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Chapter 1

Introduction

The City of Los Angeles (City) Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) has prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP)/Initial Study (IS) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of The Boring Company's (TBC) proposed Dugout Loop High Speed Transportation Project (Project) or "The Dugout," which is located within the City’s Echo Park, Elysian Park, Silver Lake, Rampart Village, East Hollywood, and Los Feliz neighborhoods. As part of the permitting process for LABOE, the proposed Project is required to undergo an environmental review process pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

One of the main objectives of CEQA is to disclose the potential environmental effects of proposed activities to the public and decision-makers. Under CEQA, LABOE as the Lead Agency has prepared an IS and determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is needed. CEQA requires that the potential environmental effects of a project be evaluated prior to implementation. This IS includes a discussion on the proposed Project's effects on the existing environment and identifies which potential impacts and environmental resource areas will be studied further and presented in the Draft EIR.

Authority

CEQA was enacted in 1970 and is codified in the California Public Resources Code (PRC) (Sections 21000 et seq.). The CEQA statute contains detailed rules governing the content of environmental documents and the environmental review process by State and local agencies. It also provides decision-makers and the public with information regarding environmental effects of a proposed project; identifying means of avoiding environmental damage; and disclosing to the public the reasons behind a project's approval even if it leads to environmental impacts. LABOE has determined the proposed Project is subject to CEQA, and no exemptions apply.

This IS has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 15000 et seq.).
Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies

LABOE is the Lead Agency for the proposed Project, pursuant to Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines, because it has the greatest degree of discretion to approve or deny the proposed Project. Approvals of permits include, but are not limited to, final design of public facilities and construction contracts.

In addition to the Lead Agency, several other agencies have special roles with respect to the proposed Project as responsible or trustee agencies. These agencies will use the EIR once it is prepared as the basis for their decisions to issue any approvals and/or permits that may be required. Permits and approvals noted in Table 1 are anticipated to be required to implement the proposed Project.

Scope of the Initial Study

This IS evaluates the proposed Project’s effects on the following resource areas:

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

Impact Terminology

The following terminology is used to describe each impact’s level of significance:

**Potentially Significant Impact.** This category is only applicable if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant, and no feasible mitigation measures can be identified to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Less than Significant After Mitigation Incorporated.** This category applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measure(s), and briefly explain how it would reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
Less than Significant Impact. This category is identified when a proposed project would result in impacts below the threshold of significance, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact. This category applies when a proposed project would not create an impact in the specific environmental issue area. “No Impact” answers do not require a detailed explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the Lead Agency, which show that the impact does not apply to the specific project (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., a proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

LABOE and other public agencies have identified applicable “thresholds of significance” for certain types of environmental impacts, such as traffic, noise, and air quality impacts. Thresholds of significance for the proposed Project are based on the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide (2006) and are identified in this IS where applicable.

Document Format

This IS contains seven sections:

Chapter 1. Introduction. This section provides an overview of the proposed Project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Chapter 2. Project Description. This section provides a detailed description of the proposed Project objectives and components.

Chapter 3. Initial Study Environmental Checklist. This section presents the CEQA checklist for all impact areas and mandatory findings of significance.

Chapter 4. Impacts and Mitigation Measures. This section provides a detailed description of the proposed Project impacts and mitigation measures.

Chapter 5. References. This section provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of the IS.

Chapter 6. Preparers and Contributors. This section provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of the IS.

Chapter 7. Acronyms and Abbreviations. This section provides a list of acronyms and abbreviations used throughout the IS.
CEQA Process & Availability of the Initial Study

**EIR Process Overview**

The CEQA process is initiated when the Lead Agency identifies a proposed project. The Lead Agency then normally prepares an IS to identify the preliminary environmental impacts of the proposed Project. This IS has determined that the proposed Project could have significant environmental impacts that would require further study and the need to implement mitigation measures. Therefore, the Lead Agency has decided to prepare an EIR. A NOP is prepared to notify public agencies and the general public that the Lead Agency is starting the preparation of an EIR for the proposed Project. The NOP and IS are circulated for a 30-day review and comment period. During this review period, the Lead Agency requests comments from agencies, interested parties, stakeholders, and the general public on the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR.

After the close of the 30-day review and comment period, the Lead Agency continues the preparation of the Draft EIR and associated technical studies (if any). Once the Draft EIR is complete, a Notice of Availability (NOA) is prepared to inform agencies and the general public of the document and the locations where the document can be reviewed. The Draft EIR and NOA are circulated for a 45-day review and comment period to provide agencies and the general public an opportunity to review and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project.

After the close of the 45-day review and comment period, responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR are prepared. The Lead Agency prepares a Final EIR, which incorporates the Draft EIR or a revision to the Draft EIR, Draft EIR comments and list of commenters, and a response to comments discussion. In addition, the Lead Agency must prepare the findings of fact for each significant effect identified, a statement of overriding considerations if there are significant impacts that cannot be mitigated, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) and/or a mitigation monitoring program (MMP) to ensure that all proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

The Board of Public Works will consider the Final EIR and make a recommendation to the Los Angeles City Council, as the governing body of the City of Los Angeles, regarding certification of
the Final EIR and approval of the proposed Project. The City Council may certify and approve the Final EIR or may choose to not approve the proposed Project.

During the environmental review and project approval process, individuals, public agencies, and organizations may address the Board of Public Works and City Council regarding the proposed Project. Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Public Works is available here:

http://bpw.lacity.org/Agendas.html

City Council agenda items are posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The City Council agenda can be obtained by visiting the City Council:

City Hall
200 North Spring Street
John Ferraro Council Chamber, Room 340
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Alternatively, agendas can also be accessed via the internet at the following location:


Within five days of project approval, the LABOE will file a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the County Clerk. The NOD will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the CEQA approval by the Lead Agency. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the proposed Project and to issues that were presented to the Lead Agency by any person in writing during the public review and comment periods regarding the EIR.

**Availability of the Initial Study**

In accordance with the CEQA statutes and Guidelines, the IS is being circulated for a minimum of 30 days for public review and comment. The public review period for this IS will begin on August 16, 2018 and will conclude on September 17, 2018. The IS or a notice where the IS can be downloaded online or reviewed has been distributed to public agencies, organizations, neighbors, and other interested parties for review and comment. The IS is available for public review at the following locations:

- Chinatown Branch Library, 639 N Hill St, Los Angeles, CA 90012
- Echo Park Branch Library, 1410 W Temple St, Los Angeles, CA 90026
- Edendale Branch Library, 2011 Sunset Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90026
- Silver Lake Branch Library, 2411 Glendale Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90039
- Felipe De Neve Branch Library, 2820 W 6th St, Los Angeles, CA 90057
- Cahuenga Branch Library, 4591 Santa Monica Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90029
- Los Feliz Branch Library, 1874 Hillhurst Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90027

In addition, the IS is available online at:

http://eng.lacity.org/dugout-loop
Approximately 2,300 notices were sent to adjacent landowners, community residents, stakeholders, and local agencies about the availability of the IS and the opportunity to attend a public meeting to learn more about the proposed Project and provide comments on the IS.

**Scoping Meeting**

A public scoping meeting will be held to obtain input on the IS and the scope and contents of the EIR:

August 28, 2018, 6:15 pm – 9:00 pm  
Dodger Stadium  
1000 Vin Scully Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Free parking will be available. Upon arrival, please use the Left Field Plaza entrance. Food and drinks will be available for purchase. Written public comments will be accepted at the meeting. Speaker cards will also be available on a first come, first serve basis. The public comment period during the meeting will be limited to two hours and end promptly at 9:00 pm. Each speaker will receive approximately two minutes to provide a comment.

During the scoping period, the public has the opportunity to provide written comments on the information contained within this IS or provide comments at a public meeting. Comments on the IS and responses to comments will be included in the record and considered by LABOE during preparation of the EIR.

In reviewing the IS, responsible and trustee agencies and interested members of the public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing potential project impacts on the environment, and ways in which the potential significant effects of the proposed Project could be avoided or mitigated. Comments on the IS should be submitted in writing by **September 17, 2018**. Please submit written comments to:

Dr. Jan Green Rebstock, Environmental Supervisor II  
Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group  
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600, Mail Stop 939  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Written comments may also be sent via email to jan.green.rebstock@lacity.org. Comments sent via email should include the project title (Dugout Loop High Speed Transportation Project) in the subject line and a valid mailing address in the email.

If you have any questions regarding the environmental review process for the proposed Project, please contact:

Dr. Jan Green Rebstock, Environmental Supervisor II  
Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering  
213.485.5761  
Jan.Green.Rebstock@lacity.org
Chapter 2
Project Description

Introduction

The Boring Company (TBC) is proposing the construction of the Dugout Loop High Speed Transportation Project (Project), or “The Dugout.” The proposed Project includes the construction and operation of a 3.6-mile subterranean, zero-emissions, high-speed transportation system from the Los Feliz, East Hollywood, or Rampart Village neighborhoods to Dodger Stadium in the city of Los Angeles. For the environmental review process, the City of Los Angeles (City) Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Project Location and Setting

The proposed Project is located under and adjacent to public right-of-way (ROW) between Dodger Stadium at 1000 Vin Scully Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90012 to the east, proceeding under Vin Scully Avenue, under Sunset Boulevard, and either continuing under Sunset Boulevard to terminate in the neighborhood of Los Feliz, proceed west under Santa Monica Boulevard to terminate in the neighborhood of East Hollywood, or proceed west under Silver Lake and Beverly Boulevards to terminate in the neighborhood of Rampart Village (Project Area). See Figure 1, Project Location Map. The Project Area is located in Council Districts 1, 4, 10, and 13 at the boundary of the City’s Hollywood, Wilshire, and Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan areas, and the Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan area.

The Project Area is located within a fully developed, urban setting. Land uses along the north and south sides of the Project Area are predominately commercial, with other uses including several parks and residences; the eastern terminus will occur on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. The nearest residences are immediately adjacent to the Project Area where the proposed tunnel would proceed underneath Lilac Place and Lilac Terrace in Elysian Park, under Sunset Boulevard between Coronado Street and Rosemont Avenue in Silver Lake, and under Silver Lake and Beverly Boulevards in Rampart Village. In all three locations, the proposed Project would be built entirely underground without surfacing. Other residences are generally set back from the proposed Project alignment behind businesses along Sunset Boulevard.

Three Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Red Line stations are located in the vicinity of the western terminus of the proposed Project: Vermont/Sunset Station, Vermont/Santa Monica Station, and Vermont/Beverly Station. As part of the CEQA review process, three Design Concepts will be evaluated for the proposed Project to site its western terminus at a commercial or industrial location within the vicinity of either station (Figure 2).
Design Concept 1:
Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Sunset

Design Concept 2:
Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Santa Monica

Design Concept 3:
Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Beverly

Project to occur under public right-of-way or private land owned or leased by The Boring Company.

Shaded regions show areas where the western terminus could be located.

