and after construction in order to ensure safe pedestrian travel and convenient transit access. As such, no impact to alternative transportation modes or supporting programs would occur, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or?

   Standard: A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a tribal resource (as identified above).

   Explanation: A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the proposed project, which will identify any significant tribal cultural resources in the project area, and will assess any potential impacts to such resources. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

   Standard: A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a tribal resource (as identified above).

   Explanation: A cultural resources technical report will be prepared for the
potentially significant impact
less than significant with mitigation
less than significant
no impact

proposed project, which will identify any significant tribal cultural resources in the project area, and will assess any potential impacts to such resources. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</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>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the local regulatory governing agency.

Explanation: The proposed project would demolish the Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a community front lawn and playground area. Wastewater generated by project-related construction and operation activities would be collected and transported through existing local, trunk, and mainline sewers. The quality of wastewater from the proposed project is expected to be typical and would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</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>

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

Explanation: The proposed project would demolish the Celes King III Pool and convert the area to a community front lawn and playground area, which would require water supply and generate wastewater. Prior to demolition of the Celes King III Pool, the existing pool would be drained. Following demolition and construction activities, the proposed project would require and generate a nominal amount of water and wastewater for landscaping. As such, the proposed project is not expected to require or result in the construction of new or expansion of existing water or wastewater facilities. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The proposed project would include the installation of new stormwater and drainage infrastructure for the landscaped area. However, these improvements would not result in the need for new or expanded storm drain facilities elsewhere in the system that could result in significant impacts, as the project site currently includes drainage facilities, and the entire project site is limited in size. Therefore, the construction and operation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to the storm drain system, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project’s water demands would exceed the existing water supplies that serve the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power provides potable water to the project area. The proposed project would require a nominal amount of water for construction activities and for landscaping during operation of the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> Refer to items 18 (a) and 18 (b) above. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: 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.

Explanation: During construction, solid waste would be generated from demolition of the existing Celes King III Pool and from general construction debris. The proposed project would haul away approximately 14,000 cubic yards of demolition debris. There are no City-owned landfills currently in operation; therefore, waste from the proposed project would be hauled to private or County-operated landfills. The City standard for public works requires demolition debris to be recycled where feasible. Following construction, the project would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required. Reference: 9 (CalRecycle), 18 (LASAN)

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

Standard: 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.

Explanation: The proposed project would be demolished, constructed, and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and formally adopted City standards regarding solid waste disposal. The impact would be less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

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? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Explanation: As discussed in item 4, Biological Resources, of the Environmental Screening Checklist, impacts are less than significant. However, the proposed
project has the potential to impact historical resources, as discussed in item 5, Cultural Resources. As such, potential impacts related to cultural resources will be evaluated in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation: The EIR will contain an analysis of potential cumulatively considerable impacts associated with the proposed project. A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

Explanation: A detailed analysis of this issue will be included in the EIR.

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

Explanation: The proposed project could potentially result in environmental effects that may cause adverse effects on human beings with regard to the following environmental areas discussed in this Initial Study: air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and transportation and traffic. A detailed analysis of these issues will be included in the EIR.
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Notice of Preparation

June 21, 2018

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project
SCH# 2018061048

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

James R Tebbetts
City of Los Angeles
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, MS 939
Los Angeles, CA 90015

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
SCH# 2018061048
Project Title Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project
Lead Agency Los Angeles, City of

Type NOP Notice of Preparation
Description The proposed Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project would demolish the Celes King III Indoor Pool building and pool and convert the site into a community front lawn and playground area. The Celes King III Pool is located within the Rancho Cienega Sports Complex in Los Angeles, CA, in Council District 10.
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Name James R Tebbetts
Agency City of Los Angeles
Phone (213) 978-1332
Fax
email
Address 1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, MS 939
City Los Angeles
State CA Zip 90015

Project Location
County Los Angeles
City Los Angeles, City of
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Cross Streets 5001 Rodeo Rd
Lat / Long
Parcel No.
Township
Range
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Proximity to:
Highways I-405, 10
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Railways LA METRO
Waterways
Schools Dorsey HS
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Project Issues Air Quality; Tribal Cultural Resources; Other Issues; Toxic/Hazardous; Noise; Traffic/Circulation

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Resources, Recycling and Recovery; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water, District 4; Caltrans, District 7; Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4

Date Received 06/21/2018 Start of Review 06/21/2018 End of Review 07/20/2018

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Resources Agency

- Fish & Wildlife Region 4
  - Julie Vance
- Fish & Wildlife Region 5
  - Leslie Newton-Reed
  - Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Wildlife Region 6
  - Tiffany Ellis
  - Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Wildlife Region 6 I/M
  - Heidi Calvert
  - Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program
- Dept. of Fish & Wildlife M
  - William Pazenkas
  - Marine Region

