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Project title: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project

Lead Agency name and address: County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90020

Contact person and phone number: Julie Yom, AICP, Park Planner (213) 351-5127

Project location: The proposed approximately 8.1-acre park site is located at 1000 West 204th Street in the unincorporated community of West Carson, near the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and South Vermont. Torrance Boulevard is approximately 1,200 feet (0.23) miles south of the park site, South Vermont Avenue and Interstate 110 are approximately 380 feet (0.07 miles) and 1,900 feet (0.35 miles) east of the site, respectively. The project site is generally bound by an unpaved road to the north, residences on Budlong Avenue, Berendo Avenue, and Catalina Street to the south, and residences on South New Hampshire Avenue and West 204th Street border the park site to the east and west, respectively.

Description of project: The Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP) in coordination with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation propose the construction and operation of the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project (Project). Park facilities would include a variety of playing fields and courts (e.g., baseball, soccer, futsal), play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building with an office/community meeting room, a maintenance building, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment, landscaping, and parking. The Project would also include amenities such as benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, BBQs, bike racks, and litter receptacles. Project construction would begin in the fourth quarter of 2017 and take approximately 15 months to complete.

The Project would incorporate environmental mitigation measures to ensure protection of park users. Implementation of these measures related to environmental media would be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) through a Removal Action Workplan. These measures are detailed below and would principally include: a durable cover over the existing ground surface composed of hardscaped material, such as asphalt or concrete, or clean soil underlain by a marker material; vapor barriers under enclosed structures; and a requirement that ensures that the durable cover be maintained and groundwater not be used.

Proposed Finding: Based on the information contained in the Initial Study, the County of Los Angeles finds that there would not be a significant effect to the environment because the mitigation measures described herein would be incorporated as part of the Project.

Public Review Period: March 29, 2017 to April 28, 2017

(continued on next page)
Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Project to Avoid Significant Effects:

Air Quality

AIR-1: If 12 cubic yard trucks are used to import or export soil to the project site, to reduce NOx emissions generated during park construction to a less than significant level, a minimum of 66% of the diesel fueled off-road construction equipment used during project construction shall have engines certified to meet US EPA Tier 2 emission standards (or higher). This may be achieved by using engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on exhaust gas management devices, and/or other options as such become available.

AIR-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.2): The DANP shall prepare and implement a dust control plan that includes the following dust control strategies:

- Water shall be misted or sprayed by a water truck at least twice per day but also as often as needed to prevent formation of visible dust while clearing the Site, excavating, transferring soil on-Site, stockpiling, or loading or decontaminating transportation vehicles.
- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on the Site.
- Soil shall be sprayed or misted as it is unloaded from transport vehicles if minimizing the drop heights does not adequately prevent dust generation.
- Vehicle tires shall be cleaned prior to leaving the Site.
- Adjacent public streets shall be inspected at least three times per day including once at the end of the shift and shall be swept using a vacuum street sweeper if necessary.
- Dust monitoring will be conducted to ensure that workers and other individuals in the vicinity, including community members, are not affected by fugitive dust. Dust monitoring will be conducted in compliance with Site-specific Air Monitoring Plan (see Appendix D of the Draft Final RAW). In the event that wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour for more than 5 minutes in any one hour or when dust control measures are not able to prevent visible dust emissions, soil moving activities shall be halted until wind speeds decrease and no visible emissions are observed.
- All stockpiled soil that is not actively handled shall be securely covered with plastic sheeting.

Biological Resources

BIO-1: To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of state and federal laws pertaining to birds, if construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to September 15 or per local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot buffer for non-raptors and 1,000-foot buffer for raptors shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist. Surveys for nesting birds shall occur no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has eggs or chicks in it, or adults are observed carrying food to the nest. The results of the surveys shall be documented. If it is determined that birds are actively nesting within the survey area, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall apply. Conversely, if the survey area is found to be absent of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall not be required.

BIO-2: If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment including, but not limited to, equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal/modification, fence installation, demolition, and grading shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified
biologist. Monitoring shall be required to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.4):** Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, tan bark, or gravel.

**Cultural Resources**

**CUL-1:** In the event that archaeological, non-tribal, resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Archaeological Sensitivity Training will be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in ground moving activities on the site. DPR shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If appropriate, the archaeologist may introduce archaeological monitoring on all or part of the site. An archaeological report will be written detailing all archaeological finds. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Mitigation Measure TRC-1 will be implemented as provided in Section 17, “Tribal Cultural Resources.”

**CUL-2:** If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, then the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, then the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the County in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: To reduce the risks to human health and the environment from the release or potential release of site contamination, DANP shall obtain DTSC approval and implement a Final Removal Action Workplan, consistent with DTSC’s approved Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant & Restrictions and EPA’s recommendations included in its September 2015 Reasonable Steps Letter for the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project prior to the start of any site remediation or construction work.

HAZ-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.1): Entry of personnel and equipment into the construction areas (exclusion zones) will be controlled to avoid contact with constituents of interest (COIs) (e.g. lead) and related transfer of site soil. The surfaces of construction equipment will be brushed off to remove loose soil prior to their removal from the site. Prior to leaving the site, trucks will go through a decontamination process to ensure that site soils are not spread beyond the borders of the site. Specifics of the decontamination process will be finalized upon selection of subcontractors, but will adhere to specifications as set forth in the transportation plan. The anticipated decontamination procedure would include a dry procedure with “rumble strips” to shake off large particles and brooms and brushes to remove smaller particles. Daily street sweeping will be conducted to minimize impacts to the community. It is not anticipated that wet decontamination will be required. However, contingencies for inclement weather will include wet decontamination and the subsequent onsite collection of any excess water.