Although three Design Concepts will be evaluated, only one will be selected.
Design Concept 1: Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Sunset

Design Concept 2: Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Santa Monica

Design Concept 3: Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Beverly

Project to occur under public right-of-way or private land owned or leased by The Boring Company.

Shaded regions show areas where the western terminus could be located.

Although three Design Concepts will be evaluated, only one will be selected.
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Project Background

Founded by Elon Musk, TBC constructs safe, affordable, and environmentally-friendly tunnel transportation solutions for congested urban environments. TBC’s transportation system, referred to as “Loop,” utilizes a fleet of autonomous all-electric modified Tesla Model X platforms, herein referred to as “electric skates” or “skates” to transport passengers at speeds of up to 150 miles per hour through an underground TBC-constructed tunnel network. TBC has pursued an all-subsurface solution in large part due to the general benefits of subsurface transportation systems, including:

- No practical limit to how many layers of tunnels can be built, so any volume of traffic can be addressed;
- Higher speeds and straighter alignments due to fewer ROW constraints;
- Weatherproof;
- Minimal surface noise or vibration during construction and operations;
- Minimal effect to surface aesthetics;
- Does not divide communities with lanes and barriers.

Community Engagement

Planning efforts to engage local communities and stakeholders in the proposed Project design will include:

- **Site tours:** Guided community site tours of the Dugout Loop Site and TBC Hawthorne Test Tunnel project site with community members.
- **Mail notification:** Mail notification to adjacent landowners and residents along the corridor.
- **Group meetings:** Group meetings, focus groups, and presentations to community stakeholder groups throughout the Project Area.

The project design team will continue to engage the community throughout the design process. Updates on upcoming meetings can be found at http://eng.lacity.org/dugout-loop. Public information related to the proposed Project’s environmental review process can be found at the LABOE website at [enter website address]

Proposed Project Elements

The proposed Project would consist of the construction of a single, underground tunnel running from Dodger Stadium to Los Feliz/East Hollywood/Rampart Village neighborhoods (Figures 1 and 2), known as the “Main Artery Tunnel,” with a “Loop Lift” at each terminus, and ancillary facilities necessary to support initial operations between both points.
Main Artery Tunnel

An approximately 3.6-mile Main Artery Tunnel would run connect Dodger Stadium to Los Feliz/East Hollywood/Rampart Village neighborhoods entirely beneath public ROW or land owned or controlled by TBC. The tunnel would have a boring diameter of 14 feet, an outer diameter of 13.5 feet, and an inner diameter of 12 feet. Typical boring depth will range from 30 feet to 70 feet deep, depending on subsurface conditions. The tunnel would be bored using tunnel boring machine (TBM) technology, a trenchless mining technology that allows for the creation of the tunnel without disturbing the surface above it.

The TBM operates with a cycle of cutting and segment construction. As the TBM advances, it excavates material forward of its steel cutterhead. The TBM passes excavated material into rail cars, which are hauled out of the tunnel by an electric locomotive. The material is then deposited into a truck to be repurposed or disposed. Tunnel lining concrete segments are then raised and put into place one at a time by the TBM, constructing a “ring” within the tunnel. Grout is then injected through fill ports in the concrete segments to seal the annular space between the concrete segment ring and the surrounding soil or rock. Approximately 3,000 to 4,000 gallons of water are used per day for tunneling and support operations, roughly 90% of which is injected at the cutterhead to condition the soil, and is hauled away with the excavated material.

The crown (top) and invert (bottom) of the tunnel would be would be approximately 30 and 44 feet below the ground surface, respectively; however, in cases where underground infrastructure (e.g. utilities, bridge piles, subterranean pipelines, etc.) exists at greater-than-normal depth, tunnel depth would increase accordingly. Additionally, the tunnel is generally constructed at a gradient of less than 2% grade; therefore, depths tend to vary in areas where the ground surface is steeper than two degrees. As such, depths to top of crown are anticipated to range from as shallow as approximately 30 feet to 70 feet, but can be deepened if necessary to accommodate subsurface conditions.

Following construction of the Main Artery Tunnel, TBC would install the concrete "shelves" inside the tunnel, which serve as the guideway for the electric skates (Figure 3). The track concrete is slip formed, similarly to how street sidewalks are installed. Other tunnel infrastructure would be installed in parallel, including power, lighting, video, ventilation, safety systems, and communication systems.
Passengers would be transported through the Main Artery Tunnel in electric skates, which are electric public transportation vehicles based on a modified Tesla Model X chassis. Electric skates are confined by horizontal Shelves (Figure 3) using four pneumatic rubber automotive tires as the primary support devices for vertical, lateral and longitudinal forces to the vehicle. The electric skates engage the vertical wall of the curb (“Alignment Wheel Surface”) using two non-pneumatic alignment wheels that steer the two pneumatic rubber tires at the front of the vehicle. The rear of the vehicle is also equipped with alignment wheels that would not be in constant engagement with the Alignment Wheel Surface. This allows the vehicle to be driven in reverse for contingency scenarios and allows the skate to negotiate tighter turns at low speed without the rear tires scuffing the curb.

**Loop Lifts**

Loop Lifts are the surface points at which riders would access the Loop system. Each Loop Lift consists of a ramp or elevator that lowers an electric skate into the tunnel. Loop Lifts would resemble existing ground finishing (e.g., sidewalk, driveways; parking lots; Figure 4), and could be covered with a canopy/awning or decked to provide an above-shaft driveway, parking area, or landscaping. Skates would be brought to the surface at the Loop Lift and rest at-grade atop the Loop Lift shaft for loading/offloading passengers, and descend into the ground for transport. Alternatively, passengers could access the system at the invert of the Loop Lift and reach the surface via escalator. The Loop Lift at Dodger Stadium would occur on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. The western Loop Lift location is still to be determined, but would be either a ramp or elevator type location located within the vicinity of Metro Red Line Vermont/Sunset, Vermont/Santa Monica, or...
Vermont/Beverly stations at a site with commercial or industrial general plan land use designation (Figure 2). Vehicle maintenance would take place at the Loop Lift outside of operating hours.

The proposed Project would encourage connecting ridership through modes of transportation other than personal vehicles (e.g., pedestrian, bicycle, Metro, rideshare transport); therefore, on-site parking is not proposed for the western Loop Lift location.

**Figure 4: Conceptual Renderings of Loop Lifts, Ramped (Above) and with Elevator (Below)**
Access Shafts

Access Shafts would serve as tunnel access points for ventilation, emergency exit, and general tunnel access. Each Access Shaft would have a diameter of 12 feet utilizing 113 square feet of private land owned or controlled by TBC adjacent to the alignment. The horizontal side tunnel connection from the Main Artery Tunnel to the Access Shaft would have a diameter of 12 feet, similar to that of a tunnel spur for an intermediate Loop Lift. Access Shafts would be spaced approximately 0.5 miles apart, totaling approximately three to six locations located along the proposed Main Artery Tunnel alignment.

The Access Shafts would be hidden from public view, typically covered with a grate or hidden from view in the ground floor of an existing building (Figure 5). A newly constructed shed/garage structure may also be used to enclose the Access Shaft, approximately 15 x 15 feet wide and approximately 8 feet tall. Other visual screens or modifications would potentially be added depending on surrounding uses and aesthetics.

The Access Shaft excavation methods would vary depending on the ground conditions and the length of the tunnel spur. Tunnel spurs would vary in length but would be located directly adjacent to the Main Artery Tunnel on private land owned or controlled by TBC. Methods of construction include precast caisson/segmental shaft excavation methods, concrete secant piles, and H piles and lagging. The footprint required during construction would be less than one-quarter acre and as little as one-tenth acre. Tunnel spur excavation methods would typically include either pipejacking or SEM.
TBM Launch Shaft

The TBM would be launched from private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property from where all tunnel construction would occur. Construction equipment would include a bridge crane, forklift, and tunnel locomotive. Tunneling operations would require storage/laydown areas, electrical, communications, and water utilities, grout mixers/conveyance, a temporary site office, and temporary restrooms.
Routine deliveries would include concrete tunnel-lining segments, ventilation duct, rail, and other construction materials. Routine trucking activities would include the transport of excavated earth material referred to as “tunnel muck” and general construction waste.

The TBM Launch Shaft would be converted to a Loop Lift station following project completion. The portion of the Dodger Stadium property used during construction would be returned to a similar state to its existing condition.

**Haul Trucks**

It is anticipated that between 20 to 30 haul trucks per day would be needed to move the excavated soil from the tunnels during construction. Nominal soil removal activities would include the routine handling as listed below.

*Excavation of TBM Launch Shaft, Access Shafts, and Loop Lifts*

Excavation of shafts (TBM Launch Shaft, Ventilation Shafts, Loop Lifts) an excavator located inside the shaft floor would place excavated material directly into a bucket hoisted by a crane (at ground surface) and placed directly into dump trucks for off-site removal. Each Access Shaft would generate approximately 2,000 to 3,000 cubic yards of soil.

The TBM Launch Shaft at the Dodger Stadium property would involve minor clearing of existing pavement. Therefore, no major structures would be removed. The western terminal Loop Lift and Access Shafts would be sited to preferentially avoid the demolition of existing structures; however, demolition to construct these structures cannot be ruled out because the final parcels are still being determined.

*Excavation of Main Artery Tunnels*

Removal of earth material from Main Artery Tunnels would occur by the TBM, wherein soil and/or bedrock is displaced from the cutterhead, transported along a screw conveyor, and deposited in a rail car operated by locomotive. Material is then transferred to haul trucks and driven to an approved disposal facility. Tunnel spoils would be hauled to one of several disposal facilities in the Greater Los Angeles area, depending on the presence of contaminants, in accordance with applicable regulations. A total of approximately 110,000 cubic yards of material would be generated from excavation of the 3.6-mile Main Artery Tunnel.

It is assumed that all spoils would be taken to a landfill or other suitable (e.g., reclamation) facility however, potential soil reuse options include:

- Building bricks for use in commercial construction projects and/or landscaping;
- Engineered fill for construction and segment production;
- Material for sand or aggregate supply; and/or,
- Input for grout.

Nominally, soil reuse operations would occur off-site from the TBM Launch Shaft location and would be subject to separate permitting and approvals. Any soil that is not repurposed in the aforementioned ways would be disposed of at an approved disposal facility.
Water and Wastewater

Water use during construction is estimated to be approximately 3,000 to 4,000 gallons of water per day. Wastewater is generated from the production of grout and from cleaning down working surfaces. The proposed Project would generate an anticipated 500 to 1000 gallons per day. Water generated from grout production would potentially contain high pH (basic) and high total suspended solids (TSS). Water would be treated on-site through use of a CO2 bubbler (for pH) and settlement tanks (for TSS) before being disposed off-site or discharged into the sewer under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Dewatering, the manual draw-down of the groundwater table used to build civil structures below the water table, may be required for Access Shafts and Loop Lift locations. The Main Artery Tunnel is not anticipated to require dewatering. The combined use of an earth-pressure balanced (EPB) TBM and precast concrete segment tunnel lining generally eliminates the need for dewatering while tunneling and during operation. EPB TBMs have an articulated shield that is sealed against the pressure of water inflows up to 10 Bar. Additionally, the EPB TBMs control the stability of the tunnel face and ground surface. Stability is achieved by the cutterhead chamber, which monitors and adjusts its internal pressure to be equivalent to the pressures of the outside formation of the tunnel face. Pressure equalization by the EPB TBM prevents the inflow of groundwater through the tunnel face.