Other Departments

- California Department of Education
  - Lesley Taylor
- OES (Office of Emergency Services)
  - Monique Wilber
- Food & Agriculture
  - Sandra Schubert
  - Dept. of Food and Agriculture
- Dept. of General Services
  - Cathy Buck
  - Environmental Services Section
- Housing & Comm. Dev.
  - CECOA Coordinator
  - Housing Policy Division

Independent Commissions, Boards

- Delta Protection Commission
  - Erik Vink
- Delta Stewardship Council
  - Anthony Navasero
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  - Eric Knight
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- Native American Heritage Comm.
  - Debbie Treadway
- Public Utilities Commission Supervisor
- Santa Monica Bay Restoration
  - Guanyu Wang
- State Lands Commission
  - Jennifer Deleong
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
  - Cherry Jacques

Cal EPA

- Air Resources Board
  - Jack Wursten
    - Transportation Projects
    - Nesamani Kalandiyur
    - Industrial/Energy Projects
    - Mike Tollstrup
    - California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery
      - Kevin Taylor/Jeff Esquivel
- State Water Resources Control Board
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- State Water Resources Control Board
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- State Water Resources Control Board
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- Department of Pesticide Regulation
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Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
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- RWQCB 2
  - Environmental Document Coordinator
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- RWQCB 3
  - Central Coast Region (3)
- RWQCB 4
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- RWQCB 5S
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- RWQCB 5F
  - Central Valley Region (5)
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- RWQCB 5R
  - Central Valley Region (5)
    - Redding Branch Office
- RWQCB 6
  - Lahontan Region (6)
- RWQCB 6V
  - Lahontan Region (6)
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- RWQCB 7
  - Colorado River Basin Region (7)
- RWQCB 8
  - Santa Ana Region (8)
- RWQCB 9
  - San Diego Region (9)

Other
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Last Updated 5/22/18
June 28, 2018

James R. Tebbetts
City of Los Angeles
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, MS 939
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Also sent via e-mail: james.tebetts@lacity.org

RE: SCH# 2018061048, Rancho Cienega Celes king III Pool Demolition Project, City of Los Angeles; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Mr. Tebbetts:

The Native American Heritage Commission has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for Draft Environmental Impact Report for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd. (a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources” (Pub. Resources Code § 21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2). Please reference California Natural Resources Agency (2016) “Final Text for tribal cultural resources update to Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form,” http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/ab52/Clean-final-AB-52-App-G-text-Submitted.pdf. Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC’s recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.
AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. **Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project:** Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A “California Native American tribe” is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21073).

2. **Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report:** A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, “consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)).

3. **Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe:** The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

4. **Discretionary Topics of Consultation:** The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project’s impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

5. **Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process:** With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. **Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document:** If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)).
7. **Conclusion of Consultation:** Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
   b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)).

8. **Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)).

9. **Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)).

10. **Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
   a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
      i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
      ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
   b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
      i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
      ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
      iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
   c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
   d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code § 21084.3 (b)).
   e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).
   f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

11. **Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An environmental impact report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
   a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
   b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
   c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)).

   *This process should be documented in the Cultural Resources section of your environmental document.*

The NAHC’s PowerPoint presentation titled, “Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices” may be found online at: [http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf](http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf)
SB 18 applies to local governments and requires **local governments** to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code § 65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s “Tribal Consultation Guidelines,” which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18’s provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation**: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a “Tribal Consultation List.” If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation**. There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. **Confidentiality**: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city's or county’s jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation**: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and “Sacred Lands File” searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

**NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments**

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. **Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center** (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
   a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project’s APE.
   b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Please contact me if you need any additional information at gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Gayle Totton
Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
(916) 373-3714

cc: State Clearinghouse
7/5/18

James R Tebbetts  
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Mail Stop 939  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

SUBJECT: PROJECT NAME: Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition  
PROJECT LOCATION: 5001 Rodeo Road, Los Angeles, CA 90016

Presented below are comments submitted on behalf of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) regarding the notice of preparation for the subject project. Due to the fact that Dorsey High School is located adjacent to the proposed project site, LAUSD is concerned about the potential negative impacts of the project to our students, staff and parents traveling to and from the referenced campus.

Based on the extent/location of the proposed development, it is our opinion that significant environmental impacts on the surrounding community (air quality, noise, traffic, pedestrian safety, etc.) will occur. Since the project will have a significant impact on LAUSD schools, mitigation measures designed to help reduce or eliminate such impacts are included in this response.