HAZ-3 (Draft Final RAW, Section 9.0 and Appendix G): A site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared for the site in accordance with current health and safety standards as specified by the federal and California OSHAs and submitted to DTSC prior to initiation of field work. The DANP shall require the on-site contractor and its subcontractors doing fieldwork in association with the project to either adopt and abide by the HASP, or develop their own safety plans which, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the HASP. All onsite personnel shall read the HASP and confirm their acceptance in writing before starting site activities.

HAZ-4 (Draft Final RAW, Appendix C, Section 4.2, and Appendix E, Section 3.0): The DANP shall implement a soil management plan to address potential adverse impacts related to disturbed, contaminated soils. The soil management plan shall address the following components:

- While excavation activities are taking place during grading, removed soil will be utilized as fill material at the site and placed below import cover fill material, underlain with a visual barrier. If the volume is greater than needed, it may be taken off site.

In the event that excavation for off-site disposal or unknown materials is required during grading, soil samples will be collected and analyzed for COIs to ensure the soils subject to excavation do not pose a health risk for the construction workers and neighborhood residents. No disturbing activities of the shallow soil rather than the anticipated activities described in the RAW shall be allowed prior to DTSC’s approval.

HAZ-5 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.5): The DANP shall install and maintain vapor barriers in any enclosed buildings built on site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.4): Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained.
Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, tan bark, or gravel.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

**HYD-1 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Prior to removal action activities, any storm drains located near the site (offsite) will be identified and temporarily protected by placing waterproof covers over the drains or berms (e.g., straw wattles and fiber rolls) around them to prevent an unauthorized release. These temporary controls will be inspected daily to ensure proper placement and integrity.

**HYD-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** During soil importation activities, surface water shall be prevented from ponding or causing excessive erosion in the earthwork areas by placing berms (e.g., soil berms, straw wattles, or fiber rolls) around the areas to prevent water run-on or run-off. Soil piles will also be covered with plastic sheets and surrounded by berms.

**HYD-3 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Excess stormwater may be diverted or containerized on-site in order to continue the field work. Depending on the risk level and potential contacts with the residual soil, the diverted or containerized water may be sampled for COIs in accordance with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and based upon the results of the analysis, disposed of, through existing stormwater inlets on-site, at a pre-approved treatment facility, or any other suitable manner that is approved by DTSC. A list of COIs for characterization of the diverted/containerized water will be provided to DTSC. The characterization of the water will be sufficient for DTSC to evaluate and determine if the method of disposal is appropriate.

**Noise**

**NOI-1:** To reduce potential temporary, construction-related increase in ambient noise levels at sensitive residential receptors:

- All construction occurring on the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project shall occur in compliance with the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Construction Noise Standards set forth in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.400, including but not limited to the requirement for all internal combustion engines to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air intake silencers.
- Construction work hours shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday to Saturday.
- Truck trips shall be routed to minimize travel on neighborhood residential roads to the maximum extent feasible.
- Construction and equipment staging areas shall be setup as far away as possible from adjacent residential areas. If feasible, staging areas shall be at least 175 feet from all adjacent residences. However, factors such as site specific ingress and egress requirements and the final planned sequence of construction activities may require staging areas to be located closer than 175 feet from adjacent residential areas.
- The following best management practices shall apply to equipment used on-site:
If feasible electrical service connections are available, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools as much as possible. If electric power is not feasible, use “quiet” generators (e.g., MQ Whisperwatt or equivalent) rates no greater than 60 dBA at 50 feet or 67 dBA at 23 feet.

All diesel compression-ignition equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall be operated with closed engine doors/mechanical compartments and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the DANP shall submit a mitigation plan prepared by a qualified engineer or other acoustical expert for review and approval by the County’s Departments of Regional Planning and Public Health that identifies the additional noise control measures that would be implemented construction activities within 175 feet of adjacent residences. These measures shall be designed to achieve compliance with the County’s construction noise control requirements contained in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440, and shall be designed to achieve a minimum 16 dB reduction from combined construction noise levels. Additional measures may include:

- Restrict engine idling to no more than five minutes.
- Use of temporary sound barriers at the property boundary or adjoining property lines. However, the inside face of any such barrier installed in close proximity to construction equipment shall be absorptive so that sound energy is not reflected back into the ambient environment.
- Use of a sound enclosure (e.g., three sides with a partial top) to shield stationary noise sources (generators, pumps, compressors).
- Provide notification to residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 48 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas (e.g., work activities within 50 feet of residences). This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a contact name and telephone number for the construction contractor and DANP staff member responsible for receiving and resolving construction-related noise complaints.