The EPB TBM erects precast concrete segments which form the tunnel lining in 5-foot intervals. The concrete segments are outfitted with rubber gaskets, and grout is injected to fill any voids outside the precast lining, which collectively seal the tunnel from groundwater. In off-nominal scenarios, water can enter the tunnel. In that case, it is collected in a water tank and discharged back into the storm drain or sewer system under a NPDES permit or sent for offsite disposal.

The construction of the TBM Launch Shaft and Access Shafts utilizes civil structures that would be constructed using inert materials with low mobility and solubility (e.g., precast concrete, grout) that would create a seal from groundwater resources. Where surface excavation would occur in shallow groundwater areas, dewatering would potentially be employed. Should there be any ground water removed during shaft construction, the water would be collected in a tank using a sump pump and discharged back into the storm drain or sewer system under a NPDES permit or sent for offsite disposal in accordance with applicable regulations.

Anticipated Construction Schedule

Construction of the proposed Project would take an estimated 14 months to complete. The western Loop Lift location and intermediate Access Shafts would be constructed concurrently with development of the Main Artery Tunnel.
Proposed Operations

All operations would be managed by TBC under either a Revocable Permit or a Franchise Agreement with the City and under oversight by the City. Operations would be coordinated with Metro.

Operation of the proposed Project during games and special events would be event-specific. Generally, transportation from the western terminus in Los Feliz/East Hollywood/Rampart Village neighborhoods to Dodger Stadium would begin prior to event start times; transport from Dodger Stadium to the western terminus would generally commence sometime following the start of the event. Initially, all riders would book time-slots online or on the phone in advance, with bookings initially limited to approximately 1,400 people (approximately 2.5% of average total attendance) per event. Based on City and community feedback, it could be possible to increase ridership per game to 2,800 per game (5% of attendance) and/or add the ability to purchase tickets onsite. Passengers would be transported through the Main Artery Tunnel in electric skates, which are electric public transportation vehicles based on a modified Tesla Model X chassis. Skates would be stored in parking spaces or in parking garages or car racks on-site at Loop Lift locations. This could occur at street level or within the Loop Lift shafts. It is possible Dugout Loop would operate at a low frequency on non-event days if such demand is observed.

Public Agencies and Project Approvals

The following permits and approvals would likely be required to construct and operate the proposed Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Agency</th>
<th>Anticipated Permits, Approvals, and Related Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)</td>
<td>Safety approval for Loop technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)</td>
<td>Any applicable permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)</td>
<td>Consultation regarding biological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)</td>
<td>Section 106 consultation and agreement document to resolve any potential adverse effects to historic resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LA-RWQCB)</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (if necessary); Waste Discharge Requirements (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro)</td>
<td>Any applicable permits, coordination related to public transit and bikeways, and adjacent facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>Anticipated Permits, Approvals, and Related Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)</td>
<td>Any applicable permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City Council</td>
<td>Project approval and certification of EIR, tunnel excavation permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles Planning Department</td>
<td>Conditional use permits, zone change (if applicable), any other permits as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD)</td>
<td>Approvals regarding emergency access and life support systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)</td>
<td>Authority to operate through franchise agreement and/or revocable permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Building Safety (LADBS)</td>
<td>Permits to construct and operate lift, escalators, and elevators on private property. Haul route approval. Other applicable permits, including: demolition (if applicable), grading, building, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical for Loop Lifts and/or Access Shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services</td>
<td>Street trees which could potentially be affected (under their division of Urban Forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)</td>
<td>Any applicable permits or clearances related to water and/or energy infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (LABOE)</td>
<td>Excavation permits for tunnel construction and civil structures adjacent to public ROW; Revocable permit for use of subsurface public ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Sanitation (LASAN)</td>
<td>Dewatering permits during construction (if needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Initial Study Environmental Checklist

1. **Project Title:**
   - Dugout Loop High Speed Transportation Project

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
   - City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works
   - Bureau of Engineering
   - Environmental Management Group
   - 1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600
   - Los Angeles, CA 90015

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
   - Dr. Jan Green Rebstock
   - Environmental Supervisor II
   - Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group
   - 213.485.5761, Jan.Green.Rebstock@lacounty.ca

4. **Project Location:**
   - Under or adjacent to public ROW from Dodger Stadium at 1000 Vin Scully Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90012 to the east, to Vin Scully Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, and terminate in neighborhoods of Los Feliz, East Hollywood, or Rampart Village in the City of Los Angeles.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
   - Steve Davis, Director
   - The Boring Company
   - 12200 Crenshaw Blvd.
   - Hawthorne, CA 90048
   - communityfeedback@boringcompany.com

6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:**
   - Public Facilities, Open Space, Limited Industrial, Commercial Industrial, General Commercial, Highway Oriented Commercial, Community Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial, Medium Residential, Low Medium Residential

7. **Zoning:**
   - A1, OS, PF, M1, MR1, C1, C2, CM, R1, RD1.5, R2, RD2, R3, RD3, R4

8. **Description of Project:**
   
   The proposed Project includes the construction and operation of an approximately 3.6-mile subterranean, zero-emissions, high-speed transportation system from the Los Feliz, East Hollywood, or Rampart Village neighborhoods to Dodger Stadium in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed Project includes excavating approximately 150,000 cubic yards of soil and operating a battery-powered rail mass public transportation system within the tunnel utilizing modified Tesla Model X vehicles affixed to an “electric skate” exterior track. The proposed Project is
located under and adjacent to public ROW between Dodger Stadium at 1000 Vin Scully Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90012 to the east, proceeding under Vin Scully Avenue, under Sunset Boulevard, and either continuing under Sunset Boulevard to terminate in the neighborhood of Los Feliz, proceed west under Santa Monica Boulevard to terminate in the neighborhood of East Hollywood, or proceed west under Silver Lake and Beverly Boulevards to terminate in the neighborhood of Rampart Village (Project Area). See Figure 1, Project Location Map. The Project Area is located in Council Districts 1, 4, 10, and 13 at the boundary of the City of Los Angeles’ Hollywood, Wilshire, and Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley Community Plan areas, and the Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan area.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Project Area is located within a fully developed, urban setting. Land uses along the north and south sides of the Project Area are predominately commercial, with other uses including several parks and residences; the eastern terminus would occur on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. The nearest residences are adjacent to the Project Area where the proposed tunnel would travel underneath Lilac Place and Lilac Terrace in Elysian Park, under Sunset Boulevard between Coronado Street and Rosemont Avenue in Silver Lake, and under Silver Lake and Beverly Boulevards in Rampart Village. In all three locations, surface features would not be constructed. Other residences are generally set back from the proposed Project alignment behind businesses along Sunset Boulevard.

10. Potential Responsible and Trustee Agencies who may need to review, approve or permit the proposed Project:

Federal Railroad Administration, Los Angeles Metro, Los Angeles County Flood Control, Los Angeles Fire Department, City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department, Los Angeles Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and South Coast Air Quality Management District.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact"), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forestry
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and 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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is potentially significant" or potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL...
IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a Lead Agency cites in the parentheses 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 if 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).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-Significant Impact". The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced.)

5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.

   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined.
from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
Chapter 4
Environmental Checklist

I. Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Less than Significant Impact.** A scenic vista is a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The Project Area is predominately commercial or in low-lying areas. The TBM Launch Shaft for the proposed Project is located on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. The parking lot offers views of Downtown Los Angeles but is located entirely on private land that is not a designated scenic landmark. The launch shaft would be an excavation advanced downwards with surface components consisting of construction equipment during construction. The Launch Shaft would be converted to a Loop Lift during operation, which would also be subsurface with the potential addition of a low-relief canopy and parked cars consistent with the existing use.

The proposed Project Area is adjacent to several historic monuments, which could potentially be considered scenic vistas. Design conformance to these structures for above-ground structures would be considered. Design of Loop Lifts and Access Shafts of the proposed Project are anticipated to generally conform to the designs of existing nearby structures and uses (Figure 4).

During construction, vehicles, equipment, and materials may be staged adjacent to the proposed Project Area and may temporarily degrade visual character and quality. Large machinery would include an excavator, truck-mounted crane, auger drill, and/or pile driver during shaft construction and a fixed bridge crane over the TBM Launch Shaft during tunneling. All construction sites would be shielded with
fences outfitted with privacy screen. Construction impacts would be short-term and temporary in duration and would not be substantial because the visual character and quality would be restored and improved following construction. While impacts are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** There are no state scenic highways in the Project Area. The Transportation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan designates scenic highways in Los Angeles. These highways are designated as part of an effort to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to highways. The Project Area does not include a city-designated scenic highway (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 1998). Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. As such, the impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Area is located in a highly developed urban environment. The Main Artery Tunnel would be located entirely below ground and therefore invisible. The proposed Project would be constructed in an area that is primarily zoned for commercial uses or parking. At-grade structures (Loop Lifts, Access Shafts) would be minimalistic in design, for which design guidelines would be developed to complement existing structures in the vicinity. Because of this, combined with the small size of proposed structures (approximately 15 feet by 15 feet and up to approximately 8 feet in height), the proposed Project would not impact the visual character of the Project Area.

The proposed Project's the eastern terminus would occur on private within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. Design of the Loop Lift terminus at the Dodger Stadium parking lot is expected to be minimalistic and would comply with any existing architectural design guidelines such that it would fit into the existing visual character of the stadium.

The Dodger Stadium parking lot, though a paved developed area, is designated as open space permitted for use as a baseball stadium pursuant to a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The TBM Launch Shaft at the Dodger Stadium property would be excavated downwards with surface components consisting of construction equipment during construction and a long-term Loop Lift (Figure 3) that would not impede views of downtown from vantages within the stadium parking lot or degrade the existing visual quality of the parking lot or its surroundings.

The proposed Project would avoid the removal or modification of existing urban features that are consistent with the current aesthetics of the surrounding area, including historic structures and potentially structures with potential historic/cultural significance. While the proposed Project is not expected to change existing aesthetic features. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

During construction, vehicles, equipment, and materials may be staged adjacent to the Project Area and may temporarily degrade visual character and quality, including at the proposed eastern terminus would occur on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. Any fencing and/or
vehicle, equipment, and material staging will comply with any existing visual and aesthetics guidelines or requirements. Construction impacts would be short-term and temporary in duration and would not be substantial because the visual character and quality would be restored and improved following construction.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is located in an urban area with predominantly commercial properties that produce nighttime light and glare. The Project Area and the Dodger Stadium parking lot includes street lights and accent lighting. The proposed Project would create new light sources, which may include lighting for signage, roadway lighting, lighting for pedestrian paths and bike paths, and feature lighting. The overall addition of lighting for the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing amount of lighting in the Project Area.