Air Quality

District students and school staff should be considered sensitive receptors to air pollution impacts. Construction activities for the proposed project would result in short term impacts on ambient air quality in the area resulting from equipment emissions and fugitive dust. To ensure that effective mitigation is applied to reduce construction air pollutant impacts on the school, we ask that the following language be included as a mitigation measure for air quality impacts:

- If the proposed mitigation measures do not reduce air quality impacts to a level of insignificance, the project applicant shall develop new and appropriate measures to effectively mitigate construction related air emissions at the affected schools. Provisions shall be made to allow the school and or designated representative(s) to notify the project applicant when such measures are warranted.

Noise

Noise created by construction activities may affect the school in proximity to the proposed project site. These construction activities include grading, earth moving, hauling, and use of heavy equipment. The California Environmental Quality Act requires that such impacts be quantified, and eliminated or reduced to a level of insignificance.

LAUSD established maximum allowable noise levels to protect students and staff from noise impacts generated in terms of Leq. These standards were established based on regulations set forth by the California Department of Transportation and the City of Los Angeles. LAUSD’s exterior noise standard is 67 dBA Leq and the interior noise standard is 45 dBA Leq. A noise level increase of 3 dBA or more over ambient noise levels is considered significant for existing schools and would require mitigation to achieve levels within 2 dBA of pre-project ambient level. To ensure that effective mitigations are employed to reduce
construction related noise impacts on District sites, we ask that the following language be included in the mitigation measures for noise impacts:

- If the proposed mitigation measures do not reduce noise impacts to a level of insignificance, the project applicant shall develop new and appropriate measures to effectively mitigate construction related noise at the affected school. Provisions shall be made to allow the school and or designated representative(s) to notify the project applicant when such measures are warranted.

Traffic/Transportation
LAUSD’s Transportation Branch must be contacted at (213) 580-2950 regarding the potential impact upon existing school bus routes. The Project Manager or designee will have to notify the LAUSD Transportation Branch of the expected start and ending dates for various portions of the project that may affect traffic within nearby school areas. To ensure that effective mitigations are employed to reduce construction and operation related transportation impacts on District sites, we ask that the following language be included in the mitigation measures for traffic impacts:

- School buses must have unrestricted access to schools.
- During the construction phase, truck traffic and construction vehicles may not cause traffic delays for our transported students.
- During and after construction changed traffic patterns, lane adjustment, traffic light patterns, and altered bus stops may not affect school buses’ on-time performance and passenger safety.
- Construction trucks and other vehicles are required to stop when encountering school buses using red-flashing-lights must-stop-indicators per the California Vehicle Code.
- Contractors must install and maintain appropriate traffic controls (signs and signals) to ensure vehicular safety.
- Contractors must maintain ongoing communication with LAUSD school administrators, providing sufficient notice to forewarn children and parents when existing pedestrian routes to school may be impacted.
- Parents dropping off their children must have access to the passenger loading areas.

Pedestrian Safety
Construction activities that include street closures, the presence of heavy equipment and increased truck trips to haul materials on and off the project site can lead to safety hazards for people walking in the vicinity of the construction site. To ensure that effective mitigations are employed to reduce construction and operation related pedestrian safety impacts on District sites, we ask that the following language be included in the mitigation measures for pedestrian safety impacts:

- Contractors must maintain ongoing communication with LAUSD school administrators, providing sufficient notice to forewarn children and parents when existing pedestrian routes to school may be impacted.
- Contractors must maintain safe and convenient pedestrian routes to all nearby schools. The District will provide School Pedestrian Route Maps upon your request.
• Contractors must install and maintain appropriate traffic controls (signs and signals) to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety.

• Haul routes are not to pass by any school, except when school is not in session.

• No staging or parking of construction-related vehicles, including worker-transport vehicles, will occur on or adjacent to a school property.

• Funding for crossing guards at the contractor’s expense is required when safety of children may be compromised by construction-related activities at impacted school crossings.

• Barriers and/or fencing must be installed to secure construction equipment and to minimize trespassing, vandalism, short-cut attractions, and attractive nuisances.

• Contractors are required to provide security patrols (at their expense) to minimize trespassing, vandalism, and short-cut attractions.

The District’s charge is to protect the health and safety of students and staff, and the integrity of the learning environment. The comments presented above identify potential environmental impacts related to the proposed project that must be addressed to ensure the welfare of the students attending Dorsey High School, their teachers and the staff, as well as to assuage the concerns of the parents of these students. Therefore, the measures set forth in these comments should be adopted as conditions of project approval to offset unmitigated impacts on the affected school students and staff.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you need additional information please contact me at (213) 241-4674.