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

**TRC-1:** If subsurface deposits believed to be Tribal Cultural Resources or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.
- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a Tribal Cultural Resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or
California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

- If the find represents a Native American or potentially Native American resource that does not include human remains, then he or she shall further notify the Kizh Nation and the NAHC. The agency shall consult with the NAHC on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR. Work cannot resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

TRC-2: At the southwest side of the project site (where a driveway is proposed), the southeast side of the project site (where a sidewalk is proposed), and all other areas where grading and excavation activities are proposed, shall be monitored by one tribal monitor representing the Kizh Nation. The tribal monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities within 100 feet of a TCR or a potential TCR to determine if significant or potentially significant resources will be adversely affected by continuing construction activities. The tribal monitor shall use flagging tape, rope, or some other means, as necessary, to delineate the area of the find within which construction shall halt and the procedures in TRC-1 shall apply. Construction shall not take place within the delineated find area until the County consults on appropriate treatment. Tribal monitor may suggest options for treatment of finds for consideration. The County shall have ultimate authority over the treatment of new finds.

TRC-3: Consider All Potential Tribal Resources to be Significant. All Native American artifacts and finds suspected to be Native American in nature are to be considered as significant tribal cultural resources until the DPR has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative of the Kizh Nation and any other tribe as designated by the NAHC.

Transportation/Traffic

TRA-1 (Draft Final RAW, Sections 6.5.6 and 8.2, and Figure 9). DANP and/or its contractor will implement the Traffic Control Plan that has been prepared for the proposed project. During soil transport activities, trucks will enter the site though Del Amo Boulevard. A flagman will be located at the site to assist the truck drivers to safely drive into the site. Transportation will be coordinated in such a manner that at any given time, on-site trucks will be in communication with the site trucking coordinator. In addition, all vehicles will be required to maintain slow speeds (i.e., less than 15 mph) for safety and for dust control purposes (see Mitigation Measure AIR-2).

Prior to exiting the site, the site manager will be responsible for inspecting each truck to ensure that the trucks are empty of clean soil, the trucks do not contain extra soil from site areas, and that the truck’s manifest has been completed and signed by the generator (or its agent) and the transporter. As the trucks leave the site, the flagman will assist the truck drivers so that they can safely merge with traffic on Del Amo Boulevard.
Project title: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 S. Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90020

Contact Person and phone number: Julie Yom, (213) 351-5127

Project sponsor’s name and address: Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP), 315 W 9th St #950, Los Angeles, CA 90015

Project location: 1000 West 204th Street, Unincorporated Los Angeles County, CA 90502


USGS Quad: Torrance

Gross Acreage: Approx. 8.1

General plan designation: Residential H18 (0 to 18 dwelling units per acre)

Community/Area wide Plan designation: N/A

Zoning: Two Family Residences (R-2)

Description of project:

The Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP), in coordination with the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), has prepared this Initial Study (IS) to evaluate the potential environmental effects that could result from the construction and operation of the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project (proposed project). The proposed project would be located on approximately 8.1 acres of vacant land in the unincorporated community of West Carson. Park facilities would include a variety of playing fields and courts (e.g., baseball, soccer, futsal), play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building with an office/community meeting room, a maintenance building, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment, landscaping, and parking. The park would also include amenities such as benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, BBQs, bike racks, and litter receptacles. The project would incorporate environmental mitigation measures to ensure protection of park users. Implementation of these measures related to environmental media would be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) through a Removal Action Workplan. These measures are detailed below and would principally include: a durable cover over the existing ground surface composed of hardscaped material, such as asphalt or concrete, or clean soil underlain by a marker.
material; vapor barriers under enclosed structures; and a requirement that ensures that the durable cover be maintained and groundwater not be used.

**Project Setting**

The proposed approximately 8.1-acre park site is located at 1000 West 204<sup>th</sup> Street in the unincorporated community of West Carson, near the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and South Vermont Avenue (33°50'45" North latitude and 118°17'37" West longitude; see Figure 1, Regional Setting). The site is bordered by an unpaved road to the north, which is the County's planned right of way for a 0.2-mile extension of West Del Amo Boulevard; vacant lands are located across (to the north) of this unpaved road. Residences on Budlong Avenue, Berendo Avenue, and Catalina Avenue border the park site to the south, while residences on South New Hampshire Avenue and West 204<sup>th</sup> Street border the park site to the east and west, respectively. Torrance Boulevard is approximately 1,200 feet (0.23 miles) south of the park site. South Vermont Avenue and Interstate 110 are approximately 380 feet (0.07 miles) and 1,900 feet (0.35 miles) east of the site, respectively (see Figure 2, Project Location).

The proposed park site is east of the Montrose Chemical Corporation Superfund Site and south of the Del Amo Superfund Site. The Montrose Chemical Corporation manufactured dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) from 1947 to 1982 at a plant located approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the proposed park site. Fill material was transported to the proposed park site by the Montrose Chemical Corporation, which resulted in a removal action under the jurisdiction of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The EPA certified the removal action as complete, and in September 2015 subsequently identified the site as appropriate for its intended park use, provided enclosed structures (e.g., restrooms) are equipped with vapor barriers. Nonetheless, because of the placement of fill material at the project site from the Montrose Chemical Corporation, the EPA identified approximately one-half acre of the proposed park site as part of the Montrose Superfund site.

The majority of the Montrose Superfund Site is located off-site. That area is vacant and currently capped with asphalt. The Del Amo Waste Pits, located to the north of the proposed project site, are currently covered with a Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)-equivalent cap, constructed in 1999 and surrounded by a perimeter fence (C2REM 2017).

The proposed park site has consisted of vacant land since 2001 (C2REM 2017). The site is partially vegetated with shrubs and grasses typical of an urban setting, although some parts of the site are disturbed due to unauthorized use and lack of vegetation. Three trees are located in the northwestern corner of the site.