Though the Project Area includes low and medium density residential land uses that could be sensitive to nighttime light, surface structures would not be placed near such properties and would be relatively small (15 feet by 15 feet and approximately 8 feet tall) of a scale smaller and not inconsistent with surrounding structures. Furthermore, design guidelines would be developed that result in structures that complement existing development. Therefore, the proposed Project would not generate substantial additional levels of artificial light or glare for sensitive receptors.

Some construction activities may require lighting. During construction, vehicles, equipment, and materials may be staged adjacent to the Project Area and may temporarily result in additional glare. However, lighting would be directed towards construction activity areas and spill would not be greater than existing lighting levels from existing surrounding development. Construction impacts would be short-term and temporary in duration and would not be expected to be substantial because the levels of light and glare would be restored to existing conditions following construction. Although the proposed Project is not expected to generate additional light and glare, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on 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 the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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? ☑️

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract? ☑️

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? ☑️

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

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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? ☑️

a) Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project is located in an urban area surrounded predominantly by commercial properties. There are no existing agricultural uses in or near the Project Area (California Department of Conservation, 2016). Therefore, there would be no impacts on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or...
Farmland of Statewide Importance. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Area includes the following land use designations: Public Facilities (zoned PF), Open Space (zoned OS, A1), Limited Industrial (zoned M1), Commercial Industrial (zoned CM), General Commercial (zoned C2), Highway Oriented Commercial (zoned C2), Community Commercial (zoned C2), Neighborhood Commercial (zoned C2), Medium Residential (zoned R2, R3, R4), Low Medium Residential (zoned R1, RD2). There are several roadways within and surrounding the Project Area.

The TBM Launch Site would be located on private land within or adjacent to the Dodger Stadium property. The Dodger Stadium property is zoned A1 (Agricultural Zone); however, the stadium and the stadium parking lots operate under a CUP, which allows for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a Major League Baseball stadium together with incidental automobile and transportation vehicle parking facilities and various appurtenant and accessory structures and uses. The proposed Project would not conflict with the existing uses permitted on the site. The site is not under the Williamson Act Contract and has been converted to a parking lot and a baseball stadium through a CUP and is therefore ineligible for Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there would be no impacts on agricultural uses or land under a Williamson Act Contract. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g])?

No Impact. As discussed in response II b) above, the Project Area is not zoned as forest land or timberland. Therefore, there would be no impacts on forest land or timberland, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Area does not contain forest land. Therefore, there would be no impacts on forest land, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project Area is developed with urban land uses. There are no agricultural uses in the Project Area and surrounding area. Therefore, there would be no impacts that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
III. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less than Significant Impact
   - No Impact

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants, which are ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter (PM₂.₅), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. Under the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB) requires that each local air district prepare and maintain an air quality management plan to achieve compliance with California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). These standards are generally more stringent and apply to more pollutants than the NAAQS.

The proposed Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Under the NAAQS, the SCAQMD has been designated as a nonattainment area for O₃ (extreme nonattainment), PM₂.₅ (serious nonattainment), and lead (partial nonattainment) (South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2016). Under the CAAQS, the SCAQMD has been designated as a nonattainment area for O₃ (extreme nonattainment), PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ (South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2016). The SCAQMD has developed an Air Quality...
Management Plan (AQMP) to achieve compliance with NAAQS and CAAQS air quality standards.

Existing air pollutant sources in the Project Area include emissions from vehicles on surrounding roadways, including U.S. 101 and Interstate 110/California 110 freeway, and industrial uses, which include stationary and mobile sources. Operation of the proposed Project is anticipated to result in the reduction of pollutant sources because the proposed Project is a zero-emissions transit system expected to reduce vehicular traffic to the area.

During construction, the principal sources of potential pollutant emissions would be fugitive dust and engine exhaust from construction equipment. Construction emissions would be short-term and intermittent; although unlikely, daily thresholds could be exceeded depending on the amount of construction equipment being used at a given time. Therefore, impacts on air quality could be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Response III a) above, applicable air quality standards in the Project Area include the NAAQS and CAAQS, and the Project Area is in a nonattainment area for the federal O₃, PM₂.₅, and lead standards and for the state O₃, PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ standards.

As discussed in Response III a) above, existing air pollutant sources in the Project Area include emissions from vehicles on the roadways and industrial uses, which include stationary and mobile sources. Operation of the Dugout Loop system is anticipated to reduce emissions of these pollutants. During construction, the principal sources of pollutant emissions would be fugitive dust and engine exhaust from construction equipment. Construction emissions would be short-term and intermittent; although unlikely, daily thresholds could be exceeded depending on the amount of construction equipment being used at a given time. The proposed Project could contribute to the existing nonattainment status for the NAAQS and CAAQS. Therefore, impacts on air quality could be potentially significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project 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)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Cumulative impacts refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. For air quality, the cumulative impact Project Area is the SCAQMD air basin. As stated in Response III a) above, the SCAQMD Project Area is in a nonattainment area for the federal O₃, PM₂.₅, and lead standards and for the state O₃, PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ standards. Existing air pollutant sources in the SCAQMD include gasoline- and diesel-powered motor vehicles, such as cars, trucks, trains and boats; factories; power plants; and construction activities (e.g., ground disturbance that releases dust). Existing air pollutant sources in the Project Area include emissions from vehicles on the roadways and industrial uses, which include stationary and mobile sources.

As discussed in Response III a) above, during operation, the proposed Project is anticipated to result in the reduction of pollutant sources because the proposed Project is expected to reduce vehicular traffic to
the area (also see Section XVI. Transportation/Traffic). During construction, the principal sources of pollutant emissions are expected to be fugitive dust and engine exhaust from construction equipment. Engine exhaust may include the O₃ precursors, volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NOₓ), which can combine to form O₃ in the presence of sunlight. Construction emissions would be short-term and intermittent; although unlikely, daily thresholds could be exceeded depending on the amount of construction equipment being used at a given time. The proposed Project could contribute to the existing nonattainment status for the NAAQS and CAAQS. Therefore, the proposed Project’s contribution to criteria pollutant emissions in the SCAQMD, including O₃ precursors, could be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts on air quality due to criteria pollutants could be potentially significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are those members of the population that are most sensitive to air emissions, and they can be found in areas that include residences, hospitals, elder-care facilities, rehabilitation centers, elementary schools, daycare centers, and parks. The Project Area is primarily surrounded by commercial land uses. However, residences, schools, religious institutions, and hospitals are located adjacent to the proposed Main Artery Tunnel and further west and north of the Project Area, and a hospital and residences are located west of the proposed TBM Launch Shaft location. Therefore, there are sensitive receptors in proximity to the Project Area.

During operation, the proposed Project is anticipated to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants by replacing idling vehicles accessing Dodger Stadium with zero-emissions technology; therefore, operational impacts to sensitive receptors are not anticipated.

Construction emissions would be short-term and intermittent over approximately two years, and with compliance with applicable SCAQMD rules, regulations, and significance thresholds. Furthermore, the proposed Project construction would have limited diesel equipment onsite for long durations principally consisting of a crane and forklift, as the TBM would be electric and haul trucks would be transient. As a result, the proposed Project would not likely result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations created by construction activities. Although impacts to sensitive receptors are anticipated to be less than significant during construction and operation, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Area is located in a heavily urbanized area. Project construction equipment and activities, including diesel exhaust emissions, would generate odors. There could be situations where construction activity odors would be noticeable by persons working at or visiting nearby facilities, but these odors would be typical of common construction activities and would not be expected to be objectionable by a substantial number of people. In addition, these odors would be temporary and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. During operation, odors from the Loop technology are not anticipated. While impacts from odors during construction and operation are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
IV. Biological Resources

Would the project:

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

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

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?

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

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Vegetation within the Project Area includes non-native invasive species
growing through cracks in concrete and pavement, as well as non-native ornamental species growing in landscaped areas. Due to the level of disturbance and the limited amount of vegetated areas within the Project Area, the biological diversity of animals within the survey area and surrounding areas is low.

A preliminary Initial Planning and Consulting (IPAC) records search conducted with the USFWS indicates that the Project Area is not located within a critical habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species. The IPAC identified a total of 12 migratory bird species defined as Birds of Conservation Concern (range-wide or region wide) within the region. There are no specific characteristics of the proposed Project site or disturbances that would affect these species use of the area any more than existing urban uses.

The proposed Project would include adding construction uses that could generate additional lighting and noise, which could disturb birds temporarily until construction completion. Operation of the proposed Project would be consistent with the urban uses of the Project Area, which is not an identified final (non-migratory) habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species. While, impacts on special status species would be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact. Riparian habitat refers to trees, other vegetation, and physical features normally found on the banks and floodplains of rivers, streams, and other bodies of fresh water. None of these hydrologic features are present. Therefore, no riparian habitat is expected to be in the Project Area. In addition, the proposed Project is located in an urban environment where natural communities or vegetation types are unlikely to exist. Even though there would likely be no impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) define wetlands regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) as "...areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions..." The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) uses the same definition of wetlands under state jurisdiction; the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) uses the United States Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) definition: "Wetlands are lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. For purposes of this classification, wetlands must have one or more of the following three attributes: (1) at least periodically, the land supports hydrophytes, (2) the substrate is predominantly undrained hydric soil; and (3) the substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year."

The proposed Project Area does not include a wetland area, and the proposed Project would not include
modification of such an area. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project 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?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is located in a heavily developed area and does not support significant fish and wildlife species. Because the Project Area is heavily developed, the area is not used as a wildlife corridor. In addition, there are no native wildlife nursery sites in the Project Area. While, it is anticipated that impacts on migrating or established native resident species, or to native wildlife nursery sites would be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Los Angeles passed Ordinance Number 177404, which requires the protection of all native Oak tree species (*Quercus* spp), California Sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), California Bay (*Umbellularia californica*), and California Black Walnut (*Juglans californica*) (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 2006). The City of Los Angeles also requires the maintenance and protection of designated Heritage trees, which are trees with historical, commemorative, or horticultural significance. The Project Area is heavily developed, and the surface features of the proposed Project would avoid the tree species listed above and heritage trees, if present. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**No Impact.** The Project Area is heavily developed and urbanized and is not located in an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no impact related to conservation plans, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

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

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Historical resources could be located in the proposed Project Area. According to the LABOE’s NavigateLA website, the following sites are located in or adjacent to the proposed Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status of Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America - Echo Park Branch</td>
<td>1572 West Sunset Boulevard</td>
<td>Los Angeles (cert/active since 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensens Recreation Center and Electric Roof Sign</td>
<td>1700 West Sunset Boulevard</td>
<td>Los Angeles (cert/active since 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109 North Coronado Terrace</td>
<td>1109 North Coronado Terrace</td>
<td>Los Angeles (cert/active since 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Boulevard Bridge</td>
<td>Sunset Boulevard/Silver Lake Boulevard crossing</td>
<td>Los Angeles (active since 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Cat</td>
<td>3909 West Sunset Boulevard</td>
<td>Los Angeles (cert/active since 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCET Studios</td>
<td>4391-4421 Sunset Boulevard &amp; 1327-1435 North Hoover Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles (active since 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuenga Branch Library</td>
<td>4591 West Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>National and Los Angeles (cert/active since 1986/87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsdall Park/Hollyhock House</td>
<td>4800 Hollywood Boulevard</td>
<td>National and Los Angeles (Components active since 1963 – 2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structures more than 50 years old are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). NRHP and locally eligible structures will be further evaluated in the EIR.
The proposed Project would include construction of ventilation shafts (locations TBD) and Main Artery Tunnel, which could cause impacts to historic structures which may be more sensitive to settlement and/or vibration than other developments and/or ground conditions. Although unlikely, impacts on historical resources could be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** An archaeological resource is any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 100 years of age, and that are of archaeological interest (Title 43, Part 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations). Construction of the TBM Launch Shaft, Loop Lifts, and Access Shafts of the proposed Project would require ground-disturbing activities that could unearth archaeological resources. However, the proposed Project is located in a heavily developed area that has already been highly disturbed.