Regards,

Cinah Daqiq
Environmental Specialist/Research Associate
Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition Project

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. SCAQMD staff’s comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the project that should be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Please send SCAQMD a copy of the DEIR upon its completion. Note that copies of the DEIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the DEIR directly to SCAQMD at the address shown in the letterhead. In addition, please send with the DEIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files1. These include emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling input and output files (not PDF files). Without all files and supporting documentation, SCAQMD staff will be unable to complete our review of the air quality analyses in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.

Air Quality Analysis
SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. SCAQMD recommends that the lead agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from SCAQMD’s Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. More guidance developed since this Handbook is also available on SCAQMD’s website at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993). SCAQMD staff also recommends that the lead agency use the CalEEMod land use emissions software. This software has recently been updated to incorporate up-to-date state and locally approved emission factors and methodologies for estimating pollutant emissions from typical land use development. CalEEMod is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and replaces the now outdated URBEMIS. This model is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.

SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. SCAQMD staff requests that the lead agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to SCAQMD’s

---

1 Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15174, the information contained in an DEIR shall include summarized technical data, maps, plot plans, diagrams, and similar relevant information sufficient to permit full assessment of significant environmental impacts by reviewing agencies and members of the public. Placement of highly technical and specialized analysis and data in the body of an DEIR should be avoided through inclusion of supporting information and analyses as appendices to the main body of the DEIR. Appendices to the DEIR may be prepared in volumes separate from the basic DEIR document, but shall be readily available for public examination and shall be submitted to all clearinghouses which assist in public review.
CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds to determine air quality impacts. SCAQMD’s CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds can be found here: [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf). In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts, SCAQMD staff recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LSTs can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized analysis by either using the LSTs developed by SCAQMD staff or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds.pdf).

The lead agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, such as sources that generate or attract vehicular trips, should be included in the analysis.

In the event that the project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment (“Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis”) can be found at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/mobile-source-toxics-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/mobile-source-toxics-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis.pdf). An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses (such as placing homes near freeways) can be found in the California Air Resources Board’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective, which can be found at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf). CARB’s Land Use Handbook is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process. Guidance on strategies to reduce air pollution exposure near high-volume roadways can be found at: [https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/rd_technical_advisory_final.PDF](https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/rd_technical_advisory_final.PDF).

**Mitigation Measures**

In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize these impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed. Several resources are available to assist the lead agency with identifying potential mitigation measures for the project, including:

---

2 In April 2017, CARB published a technical advisory, *Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways: Technical Advisory*, to supplement CARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. This technical advisory is intended to provide information on strategies to reduce exposures to traffic emissions near high-volume roadways to assist land use planning and decision-making in order to protect public health and promote equity and environmental justice. The technical advisory is available at: [https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm](https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm).
Alternatives
In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires the consideration and discussion of alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant effects of the project. The discussion of a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives, including a “no project” alternative, is intended to foster informed decision-making and public participation. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), the DEIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the project.

Permits
In the event that the project requires a permit from SCAQMD, SCAQMD should be identified as a responsible agency for the project. For more information on permits, please visit SCAQMD webpage at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/permits. Questions on permits can be directed to SCAQMD’s Engineering and Permitting staff at (909) 396-3385.

Data Sources
SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling SCAQMD’s Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available at SCAQMD’s webpage at: http://www.aqmd.gov.

SCAQMD staff is available to work with the lead agency to ensure that project air quality impacts are accurately evaluated and any significant impacts are mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Robert Dalbeck, Assistant Air Quality Specialist, at rdalbeck@aqmd.gov or call (909) 396-2139.

Sincerely,

Daniel Garcia
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources
Good afternoon,

I have returned from summer break. I read the copy of the response. You have addressed the schools greatest concern which is heavy truck and equipment parking, and pedestrian safety. Thank you for forwarding me the communication.

Regards,

Dr. Sean Gaston, Principal
Susan Miller Dorsey Senior High School

A First Choice School Offering A First Class Education

From: Daqiq, Cinah
Sent: Thursday, July 5, 2018 12:12:50 PM
To: james.tebbetts@lacity.org
Cc: Gaston, Sean; GODEK, GWENN
Subject: Comments Regarding NOP for Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition

Hello,

Please see LAUSD’s comment letter (attached) regarding the Rancho Cienega Celes King III Pool Demolition.

Thank you,

Cinah Daqiq
Environmental Specialist/Research Associate
LAUSD | Office of Environmental Health & Safety

Contract Professional

333 S. Beaudry Ave., 21st Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.241.4674 office
925.324.5922 mobile
cp-cinah.daqiq@lausd.net