**Project Land Parcels**

The proposed park site includes 62 adjoining parcels and abandoned road ways (portions of 204th Street, Catalina Avenue and Berendo Avenue) totaling approximately 8.1 acres (C2REM 2017). Historically, the proposed site was used for residential structures. However, in 1998 these structures were demolished due to remediation activities that took place because of DDT soil contamination. For more information, see Site History below.

**Elevation and Topography**

The proposed park site is generally flat. Site surface elevations are approximately 31 feet above mean sea level (amsl) on the eastern portion of the site and gradually rise to approximately 41 feet amsl on the western portion of the site.

**Site History**

The proposed park site at 1000 West 204<sup>th</sup> Street has a history of soil contamination and remediation associated with the nearby Montrose Chemical Corporation Superfund Site and adjacent Del Amo
Superfund Site. As such, a series of environmental investigations were conducted from 1983 to 2006. The initial investigation was conducted by the State of California Department of Health Services (CDHS) on December 14 and 15, 1983. Analytical results indicated no detectable concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs). However, DDT concentrations were reported to be in excess of background sample levels. This discovery of DDT eventually lead to the permanent buy-out and relocation of residents along West 204th Street in 1994. Approximately fifty-five vacated residences were subsequently demolished in 1998, and the contaminated soils at and around the residences were remediated such that DDT concentrations were below the EPA action levels (LA County 2000).

In November 2001, the County of Los Angeles performed a limited site assessment, which identified elevated lead levels in two samples (at the same boring location) exceeding DTSC’s screening action level at that time (LADPW 2003). Additional samples were taken surrounding the initial borings which exhibited elevated lead concentrations when compared to the DTSC’s screening action level. Results indicated that the elevated lead concentrations were localized, and/or located at a depth greater than 3 feet. The post grading surface soils were sampled and concluded that the DDT soil concentrations in surface soils at the proposed park were found to be significantly lower than the site-specific risk level (C2REM 2017).

Current Conditions

In May 2015, Weston Solutions, Inc. (Weston) conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) which identified the following:

- Soil located in the western portion of the subject property is contaminated with DDT at concentrations below regulatory threshold limits (26 mg/kg).
- Metal slag material or “blue lava rock” is buried seven feet below ground surface in a trench capped with asphalt located in the western portion of the subject property (adjacent to and below the southern portion of the proposed basketball court). The rock contains arsenic, copper, lead and zinc in concentrations of potential concern.
- The groundwater and soil gas beneath the subject property is contaminated with chlorobenzene and other chemicals predominately originating from the Montrose Superfund site and limited benzene potentially from the Del Amo Superfund Site, with contamination extending downward through several water-bearing units.

Per the Phase I ESA, no further inquiry is needed for purposes of all appropriate inquiries; therefore, the property is suitable for exchange and/or acquisition (Weston, 2015). DTSC subsequently determined the only constituent of interest (COI) is lead as described below (DTSC 2015).

Also in 2015, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) requested that the proposed park site be evaluated per current health-based screening levels. As such, a Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant & Restrictions, was prepared for the project. Based upon the evaluation contained in this technical memorandum, DTSC concluded that DDT levels at the site have been remediated to the levels that are acceptable for park use. In addition, DTSC also found that lead exists on the property at levels greater than the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg in a few areas at a depth of three to five feet below ground surface. No other chemicals have been identified as a potential risk at the site.

Based on the numerous site investigations and the prior excavation and removal of impacted soils from the site, the EPA, CDHS, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, LA County Department of Public Health and DTSC have determined the appropriateness of the property for park use, provided certain actions are taken. Specifically, DTSC’s approval is contingent on addressing shallow lead in site soils, which the proposed project accomplishes by covering the site with imported soil. The EPA has also required the installation of vapor barriers under enclosed structures (e.g., restrooms).
Proposed Park Facilities

This section describes the proposed park facilities as shown on the final conceptual plan that the DANP has prepared for the project with input from the community (see Figure 3, Final Conceptual Park Plan). DANP’s final conceptual plan for the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park project reflects stakeholder input received at three community meetings held in January, April, and August 2016, including two conceptual plans presented to the local community in April 2016. In general, the park facilities would include a variety of playing fields and courts (e.g., baseball, soccer, futsal), play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building, a maintenance building, a community meeting room, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment and landscaping and parking. The park would also include amenities such as benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, BBQs, bike racks, and litter receptacles. The design base for these park facilities and features were obtained through three community meetings convened by the Los Angeles Conservation Corps in 2011.

Park Access, Circulation, and Trails

Vehicular and pedestrian access to the park would occur primarily via West 204th Street. However, pedestrian access would also be provided via Catalina Street, South New Hampshire Avenue and Berendo Avenue. The main vehicular and pedestrian access point to the park would be on the park’s western side, at the intersection of West 204th Street and Budlong Avenue. The DANP would use an existing curb cut at this location to provide access to the park’s parking lot, which would contain 60 parking spaces, including three (3) Americans with Disability Act (ADA)-accessible spaces, and one (1) van-accessible space. The proposed parking lot, which is also where the proposed maintenance building would be located, would occupy approximately 0.85 acres of the approximately 8.1-acre park site. The maintenance building would be an approximately 11-foot by 12-foot prefabricated building (approximately 130 square feet).