Impacts on archaeological resources could be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Paleontological resources include fossils, which are the preserved remains or traces of animals, plants, and other organisms from prehistoric time (i.e., the period before written records). Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units (formed by the deposition of material at the Earth's surface); and are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance or natural causes, such as erosion by wind or water.

Construction of the proposed Project would require ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation, that could unearth paleontological resources. Impacts on paleontological resources could be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed Project would require ground-disturbing activities that could unearth human remains. However, the proposed Project is located in a heavily developed area that has already been highly disturbed. The nearest cemetery is Hollywood Forever Cemetery approximately 1 mile away from the Project Area. To minimize or avoid potential impacts, all construction activities would cease, and the Los Angeles County Coroner would be contacted if any human remains are discovered, in accordance with Title 14, CCR, Section 15064.5(e). If the coroner determines that the human remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) would be notified to determine the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) for the area. The MLD would make recommendations for the arrangements for the human remains per PRC Section 5097.98. While, impacts on human remains are anticipated to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:

a. Have Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   
   i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
      
   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
   iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefication?
   iv. Landslides?
      
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

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

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

   **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, there are no potentially active faults that pass through the Project Area (California Department of Conservation, 1977). The closest Alquist-Priolo zoned fault is the Hollywood Fault located approximately 0.5 miles northwest of the Project Area's western terminus Project Area at Vermont/Sunset. The Upper Elysian Park fault runs parallel to the proposed Project alignment southwest of Sunset Boulevard and crosses under the proposed Dodger Stadium to Vermont/Beverly alignment alternative at Parkman Avenue and the Vermont/Santa Monica alignment alternative at Santa Monica Boulevard. The fault is a blind thrust, meaning that it does not rupture at the earth’s surface. It is not anticipated that any proposed Project features would cross the plane of the fault. Although impacts are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

   **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, there are no potentially active faults that pass through the Project Area (California Department of Conservation, 1977). According to California Geological Survey maps showing the earthquake shaking potential in California, there is a medium intensity of ground shaking and damage in the Project Area from anticipated future earthquakes (California Geological Survey, 2016). Therefore, impacts from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

   iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   **Less Than Significant Impact.** Soil liquefaction occurs when a saturated or partially saturated soil substantially loses strength and stiffness in response to an applied stress, usually earthquake shaking or other sudden change in stress condition, causing it to behave like a liquid. Other types of ground failure resulting from seismic activities include collapsible soils, subsidence (the gradual caving in or sinking of an area of land), landslides, and lateral spreading (landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid fluid-like flow movement). According to the most recent seismic hazards zones map, the proposed Project is located in areas designated as having seismically-induced liquefaction potential in the vicinity of Dodger Stadium, Echo Park reservoir, and the intersection of Hollywood Boulevard/Vermont Avenue (California Department of Conservation, 2016). Prior to construction of the proposed Project, designs would be engineered to meet or exceed building code requirements for structures in areas prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts from seismic-related ground failure are anticipated to be less than significant; however, due to the proposed Project’s occurrence in designated areas, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

   iv. Landslides?

   **Less Than Significant Impact.** Landslides are the sliding down of a mass of earth or rock from a mountain or cliff. According to the most recent seismic hazards zones map, the Main Artery Tunnel of
the proposed Project could potentially transect an earthquake-induced landslide zone (California Department of Conservation, 2016). However, the tunnel would be located at a depth greater than 30 feet below ground surface (bgs) at its shallowest depth, and below the potential landslide failure plane. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts from landslides. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. Erosion is the movement of rocks and soil from the Earth’s surface by wind, rain, or running water. Several factors influence erosion, such as the size of soil particles (larger particles are more prone to erosion), and vegetation cover, which prevents erosion. The proposed Project is located in an industrial and commercial area with predominantly paved and developed surfaces that would not be susceptible to erosion. During construction of the proposed Project, open excavation areas that would be exposed could be susceptible to erosion. Standard BMPs would be implemented during construction to ensure that erosion or the loss of topsoil would not occur, and that construction activities would not result in downstream impacts.

Once the proposed Project is constructed, surface features would be returned to a state similar to existing conditions (e.g., pavement, planters, grass, etc.). Changes in elevation would not likely occur over the sites. While substantial soil erosion is not expected to occur during operation, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. See Response VI a) (iii). This topic will be evaluated further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Expansive soil is a soil that is prone to large volume changes (swelling and shrinking) that are directly related to changes in water content; with higher moisture levels, the soils will swell, and with lower moisture levels, the soils will shrink. Potential impacts to civil structures include stress, settlement, and cracking. According to Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code, special foundation design is required if the Expansion Index (which predicts the swelling potential of compacted soils) is higher than 20. Based on a 1989 United States Geological Survey (USGS) map, the proposed Project is located in an area where data is insufficient to indicate the swelling potential of the clay (U.S. Geological Survey, 1989). Therefore, impacts from expansive soils are potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located in a developed area that is supported by waste and wastewater disposal systems. Septic tanks would not be used. Wastewater is generated from the production of grout and from cleaning working surfaces. The proposed Project would generate an
anticipated 500 to 1000 gallons per day. Water generated from grout production would potentially contain high pH (basic) and high total suspended solids (TSS). Water would be treated on-site through use of CO2 bubblers and settlement tanks before being disposed off-site or discharged into the sewer. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Greenhouse gases (GHG) are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. The transportation sector (i.e., the movement of people and goods by cars, trucks, trains, ships, airplanes, and other vehicles) accounts for 39 percent of total GHG emissions in California (California Air Resources Board, 2018). The majority of GHG from transportation are carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions resulting from the combustion of petroleum-based products, like gasoline, in internal combustion engines (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). The largest sources of transportation-related GHG emissions include passenger cars and light-duty trucks, which account for over half of the emissions from the sector.

During construction, the proposed Project could contribute to GHG emissions from vehicles, power consumption, and concrete production and would generate additional traffic. During operation, GHG emissions would be expected to result in a net reduction due to the replacement of vehicle trips with a more energy efficient public transportation system and Impacts from GHG emissions from construction activities could be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Assembly Bill (AB) 32, or the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, was passed to establish regulations that reduce GHG emissions in California, and to monitor and enforce compliance with the program. As part of AB 32, a scoping plan was created to outline the strategies for meeting emissions goals (California Air Resources Board, 2017). The proposed Project is consistent with California’s objectives to reduce GHG emissions and conforms to the strategies of increasing low carbon mobility choices, including improved access to viable and affordable public transportation and active transportation opportunities.
While the proposed Project is expected to be consistent with plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions; this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site that 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Less than Significant Impact.** A hazardous material is any substance or material that could adversely affect the safety of the public, handlers, or transportation carriers.

Project construction would require the removal of excavated soil and rock which may be contaminated, as well as the use of construction materials that could be hazardous, such as oils, sealants, and cement; however, the transport, use, and disposal of these materials would be conducted in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the safe handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, including the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which includes requirements for hazardous solid waste management; the DTSC Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5), which include standards for generators and transporters of hazardous waste; and the provisions of the Los Angeles Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Unit, which include requirements for the use and storage of hazardous materials.

The proposed Project is also located within City of Los Angeles methane and methane buffer zones from Coronado Terrace to Vendome Street along Sunset Boulevard, and along Silver Lake Boulevard to Vermont Avenue and Beverly Boulevard along the Vermont/Beverly alignment. Prior to and during construction for the proposed Project within methane and methane buffer zones, testing and monitoring for methane would be conducted pursuant to the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code – Methane Code and Cal/OSHA requirements.

The use of hazardous materials during operation and construction of the proposed Project would be relatively minor. Any hazardous materials that are used for the proposed Project would be properly handled and contained. Impacts from the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant, however, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project 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?

**Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Response VIII a), operation and construction of the proposed Project would involve the excavation of materials potentially impacted with hazardous constituents. The removal of these materials would be subject to appropriate handling and containment requirements using BMPs (e.g., sampling and analysis by qualified personnel, segregation of stockpiles/sources, spraying dry soil with water or a vapor suppressant to prevent aerial deposition, reduction in handling) in accordance with existing regulatory requirements to ensure the material can be safely handled per those requirements. Impacts from the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant, but this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are schools located within one-quarter mile from the Project Area, including Thomas Starr King Middle School, Logan Early Education Center, Cisneros Learning Academy, VISTA Charter Middle School, Camino Nuevo High School, Central City Value High School, Vigil Middle
School, Frank Del Olmo Elementary School, Micheltorena Street Elementary School, Saint Francis de Assisi Elementary School, King Film/Media Magnet School, and Los Feliz STEM Magnet School (Table 2). The proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous materials. Any and all potentially hazardous materials would be handled, transported, and disposed of in accordance with existing regulations. Quantities generated would be relatively minor and would be similar to existing uses in the area surrounding the Project Area. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts on existing or proposed schools. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

Table 2: Schools in Project Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Distance from Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Starr King Middle School</td>
<td>4201 Fountain Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90029</td>
<td>600 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Early Education Center</td>
<td>1712 Montana St, Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td>200 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisneros Learning Academy</td>
<td>1018 Mohawk St, Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td>150 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISTA Charter Middle School</td>
<td>2900 W Temple St, Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td>0.25 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Nuevo High School</td>
<td>3500 W Temple St, Los Angeles, CA 90004</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Value High School</td>
<td>221 N Westmoreland Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90004</td>
<td>350 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigil Middle School</td>
<td>152 Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90004</td>
<td>150 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Del Olmo Elementary School</td>
<td>100 N New Hampshire Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90004</td>
<td>600 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micheltorena Street Elementary School</td>
<td>1511 Micheltorena St, Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Francis de Assisi Elementary School</td>
<td>1550 Maltman Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Film/Media Magnet School</td>
<td>4201 Fountain Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90029</td>
<td>500 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Feliz STEM Magnet School</td>
<td>1740 N New Hampshire Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90027</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to compile the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, also called the Cortese List. The following data sources were reviewed for information on hazardous materials sites in the Project Area (California Environmental Protection Agency, 2012):

- List of Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from DTSC EnviroStor database.
- List of Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Sites by County and Fiscal Year from State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database.
- List of solid waste disposal sites identified by SWRCB with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit.
- List of "active" cease and desist orders (CDO) and cleanup and abatement orders (CAO) from SWRCB.
• List of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, identified by DTSC.