The park’s main entry plaza would also be located on its western side, at the intersection of Budlong Avenue and West 204th Street. This entry plaza would lead visitors onto the park’s main walkway, which would run in an east-west direction for approximately three quarters the length of the park site and provide access to the park’s various fields, play areas, and other facilities. The main walkway would connect to another park entrance located at the northern terminus of Berendo Avenue, near the southeastern corner of the park. Eight existing parking spaces on West 204th Street, but adjacent to Berendo Avenue, would provide additional vehicle parking.

In addition to the main walkway, a decomposed granite walking trail would travel along the eastern and northern perimeter of the park site.

Athletic Fields and Courts

The final conceptual plan for the proposed park includes one full size basketball court, two futsal courts, a baseball field, and a soccer field (which would be located on the interior of the baseball field).

The basketball and futsal courts would occupy approximately 0.5 acres near the center of the park, north of the main walkway; a group exercise equipment area would also be provided in this area. The ball field, located on the eastern portion of the project site, would occupy approximately 1.75 acres on the eastern side of the park (0.5 acres of which would consist of the under-8 soccer field).

Non-athletic Recreational Areas

The park includes open turf/lawn areas, a pedestrian plaza with tree wells, a children’s play area, and shade structures. These areas would provide picnic and other non-athletic recreational opportunities. The park’s play structures would primarily be located along the main walkway.
Landscaping

The final conceptual landscaping plan for the proposed park identifies more than 200 native and ornamental trees would be planted along the perimeter and on the interior of the park site, as well as drought tolerant landscaping.

Utilities and Other Site Improvements

DANP would connect to existing water, gas, and electric utilities present at or adjacent to the site. Other on-site improvements would include a precast monument sign and park lighting. Park lighting would consist of fixtures mounted to park maintenance and restroom buildings that are consistent with LA County Department of Parks and Recreation’s (DPR) Park Design Guidelines and Standards.

Project Design Features

The DANP has coordinated with the DTSC to delineate and characterize the extent of current contamination at the site, and has prepared a Draft Final Removal Action Workplan (Draft Final RAW) for the proposed park development (DTSC Site ID 401720; Envirostor ID No. 60002199). The Draft Final RAW has been approved by DTSC for public review and identifies the placement of a soil cover over the existing park surface, as part of the Draft Final RAW. This soil cover would be two-feet thick to ensure there will be no direct exposure to impacted soil remaining under the park.

The Draft Final RAW identifies other control measures required by DTSC to protect the public and environment from potential adverse effects that may arise as a result of construction and operation of the proposed park (see Appendix A).

Additionally, as part of the County’s draft lease agreement with DANP to operate and maintain the project, the County would comply with an environmental Land Use Covenant (LUC) established by DANP and DTSC. The LUC includes measures to ensure the protection of human health and the environment from residual environmental constituents. The continued coordination by and between DANP, the County, the EPA, and DTSC, as well as conformance with the measures put forth in the Draft Final RAW and LUC, satisfy the requirements set forth by the EPA in their Reasonable Steps Letter (USEPA 2015). For more information regarding the Draft Final RAW, LUC, and Reasonable Steps Letter see the Hazards section.

Project Construction and Operation

The DANP anticipates constructing the project over an approximately 12- to 16-month period beginning in the fourth quarter of 2017. Equipment would include grading and paving equipment, small cranes, and other standard construction equipment. The total import of soils necessary to provide two-feet of clean fill to cap unpaved areas of the site is estimated to be 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill; an additional 40 cubic yards may be cut and reconsolidated or be reused on-site as fill below the soil cover material. The anticipated import of soil at the site is estimated to result in 3,980 - 5,640 one-way truck trips (1,990 - 2,820 round-trips) depending on the of size truck that is used. All existing monitoring wells would be retained on site and would not be destroyed as a result of project construction.

Project construction and operation would be subject to procedures and conditions contained in the Draft Final RAW, which are incorporated into this IS as mitigation measures. These mitigation measures would ensure project construction, operation, and maintenance do not substantially threaten or pose an unacceptable risk to public health or the environment. In addition, the proposed park design is consistent with DPR’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards document. Upon completion of the proposed park, the DANP would lease the park property to DPR.

The proposed park hours of operation would be from sunrise to sunset, seven days a week.
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Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Agency</th>
<th>Approval Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTSC</td>
<td>Removal Action Workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Site Plan Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Construction and Encroachment Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Street Vacation Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)</td>
<td>California Construction General Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major projects in the area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Case No.</th>
<th>Description and Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - Los Angeles Region
  - Lahontan Region
- Department of Toxic Substance Control
- Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- SCAQMD

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns. Area

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- State Lands Commission
- University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
  - Sewer Maintenance Division

- Fire Department
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District
- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Regional Planning
- Sheriff Department
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
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 in 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 a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, 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 EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by) ____________________________ Date 2/21/17

Signature (Approved by) ____________________________ Date 2/21/17
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 the Lead Department 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 where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

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

3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then 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 EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "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 where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they 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 Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project’s impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on: 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project’s inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project’s impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).
1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The proposed project is located within a developed, flat, urbanized area in the unincorporated community of West Carson, approximately 5.5 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and 17.5 miles southwest of the San Gabriel Mountains. The proposed project site is not distinctly visible from the mountain range, and it would not inhibit views of the ocean or have a substantial adverse effect on any other scenic vista. No impact would occur.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

As discussed in response (a), the proposed project is located within a developed, flat, urbanized portion the unincorporated community of West Carson. Figure 10.1 of the County of Los Angeles’ 2035 General Plan indicates the closest existing hiking/riding trail, the Los Angeles River Trail, runs parallel to Interstate 710 and is approximately 5-miles east of the proposed project site (LA County; 2015a; LACDPR, ND). The project site is not visible from this trail or others. Thus, the project would not obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail. No impact would occur.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. The nearest eligible state scenic highway is the portion of State Route 1 that begins at the Outer Traffic Circle in Long Beach, approximately 9.5-miles southeast of the project site. The park site is not visible from State Route 1, and therefore, does not have the potential to damage scenic resources visible from that state scenic highway.