According to the Cortese List, there are 19 hazardous waste and substances sites in the City, and none are located in the Project Area. According to the EnviroStor database, the Project Area does not include any open cases. According to the GeoTracker database, a total of 20 closed and four open sites are present adjacent to or within the Project Area (State Water Resources Control Board, 2018). All open sites are leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cases. Impacts would be less than significant; however, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. There would be no safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project Area, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or general aviation airport as defined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The nearest airport runway is Runway 33 at Hollywood Burbank Airport, located approximately 11 miles northwest of the proposed Project. Non-airport or airstrip facilities located near the proposed Project include rooftop helipads at Sunset-Glendale Heliport, located on the rooftop of 2200 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90026, and Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles, located on 4650 Sunset Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90027. According to the FAA, both heliports have an elevation of at least 500 feet. The two heliports are eight and 15 floors above ground surface, respectively. The tallest project features requiring vertical clearance are the cranes used to lift materials in/out of the shaft locations, which have maximum vertical clearances of 50 feet. Therefore, considering the vertical clearance of proposed Project features from nearby heliports, no impacts to helipads or its operations are anticipated. No impacts to private airstrips are anticipated. This topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. The County of Los Angeles has designated disaster routes that are used to bring emergency personnel, equipment, and supplies to impacted areas. The Project Area is located near the United States Highway 101 and Interstate 110, which are designated primary disaster routes (Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, 2012). The Project Area is also located within secondary disaster routes (Sunset Boulevard, Alvarado Street). Operation and construction of the proposed Project would not remove access to primary disaster routes. Where possible, alternative routes would be used to bypass any construction that may take place on any of the secondary disaster routes. Therefore, impacts on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant and haul routes for excavated material would be required/conditioned as part of the haul route permit to avoid impairment of the implementation or interference of emergency response or evacuation plans. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
h) Would the project 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?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is located in an urbanized area that is not adjacent to wildlands and does not include residences that are intermixed with wildlands. Elysian Park has experienced wildfires as recently as December 2017, however the areas of Elysian Park containing brush, which is the fuel generally associated with wildfires and are more than ½ mile from the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
## IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 onsite or offsite?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?  

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?

---

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Water quality standards are provisions approved by the U.S. EPA that describe the desired condition of a water body. These standards define the designated uses of the water body (e.g., recreation, public drinking water supply), and establish criteria to protect designated uses (e.g., maximum pollutant concentration levels permitted in a water body), antidegradation requirements to protect existing uses and high-quality waters, and general policies to address implementation issues (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015).

Waste discharge requirements are issued by the SWRCB to regulate point source discharges (defined by the U.S. EPA as any single identifiable source of pollution from which pollutants are discharged, such as a pipe or ditch) that are exempt from Title 27, Section 20090 of the CCR and are not subject to the CWA; these exempted point source discharges include discharges of domestic sewage or treated effluent, discharges of wastewater to land (e.g., from evaporation or percolation ponds), discharges of waste to wells by injection, cleanup of unintentional or unauthorized releases of waste or pollutants to the environment, discharges of gas condensate units, use of nonhazardous decomposable waste as a soil amendment, discharges of drilling mud and cuttings from well-drilling operations, recycling or reuse of materials salvaged from waste or produced by waste treatment, and waste treatment in fully enclosed facilities, such as tanks.

The proposed Project lies within the City and County of Los Angeles and is regulated by the RWQCB Los Angeles Region. The RWQCB has adopted NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges within the County of Los Angeles, and the Incorporated Cities Therein (Order No. R4R4-2012-0175). The proposed Project would be conducted in compliance with these applicable permits, if required as well as the NPDES Construction General Permit for construction. While impacts related to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project 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)?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project could receive water from several sources, including groundwater pumped from the local area, Owens Valley, treated State Water Project (SWP) water and Colorado River water via Los Angeles Department of Power and Water (LADWP), and
potential future recycled water. Project construction would require an estimated 3,000 to 4,000 gallons of water per day; however, the demand would be temporary, potentially satisfied by diverse sources, and suitable for use of recycled water. Operation of the proposed Project would require limited water that would be served by the existing area water agency (most likely LADWP) and would not be expected to exceed the entitlements associated with uses for improved parcels in the urban location. As a result, the proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Impacts are expected to be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Alterations in drainage patterns (i.e., the pattern in which storm water flows across the Earth’s surface) may result from changes in topography and impervious surfaces (e.g., steeper slopes and an increase in impervious surfaces may increase the velocity of storm water drainage). Erosion is the loosening and transportation of the upper layers of rock and soil from the Earth’s surface by wind, rain, or running water. Siltation is the process whereby sediment in water settles as the speed of water movement slows down. Alterations in drainage patterns that increase the drainage velocity may result in increased erosion or siltation. However, the drainage in the area is generally engineered and as such the proposed Project would not alter the course of a stream or river.

The proposed Project would involve the installation of shafts with footprints ranging from approximately 500 square feet (Access Shafts), to approximately 10,000 square feet (e.g., Loop Lift ramps). Temporary changes to drainage patterns around the TBM Launch Shaft location would potentially occur, but would ultimately be returned to the existing state as a paved surface. While impacts on existing drainage patterns are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See Response IX c). While impacts on existing drainage patterns are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would potentially involve the stockpiling of excavated material adjacent to shaft locations prior to off-site transport. Stockpiled material would be managed using BMPs; therefore, stormwater runoff from the proposed Project is not anticipated. Furthermore, as the area is urban in nature and the predominant surface type is impervious, impacts on the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are expected to be less than significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
f) **Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Project construction could result in potential impacts on water quality from erosion and polluted runoff; however, these impacts would be substantially minimized through compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the safe handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, and the implementation of standard measures; and, construction BMPs such as silt fencing, filters, and berms, and keeping work areas clean and free of trash. The proposed Project would also be conducted in compliance with the CWA Section 402 NPDES Construction General Permit, if applicable. With incorporation of standard measures and permits, the proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality. While impacts on water quality would be less than significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

g) **Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would not include the construction of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, there would be no impacts, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

h) **Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Area is included on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map. The crossing of the proposed Project between Sunset Boulevard and Myra Avenue, and Silver Lake Boulevard between Vendome Street and Temple Street is in Zone X, which are areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain. The proposed Project at Santa Monica Boulevard, Hoover Street, and along Silver Lake Boulevard from Temple Street to Westmoreland Avenue is located within Zone AH, which are areas subject to inundation by 1-percent-annual-chance shallow flooding (usually areas of ponding) where average depths are between one and three feet. The proposed Project is outside the 100-year flood hazard area according to NavigateLA.

Encroachment is defined by FEMA as construction, placement of fill, or similar alternation of topography in the floodplain that reduces the area available to convey floodwaters, and by FHWA as an action within the base floodplain. FEMA Section 60.3 (d)(3) states that communities shall prohibit encroachments, fill, new development, substantial improvements, and other development within the adopted regulatory floodway unless it has been demonstrated through hydrologic and hydraulic analyses that the proposed encroachment would not result in any increase in flood levels within the community of the base flood (100-year) discharge.

The proposed Project would include, as a design constraint, the construction of shaft locations within the floodway. Such a design constraint is feasible due to the relatively small amount of the Project Area containing floodways. The Main Artery Tunnel would be constructed at depths greater than 30 feet bgs; therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly impact flood flows and this topic will be not discussed further in the EIR.
i) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project Area is located downslope from the Echo Park reservoir. Surface openings to the Main Artery Tunnel would be sited to avoid any potential floodways. Otherwise, any surface features located in floodways would be designed with primary (e.g., bermed) and secondary (e.g., pumping) features to eliminate any public safety hazards due to flooding. While impacts related to risk involving flooding dam or levee failure are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A seiche is a temporary disturbance or oscillation in the water level of a lake or partially enclosed body of water. A tsunami is a long, high ocean wave caused by an earthquake, submarine landslide, or other disturbance. The Project Area is not in proximity to a lake or ocean, and is therefore not susceptible to seiche or tsunami. A mudflow is a fluid or hardened stream or avalanche of mud. The Project Area is located adjacent to landslide hazard zones; however, surface features of the proposed Project would not be located inside any landslide hazard zones. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be susceptible to mudflows. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
X. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is intended to improve connections within the neighborhoods surrounding the Project Area. The proposed Project will feature a transportation option that will improve connections and will not have physical barriers between communities in the area. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in beneficial impacts that would be less than significant. This topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project 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?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Land Use element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan includes Community Plans for 35 community plan areas within Los Angeles to address the specific needs and wishes of each community. Land use designations help inform decision-makers, as well as the public, on types of future development to pursue in various areas and neighborhoods. General land use maps were developed for the communities where the Project Area is located. The General Plan designation for the location of the TBM Launch Shaft at Dodger Stadium is open space, and the Dodger Stadium property is zoned A1; however, the stadium and the stadium parking lots operate under a CUP, which allows for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a Major League Baseball Stadium together with incidental automobile and transportation vehicle parking facilities and various appurtenant and accessory structures and uses. While Figure 2 identified the areas of interest for Loop Lift station locations, because the precise location and parcels for the surface disturbances are in the process of being selected, there is the potential for conflicts with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted...
for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This issue will be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project Area is heavily developed and urbanized and is not located in an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to conservation plans, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
XI. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project 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?**

**No Impact.** Mineral resources are geological deposits in or on the Earth’s crust that may have economic value, and include fuels (e.g., coal, oil, and natural gas), metals (e.g., iron, copper, and aluminum) and non-metals (e.g., salt, gypsum, clay, sand, and phosphates). The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires the State Geologist to classify land into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) according to the known or inferred mineral potential of that land. The process is based solely on geology, without regard to existing land use or land ownership. The primary goal of mineral land classification is to ensure that the mineral resource potential of land is recognized by local government decision-makers and considered before land-use decisions that could preclude mining are made.