The project site is approximately 0.4 miles from Interstate 110, a locally adopted Scenic Highway as shown on Figure 9-7 of the County’s 2015 General Plan (LA County, 2015b). Although the project site is visible from the Interstate 110 West Del Amo Boulevard overpass, views are limited and the project site does not have any scenic resources. The site is partially vegetated with shrubs and grasses typical of an urban setting, although some parts of the site are disturbed due to unauthorized use and lack of vegetation. Three trees, located in the northwestern corner of the site, would remain on site during construction and operation phases of the proposed park. These three trees are not a scenic resource. The project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.
d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?

The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The project would consist of the construction and operation of a neighborhood park on a piece of land that has been vacant since 2001. The project would improve the visual character and quality of the site. The proposed park design is consistent with the DPR’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards, and final approval from the County would ensure consistency with applicable zoning and General Plan standards and requirements (LA County 2014). Thus, the project would not degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site. No impact would occur.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed park hours of operation would be from sunrise to sunset, seven days a week. Proposed park design incorporates lighting fixtures mounted to park maintenance and restroom buildings that are consistent with DPR’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards. The project would be consistent with DPR’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards, which addresses potential impacts to shadows, light, and glare. One of the ways in which the park would be designed to reduce glare is by incorporating shielded or cut-off luminaries. The project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No impact would occur.
2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<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) 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?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is not comprised of any farmland. The construction of a neighborhood park in an urbanized area will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland (CDC 2014). No impact would occur.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is zoned residential; it is not zoned for agricultural uses. The project site is not currently used for agricultural purposes and it is not designated as an Agricultural Opportunity Area or under a Williamson Act contract (CDC 2016). No impact would occur.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production within the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no forest land within the vicinity of project site. No impact would occur.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

There is no forest land or farmland within the vicinity of the project site, and the project would not result in changes to the environment that would result in the loss of either type of land. No impact would occur.
3. AIR QUALITY

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

Construction of the proposed project would result in the development of an approximately 8.1-acre neighborhood park. The proposed project would not induce population growth (see Population and Housing) or significantly increase traffic (see Traffic and Transportation). Since the proposed project would not induce population growth, the project would be consistent with the population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) projections of the existing SCAQMD Air Quality Plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would generate short-term construction emissions, and long-term operational emissions, primarily stemming from mobile source emissions. The project would not result in any new stationary source equipment at the site. The proposed project’s emissions were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.1 (see Appendix B). The results from the modeling are presented below.

**Short-Term Construction Emissions**

Project construction would generate short-term construction emissions from construction activities which would disturb approximately 8.1 acres in total. Construction activities would include site excavation and grading, soil import and compaction, park facility construction, new on-site utility improvements, and related construction worker commute trips. Park construction activities are anticipated to last approximately 15 months.

The DANP is in the process of identifying source(s) of 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill to be imported and distributed across the project site. Due to the uncertainty regarding where clean fill would come from, two different construction scenarios (one with mitigation) are presented, which provide a reasonable range in potential emissions resulting from construction of the proposed park project.

Project construction emissions for two different hauling scenarios were modeled using CalEEMod. Both modeled scenarios assume:
• 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill would be imported to the project site from a source or sources located within 20 miles of the proposed park site\(^1\),

• Limited material may be removed from the Site to a permitted landfill\(^2\);

• Import/export of soil would take place over approximately two and a half months;

• Construction activities would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403\(^3\).

The only difference in the modeled construction scenarios involves the size of the trucks used to haul soil to and from the proposed park site.

**Scenario 1: 17 Cubic Yard Trucks**

Scenario 1 evaluates the potential maximum daily emissions that could be generated during project construction with the use of 17 cubic yard capacity haul trucks. At this capacity, the number of trucks needed to accommodate the import and export of soils is estimated to be approximately 1,990, resulting in 3,980 total truck trips to and from the project site. The resulting emissions are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Season</th>
<th>Pollutant Emissions</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NO(_x)</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM(_{10})</th>
<th>PM(_{2.5})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD CEQA Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen above in Table 1, air quality emissions for Scenario 1 would be less than significant.

**Scenario 2: 12 Cubic Yard Trucks**

Scenario 2 evaluates the potential maximum daily emissions that could be generated during project construction with the use of 12 cubic yard capacity haul trucks. At this capacity, the number of trucks needed to accommodate the import and export of soils is estimated to be approximately 2,820, resulting in 5,640 total, one-way truck trips to and from the project site. The modeling also assumes two additional truck trips may be needed to remove potential debris from site, resulting in 5,642 total one-way truck trips. The

---

\(^1\) 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill would be needed to accommodate two feet of clean fill across the project site.