According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), Design Concept 3 of the proposed Project crosses the northeast boundaries of the Los Angeles City Oilfield from approximately 80 feet northeast of Vendome Street to 50 feet northeast of Dillon Street. The nearest oil wells to the proposed Project are located approximately 350 southeast of Silver Lake Boulevard at 712 Parkman Avenue, Los Angeles CA 90026; however, the site is currently a residential property and the two oil wells are plugged. Oil reserves would be at depths greater than those of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not remove or impede the use of mineral resources that would be of value to the region or residents of the state. Therefore, no impacts resulting from the loss of mineral resources are anticipated, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Project Area does not include any important mineral resources recovery sites delineated on the City's General Plan; therefore, there would be no impacts, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
### XII. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a substantial permanent 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>d. Result in 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>e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and 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>f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project result in 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?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Noise criteria are established by municipalities to provide avoidance measures for noise impacts from noise-generating activity on the community. The City of Los Angeles has adopted noise criteria in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Noise thresholds for various land uses are identified in **Table 3.**
Table 3: Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Presumed Ambient Noise Level (dB(A))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, agricultural</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Public Use</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy manufacturing</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (City of Los Angeles, 1982)

Notes: In this chart, daytime levels are to be used from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and nighttime levels from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. At the boundary line between two zones, the presumed ambient noise level of the quieter zone shall be used.

In addition to the standards in Table 3, the City's noise ordinance sets forth noise limits for construction activities. Chapter XI, Article 2, Section 112.05, of the Los Angeles Municipal Code states that noise generated from construction and industrial machinery shall not exceed a maximum of 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet (ft.), except where compliance is technically infeasible. “The burden of proving that compliance is technically infeasible shall be upon the person or persons charged with a violation of this section. Technical infeasibility shall mean that said noise limitations cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or any other noise-reduction device or technique during the operation of the equipment.”

In addition, Section 41.40 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code restricts construction activities during different hours of the day. According to this code, no person shall perform any construction or repair work that makes loud noises that disturbs persons occupying sleeping quarters in any place of residence between the hours of 9:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day. Furthermore, the code prohibits any person other than an individual homeowner engaged in the repair or construction of his single-family dwelling from performing any construction or repair work on land occupied by residential buildings, or within 500 ft. of land so occupied, before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday or at any time on any Sunday. If a tight project construction schedule would necessitate construction activities to occur outside of the hours allowed by the City's noise ordinance, then a permit from the Police Commission is required.

The Project Area is located in an urban setting where there is existing noise from traffic and other adjacent urban activity. Existing land uses in the Project Area are predominantly commercial properties. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project Area include residences adjacent to the Project Area where the proposed Main Artery Tunnel would travel underneath Lilac Place and Lilac Terrace in Elysian Park, under Sunset Boulevard between Coronado Street and Rosemont Avenue in Silver Lake, and under Silver Lake and Beverly Boulevards in Rampart Village. The proposed Project would be constructed without surfacing in these locations; therefore, impacts from ground borne noise and vibration are anticipated to imperceptible.
The nearest hospitals include Barlow Respiratory Hospital (approximately 0.1 mile north of the Project Area) Children's Hospital Los Angeles (less than 0.1 mile west of the Project Area), and Kaiser Permanente (approximately 0.1 mile west of the Project Area).

The nearest elderly care centers include Golden State Retirement Hotel (approximately 0.2 mile south of the Project Area), You Care We Care (less than 0.3 mile west of the Project Area), Haven 501 (less than 0.2 mile north of the Project Area), and Madison Avenue Senior Citizen (less than 0.2 mile north of the Project Area).

The nearest schools include Thomas Starr King Middle School, Logan Early Education Center, Cisneros Learning Academy, VISTA Charter Middle School, Camino Nuevo High School, Central City Value High School, Vigil Middle School, Frank Del Olmo Elementary School, Micheltorena Street Elementary School, Saint Francis de Assisi Elementary School, King Film/Media Magnet School, and Los Feliz STEM Magnet School. Distances to schools are shown in Table 2.

During Project operation, primary noise sources in the Project Area are anticipated to be limited to elevator shaft components bringing electric skates to the ground surface. Operational noises would be minimal.

During construction, demolition, auger drills, and various other noise-generating construction activities would potentially be required to construct shaft sites associated with the proposed Project. The noise levels for construction equipment that would typically be used for the proposed Project are provided in Table 4. The degree of construction noise impacts could vary for different areas within the Project Area depending on the construction activities. Additional noise analysis would be provided through noise technical study, which will be included in the EIR.

### Table 4: Construction Equipment Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Maximum Noise Level ($L_{\text{max}}$) of Equipment at 50 feet (in dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loader</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger Drill</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilation Fan</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2015

Notes: The noise levels are provided in the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Construction Noise Handbook (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2015), and are actual, measured noise levels based on measurements performed for the Central Artery/Tunnel Project. Noise measurements were averaged to compute the actual emission level.
The noise levels shown in **Table 3** range from 76 to 85 dBA, which are in excess of the City's noise standards that include exterior noise limits of 45 to 65 dBA, depending on the land use. Certain noise reduction measures would be employed, and permissions received from the City to perform necessary construction work in the Project Area.

Construction of the proposed Project would include activities that could generate noise levels above existing conditions (Table 3). Impacts related to noise could be significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

**b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods employed. Operation of construction equipment causes groundborne vibrations that diminish in strength with distance. Construction vibration varies greatly depending on the construction phases, type and condition of equipment used, and layout of the construction site.

Construction vibration levels are governed primarily by the heaviest pieces of equipment, such as impact pile drivers and pavement breakers. Since the construction equipment is mobile, the intensities of vibration perceived would vary greatly depending on the spatial relationship between the source and the receiver. The worst vibration impacts would generally occur during demolition activities involving pavement breakers and pile drivers, respectively.

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) provides ground-borne vibration impact criteria for various types of building uses. FRA recommends that these criteria be used as a damage threshold for the fragile structures located near the ROW of a transit project. Additionally, Section 41.32 of the City of Los Angeles Municipal code specifies that no person should use any sound amplifying system in such a manner that any vibration emitted is received by human ear from more than 50 feet from the property line where such amplification is being conducted.

Several historic buildings are located in the Project Area immediately adjacent to the Main Artery Tunnel alignment (Table 1). The Main Artery Tunnel would be constructed using TBM technology. The noise study for Metro’s Regional Connector Transit Project (RCTP) identified two studies that measured peak particle vibration (PPV) from tunnel construction. One ranged from 0.0024 to 0.0394 inches per second PPV at a distance of 33 feet from the vibration source, the other ranged from 0.0157 to 0.0551 inches per second PPV at the same 33-foot distance from the source. Given this range of potential vibration impacts and the proposed depth of TBM usage (30-70 feet), vibration produced by the TBM would be well below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) threshold, for Category IV buildings (those most susceptible to vibration damage), of 0.12 inches per second PPV.

Construction of the proposed Project would include activities that could generate groundborne vibration or noise levels above existing conditions (Table 3). However, the proposed Project would comply with applicable codes to avoid and minimize groundborne vibrations in exceedance of City standards. While impacts related to groundborne vibration are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed Project would not contribute appreciable noise level increases. Refer to Responses VII a) and b). Nevertheless, this topic will be further analyzed in the EIR.

d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As discussed in Response XII a), project construction could result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed Project. Impacts could be significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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?

**No Impact.** The Project Area is not inside an airport land use plan, nor is it within 2 miles of an airport. According to the most recent noise contour map for the County, the Project Area is well outside the noise contour for the airport (Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 2017). Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels and no impact would result. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.

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?

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels because the Project Area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airstrips are located at Los Angeles International Airport, Bob Hope Airport, and Santa Monica Airport all approximately 10 miles away. Non-airport or airstrip facilities located near the proposed Project include rooftop helipads at Sunset-Glendale Heliport, located on the rooftop of 2200 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90026, and Children's Hospital of Los Angeles, located on 4650 Sunset Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90027. According to the FAA, both heliports have an elevation of at least 500 feet. The two heliports are eight and 15 floors above ground surface, respectively. Noise generated from the Project would occur near ground-level, at significant lateral distances away from these locations. Therefore, no noise impacts to workers or residents nearby private airstrips or helipads are anticipated. This issue will not be discussed further in the EIR.
XIII. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project 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)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project does not include the construction of new homes or businesses. The proposed Project would involve the extension of infrastructure to existing densely developed areas that are subject to persistent congestion, and would accommodate that existing development and current projected growth, providing an alternative transport over a short distance that would not induce growth because of the short distance, a primary use of the proposed Project for event-related (rather than commute-related) transportation, and both ends of the connection being already densely developed areas. The proposed Project would accommodate existing demand for increased mobility within the proposed Project Area and would not induce additional economic or population growth in the Project Area. Although there would be less than significant impact related to this topic, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would not displace any housing units, as commercial surface parking areas would be targeted, and the construction of replacement housing would not be required. Therefore, there would be no impact on housing, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people, and the construction of replacement housing would not be required. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to displacement, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
XIV. Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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 following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Protection?</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

i. Fire protection?

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project Area is served by Battalion 11, Fire Stations 6 and 20 of the South Division of Los Angeles City Fire Department (LAFD), and in the southeast and by Battalion 5, Fire Station 35 of the North Division of the LAFD in the northwest. The proposed Project would not generate an increase in population. However, the addition of facilities would require emergency fire protection in the event of emergency.

To prevent hazards that would increase the need for fire protection, the proposed Project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes set forth by the state Fire Marshall and LAFD, as well as regulations imposed by the FRA. Construction of additional facilities is not expected to be required to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. If any traffic control plans are needed during construction, the nearest local fire responders would be notified.
to coordinate emergency response routing. Although the need for additional fire protection and resources in the LAFD service area is expected to be less than significant, this topic will be further in the EIR.

ii. Police protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Area is served by the Central Bureau of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Northeast Division at Dodger Stadium and north of Sunset Boulevard; Central Bureau, Central Division south of Lilac Terrace; and, Central Bureau, Rampart Division southwest of the Sunset Boulevard. Because the proposed Project could increase traffic and visitors in the Project Area, there could be an increased demand for additional police protection, especially during public events.

If any traffic control plans are needed during construction, the nearest local police station would be notified to coordinate emergency response routing. During construction, the Project Area would be fenced and screened, nighttime lighting would be provided, and access would be controlled to deter theft. The proposed Project is not expected to result in an increase in demand for police services such that additional facilities would need to be constructed. Because the requirement for traffic control is unknown, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

iii. Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project does not include residential development that would directly increase the demand for additional or modified school facilities. The proposed Project would not induce population growth directly; therefore, the proposed Project would not likely increase the demand for schools near the Project Area. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly increase student enrollment levels at any nearby schools. Therefore, there would be less than significant impacts on schools, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

iv. Parks?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is located adjacent to several parks. Parkland will not be removed as part of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not induce growth or directly or indirectly strain existing park services; therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

v. Other public facilities?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Area is primarily comprised of commercial land uses and would provide a transit link between Metro stations at either Vermont/Sunset, Vermont/Santa Monica or Vermont/Beverly. The proposed Project is not anticipated to affect the operation of either station or result in an increase in the residential population that would cause direct or indirect impacts on public facilities. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
XV. Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 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>
<tr>
<td>b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not remove existing recreational facilities. The proposed Project would not result in employment or population growth that would significantly increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities in the surrounding area. Impacts on parks and recreational facilities are expected to be less than significant. Therefore, this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not include the construction of recreational facilities. Because the Project Area is located in a highly developed urban environment, the proposed Project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.
## XVI. Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Would the project 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?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Mobility Plan 2035 is part of the City's General Plan and outlines goals to achieve a transportation system that balances all modes of transportation (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 2016). The proposed Project would provide a clean energy transportation system to complement the existing nexus of roads, bikeways, and public transit options in the City. The proposed Project would promote several of the key policy initiatives of the Mobility Plan 2035 including: Target greenhouse gas reductions through a more sustainable transportation system; Increase the use of technology; expand the role of the street as a public space.

The proposed Project would reduce traffic congestion in the Project Area. Because the proposed Project would terminate within the vicinity of an existing Metro station, increased demand for Metro Red Line transit could result. In addition, construction would involve numerous haul truck trips to remove excavated material and construction workers that could result in temporary impacts to the transportation system in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the proposed Project may result in potentially significant impacts on the traffic circulation system, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project 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?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Prominent east-west streets in the Project Area include:

- Vin Scully Avenue (Avenue I);
- Sunset Boulevard (Avenue I);
- Beverly Boulevard (Avenue II);
- Santa Monica Boulevard (Modified Avenue I);
- Hollywood Boulevard (Avenue I); and,
- Fountain Avenue (Avenue III).

Prominent north-south streets in the Project Area include:

- Stadium Way (Avenue I);
- Glendale Boulevard (Boulevard II);
- Alvarado Street (Avenue II);
- Silver Lake Boulevard (Avenue II);
- Myra Avenue (Avenue II);
- Virgil Avenue/Hillhurst Avenue (Modified Avenue II); and,
- Vermont Avenue (Avenue I).

The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 includes traffic and circulation objectives and policies for the city, such as ensuring a safe and effective transportation system that provides adequate traffic movement while preserving community character and promoting alternative transportation through
improved pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 2016). The Mobility Plan 2035 includes a policy to establish the Complete Streets Design Guide as the City’s document to guide the operations and design of streets and other public ROW. Another policy requires developers to ensure high quality pedestrian access in all site planning and public ROW modifications to provide a safe and comfortable walking environment.

The proposed Project would involve the addition of new pedestrian transit infrastructure. The proposed Project would not involve the addition or alteration of new or existing roadway. Access to surrounding major and secondary highways would be maintained during operation of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would promote multi-modal active transportation components, including linking to existing and future bicycle and pedestrian transit facilities.

Operation of the proposed Project would serve to alleviate traffic congestion by providing a subsurface transit option for visitors who would otherwise drive vehicles to attend Dodger game and Special Events at the Dodger Stadium property during various times of the week. This would result in diminished traffic volumes during peak visitation times.

During construction, delivery and haul trucks may temporarily result in traffic congestion affecting level of service of roadways in the Study area. City policies and design standards would be incorporated to minimize traffic congestion resulting from the proposed Project and promote multi-modal active transportation components. Impacts to traffic during operation of the proposed Project would be beneficial. However, because construction of the proposed Project would add trucks to streets that could cause congestion, the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

c) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located near an airport. The proposed Project would not result in any changes in air traffic patterns because the proposed Project would not affect air traffic levels or change the location of nearby airports or air operations. Therefore, there would be no impact on air traffic patterns, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

d) Would the project substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would include a transportation system operating within a subsurface Main Artery Tunnel running completely within public ROW. The path of the Main Artery Tunnel of the proposed Project would include gradual turns consistent with the City streets under which they are proposed. Tunnel engineers would adhere to civil engineering and gravitational force loading standards for passenger comfort when designing the proposed Project to maximize rider comfort and safety. Although impacts related to design features or incompatible uses are expected to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Area is surrounded by the prominent streets listed in Response XVI a) that would provide access for emergency vehicles. Access to surrounding major and
secondary highways would be maintained during operation of the proposed Project.

The proposed Project would comply with applicable safety requirements to include the installation of approximately six Access Shafts spaced evenly along the Project Main Artery Tunnel to enable emergency egress and/or rescue access in the event of emergency.

Hospitals are located in the vicinity of the Project Area. Construction of the proposed Project would add vehicles to local roads that could increase congestion. Impacts related to this topic are expected to be less than significant. However, because of the important relationship between proposed Project vehicle use and emergency access to nearby hospitals, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

Less than Significant Impact. As described in Section XVI, a), the proposed Project would provide a public transportation route linking Dodger Stadium to East Hollywood/Los Feliz/Rampart Village neighborhoods; the proposed Project would promote objectives in adopted plans. Additionally, the proposed Project would promote multi-modal active transportation components, including linkages to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g., Metro Red Line). The proposed Project would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation; therefore, the proposed Project would have beneficial impacts, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
**XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, 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)? □ □ □ □

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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? □ □ □ □

---

**a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, 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 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)?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As described in Section V, Cultural Resources, the proposed Project would involve substantial ground disturbance, and therefore has the potential to discover, alter, remove, or destroy tribal cultural resources could include objects, sites, or features with value to a California Native American Tribe. The NAHC has been contacted to determine the Native American Tribes historically associated with the area. Consultation with identified tribes will be conducted and the likelihood for resources evaluated. Impacts would be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, 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 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed Project would require ground-disturbing activities that could unearth Tribal Cultural Resources that may be discovered and determined to be significant pursuant to PRC Section 5024.1. Such resources could include objects, sites, or human remains. The proposed Project is located in a heavily developed area that has already been highly disturbed. In the event human remains are discovered, all construction activities would cease, and the Los Angeles County Coroner would be contacted if any human remains are discovered, in accordance with Title 14, CCR, Section 15064.5(e). If the coroner determines that the human remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) would be notified to determine the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) for the area. The MLD would make recommendations for the arrangements for the human remains per PRC Section 5097.98

If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall stop in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner contacted. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Further provisions of PRC Section 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable.

The NAHC has been contacted to determine the Native American Tribes historically associated with the area. Consultation with identified tribes will be conducted and the likelihood for resources evaluated. Impacts would be potentially significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?</td>
<td>☐</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>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>
<tr>
<td>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project includes the creation of a transportation system and would not include restrooms for riders. Construction of the proposed Project would generate wastewater that would be disposed into the sewer system or haul off-site for disposal. Wastewater is generated from the production of grout and from cleaning down working surfaces. The proposed Project would generate an anticipated 500 to 1000 gallons per day. Water generated from grout production
would contain high pH (basic) and high total suspended solids (TSS). Water would be treated on-site through use of settlement tanks before being disposed off-site or discharged into the sewer. The wastewater treatment required for these uses would not exceed the requirements of the applicable RWQCB. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this topic will not be discussed further in the EIR.

b) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See Response XVII a). Los Angeles’ water is a mixture of groundwater pumped from the local area, treated SWP water, and water that is imported by the City of Los Angeles from the Owens Valley (County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2017). Likely water for the proposed Project would be provided via LADWP, which is a member of Metropolitan Water Authority, which gets water from the SWP and the Colorado River.

The proposed Project is in a fully developed, urban setting. The Project Area is predominately commercial use. Operation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to generate significant wastewater. Construction of the proposed Project is not expected to substantially increase the demand on existing water and wastewater infrastructure in the area. Although impacts related to this topic are expected to be less than significant this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would occur on existing developed land with impervious surfaces and would be converted to a condition similar to the current state. During construction, surface waters would be routed to existing underground storm drain systems and/or lined channels, thus avoiding offsite erosion. As described in Section IX, BMPs would be implemented to avoid impacts to water quality (e.g., runoff, sedimentation, etc.). Impacts are expected to be less than significant; however, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is expected to receive water from several sources including, treated SWP water and water that is imported by the City of Los Angeles from the Owens Valley. The demand would be temporary, potentially satisfied by diverse sources, and suitable for use of recycled water. Project operation would not require large amounts of water resulting in the need for new or expanded entitlements. Although impacts are anticipated to be less than significant, this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

e) Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed Project would not include the significant
production of wastewater or requirement for wastewater treatment. Therefore, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. Construction of the proposed Project could produce wastewater requiring downstream treatment; however, this would be temporary and undertaken in coordination with BOE. Although impacts are expected to be less than significant this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed Project would produce minimal waste predominantly related to vehicle maintenance.

Construction of the proposed Project would include the generation of up to approximately 150,000 cubic yards of earth material. Project construction would be short-term, and the disposal of solid waste would be minimized through the recycling and reuse of materials (e.g., as beneficial reuse material, as engineered fill, or as pressed earth blocks), as feasible. Waste would be generated during the removal of structures; however, this waste would be accommodated by a landfill with sufficient capacity. Although impacts on receiving landfills are expected to be less than significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Response XVII f), project operation would not result in the generation of significant solid waste. Project construction would include the generation of excavated material, which would generate solid waste requiring disposal at nearby landfills if not suitable for recycling or reused.

Project construction would generate waste from oils, greases, and solvents which may be characterized as non-RCRA hazardous and may require disposal at appropriate hazardous waste facilities. The proposed Project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the safe handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, including RCRA, which includes requirements for hazardous solid waste management; the DTSC Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5), which include standards for generators and transporters of hazardous waste; and the provisions of the City’s Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Division, which include requirements for proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances.

The Applicant would be responsible for educating construction workers on the proper classification and disposal of solid waste, which would ensure compliance with federal, state, and local statues and regulations; although impacts are expected to be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR. Energy use by the proposed Project will be addressed in the EIR, consistent with Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines.
XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, substantially 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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is located in an urban environment and would include construction and operations consistent with current uses. Several historic buildings are present within the Project Area; however, the proposed Project would not occur on the same sites as these structures. The proposed Project would also involve substantial excavation, which could result in impacts to unknown or undiscovered archaeological or paleontological resources as addressed in section V. Although unlikely, impacts could be significant, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Potentially Significant Impact. The impacts relevant to the proposed Project are localized and confined to the immediate Project Area. However, there could be significant impacts on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, noise, and transportation and traffic. These impacts could potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts, and this topic will be discussed further in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed Project would include the construction of a transportation system for public use. Potentially significant impacts associated with air quality, land use and planning, noise, and transportation and traffic could result from implementation of the proposed Project.

Until the impacts are fully analyzed, and mitigation measures are determined, a final impact analysis cannot be made. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project may result in a potentially significant impact and could result in significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. These topics will be evaluated in the EIR.

In addition, EIR's are required to consider energy conservation because of the implications of inefficient or wasteful energy use, for which analysis consistent with CEQA Guidelines Appendix F, will be included in the EIR.
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# Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Bureau of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Cleanup and Abatement Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>California Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>Cease and Desist Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>Decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-Weighted Decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCAA</td>
<td>Federal Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Federal Railroad Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADOT</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Maximum Noise Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>Leaking Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>Most Likely Descendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRZ</td>
<td>Mineral Resource Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>Oxides of Nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTP</td>
<td>Regional Connector Transit Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Record of Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>South Coast Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRRA</td>
<td>Southern California Regional Rail Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMARA</td>
<td>Surface Mining and Reclamation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>State Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101</td>
<td>United States Highway 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Volatile Organic Compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR</td>
<td>Waste Discharge Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>