\(^2\) A 20-mile radius allows DANP the flexibility to select from potential projects occurring in Downtown Los Angeles, as well as closer locations such as new stadium development in Carson.

\(^3\) Off haul accounts for possible contaminated soil that may need to be hauled away from the project site, as well as any other debris.

\(^4\) SCAQMD Rule 403 requires the utilization of applicable best management practices to minimize fugitive dust emissions (e.g. watering disturbed areas twice a day).
resulting emissions are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Season</th>
<th>Pollutant Emissions</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOₓ</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂.⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNMITIGATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD CEQA Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MITIGATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD CEQA Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, unmitigated construction emissions for Scenario 2 would result in a potentially significant air impact due to the additional 1,660 one-way truck trips (as compared to Scenario 1) that would occur with smaller capacity (12 cubic yard) trucks. To reduce Scenario 2’s construction emissions to levels below SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds, DPR would require DANP to implement Mitigation Measure AIR-1, which would reduce the project’s total construction emissions by requiring the use of cleaner, on-site equipment to distribute the clean fill across the project site.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** If 12 cubic yard trucks are used to import or export soil to the project site, to reduce NOx emissions generated during park construction to a less than significant level, a minimum of 66% of the diesel fueled off-road construction equipment used during project construction shall have engines certified to meet US EPA Tier 2 emission standards (or higher). This may be achieved by using engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on exhaust gas management devices, and/or other options as such become available.

Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce potential, short-term, NOx emissions levels below SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds and thus render the project’s potential construction emissions to a less than
significant impact. It is also worth noting that the values presented in Table 1 and Table 2 present a worst-case, maximum emission during construction; most daily emissions would be below the values presented.

Although the values presented for PM10 in Table 1 and Table 2 are below the thresholds established by the SCAQMD, and the project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), DANP would also apply Mitigation Measure AIR-2 below to either Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. Mitigation Measure AIR-2 is consistent with the recommendations and requirements contained in the Draft Final RAW, and is intended to ensure the project’s potential fugitive dust emissions comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 and the CAL/OSHA Permissible Exposure Limit (PEL) for fugitive dust. As identified in the Draft Final RAW (see Appendix A), the primary dust source at the site is anticipated to be clean fill soils exposed during soil importing, stockpiling, compacting, and grading activities, as well as dust generated by wind and construction vehicle traffic. Potential dust receptors include onsite workers, pedestrians adjacent to the site, occupants of nearby residences and businesses, and vehicle drivers adjacent to the site.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.2):** The DANP shall prepare and implement a dust control plan that includes the following dust control strategies:

- Water shall be misted or sprayed by a water truck at least twice per day but also as often as needed to prevent formation of visible dust while clearing the site, excavating, transferring soil on-site, stockpiling, or loading or decontaminating transportation vehicles.
- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on the site.
- Soil shall be sprayed or misted as it is unloaded from transport vehicles if minimizing the drop heights does not adequately prevent dust generation.
- Vehicle tires shall be cleaned prior to leaving the site.
- Adjacent public streets shall be inspected at least three times per day including once at the end of the shift and shall be swept using a vacuum street sweeper if necessary.
- Dust monitoring will be conducted to ensure that workers and other individuals in the vicinity, including community members, are not affected by fugitive dust. Dust monitoring will be conducted in compliance with Site-specific Air Monitoring Plan (see Appendix D of the Draft Final RAW). In the event that wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour for more than 5 minutes in any one hour or when dust control measures are not able to prevent visible dust emissions, soil moving activities shall be halted until wind speeds decrease and no visible emissions are observed.
- All stockpiled soil that is not actively handled shall be securely covered with plastic sheeting.

As described above, the project would have a less than significant, short-term impact on air quality with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2.

**Long-Term Operational Emissions**
The proposed project would serve the local community as a neighborhood park. The primary generator of emissions on site for ROG would come from area sources, such as consumer products and paint reapplication for buildings. The highest generator for CO would be the result of park attendees traveling to and from the park in automobiles. The proposed project’s modeled, long-term emissions are presented below in Table 3.
As seen in Table 3, the proposed project’s operational emissions would not exceed the thresholds established by the SCAQMD. Thus, the project’s operational emissions would have a less than significant impact on air quality.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

As discussed in a) and b) above, the proposed project would not result in construction emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance through the implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 if 12 cubic yard trucks are used and AIR-2. Furthermore, the project would not result in the generation of operational emissions exceeding the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Although the project would emit criteria pollutants during construction and operation, they would not be at cumulatively considerable levels. Thus, implementation of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant and would have a less than significant impact on air quality.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The nearest residences are directly adjacent to the project site. Earthmoving for the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to dust, as indicated by the output of the CalEEMod simulations for particulate matter (as seen above in response b). Inclusion of this mitigation measure would ensure receptors in the area would not be exposed to substantial dust concentrations. Thus, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would have a less than significant impact on air quality.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Demand</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Total</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Demand</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Total</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIG 2016. See Appendix B.
number of people?

Construction of the project would generate typical odors associated with construction activities, such as oil odors associated with asphalt paving. The odors generated by the project would be temporary, intermittent and localized in nature. Therefore, the project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and would have a less than significant impact on air quality.
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

## Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Would the project:

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

The project area has been vacant since 2001. The site is very disturbed and contains only ruderal vegetation. For the most part, trees and shrubs are absent from the project area. Three eucalyptus trees are located in the northwest corner of the site and would remain on site during and after park construction.

Special-status species are those plants and animals that are legally protected or otherwise recognized as vulnerable to habitat loss or population decline by federal, state, or local resource conservation agencies and organizations. For this project, special-status species include:

- Species that are state and/or federally listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered;
- Species considered as candidates for listing as threatened or endangered;
- CDFW Species of Special Concern;
- Fully protected species per California Fish and Game Code; and
- Plants considered by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) and the CDFW to be rare, threatened, or endangered [California rare plant ranked, (CRPR); e.g. CRPR 1B].

The potential for special-status species to occur within the project area was analyzed by conducting a query of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society Inventory to see which species occur within the nine USGS topographical quadrangles (i.e., Inglewood, South Gate, Long Beach, Venice, Redondo Beach, Torrance, and San Pedro) surrounding the site and evaluating the habitat within the project area.

No threatened or endangered wildlife or plant species are anticipated to occur in the project area. No special-status plants, fish, or reptiles are anticipated to occur within or in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no impacts to these species would occur.

Nesting birds, including raptors, protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code could be present in the vegetation (e.g., trees, shrubs, and grasses) on and in the vicinity of the project site. Construction activities, including vegetation removal, during the avian breeding season (generally February 1 to September 15) could cause injury to individuals. In addition, noise and increased construction activity could temporarily disturb nesting or foraging activities, potentially resulting in the abandonment of nest sites. The implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measure BIO-1: To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of state and federal laws pertaining to birds, if construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to September 15 or per local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot buffer for non-raptors and 1,000-foot buffer for raptors shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist. Surveys for nesting birds shall occur no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has eggs or chicks in it, or adults are observed carrying food to the nest. The results of the surveys shall be documented. If it is determined that birds are actively nesting within the survey area, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall apply. Conversely, if the survey area is found to be absent of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall not be required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment including, but not limited to, equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal/modification, fence installation, demolition, and grading shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist. Monitoring shall be required to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.4): Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, tan bark, or gravel.

As described above, the project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources with the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, through BIO-3.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

Sensitive vegetation communities include riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or designated by the USFWS and CDFW. No sensitive natural vegetation communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands) are present on or adjacent to the project area. No impact would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to,
marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The project site does not contain either Federal jurisdictional or State-protected wetlands, drainages, or waters. No impact would occur.

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?

Although wildlife may use the project area as a travel route as a stepping stone during large scale movements, there are no established native resident of migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites in or near the project area. The project area is located in a developed area and is surrounded by paved roads, major highways, and/or residences in all directions that pose a barrier to terrestrial wildlife. There are no waterbodies on or near the project area that could be used as a movement corridor or nursery site for aquatic species. Therefore, the project would not interfere substantially with any movement of native or resident or migratory wildlife species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

There are no oak trees, oak woodlands, Joshua trees, junipers, southern California black walnut, or other native trees in or adjacent to the project area. No impact would occur.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

There are no Wildflower Reserve Areas, native trees, SEAs, or SERAs in or adjacent to the project area. No impact would occur.
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

There are no existing or planned Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that include the project area. No impact would occur.
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

The California Historical Records Inventory System (CHRIS) Search from the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) showed no record of current or past historic structures or historic resources on or within a one-half mile radius or Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the site. There are no local historic inventories to search. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

There are no known archaeological resources within the project site and one isolated archaeological record (19-000099) within the APE as identified by the CHRIS record. The record shows the presence of archaeological artifacts (mortars) reported by a third-party. For confidentiality, the exact area of the discovery cannot be identified in public documents (Government Code Sections 6250 and 6254(r)). The site has been previously developed, and most soils on-site have been disturbed to a depth of seven feet due to remedial activities. Other earth moving activities will be primarily within additional soil brought in from off-site, however, there is anticipated to be limited trenching for utilities so there is the possibility to encounter native soils. In addition, due to the significant history in the surrounding area, there is a chance of encountering archaeological resources within previously disturbed site soils not been previously subject to CEQA, and that may have gone unnoticed during prior site housing development. As such, the following mitigation measures will be implemented to safeguard unanticipated archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: In the event that archaeological, non-tribal resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications and Standards. Archaeological Sensitivity Training will be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in ground moving activities on the site. DPR shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If appropriate, the archaeologist may introduce archaeological monitoring on all or part of the site. An archaeological report will be written detailing all archaeological finds. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Mitigation Measure TRC-1 will be implemented as provided in Section 17, “Tribal Cultural Resources.”

As described above, the project would have a less than significant impact on cultural resources with the
implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

There are no known unique geologic features on the site and no known unique paleontological resources. Due to the limited grading activities and previously developed nature of the site, there will be no earth moving activities at a depth that paleontological resources would be encountered. No impact would occur.

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

There are no known cemeteries on or surrounding the project site. Due to this and the limited depth of grading activities, no human remains are anticipated during earth moving activities. In the event of the discovery of human remains, the following Mitigation Measure will be implemented to safeguard the remains.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, then the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, then the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the County in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

As described above, the project would have a less than significant impact on cultural resources with the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2.
6. ENERGY

Would the project:

a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code (L.A. County Code Title 31)? □ □ □ ✔

The project is subject to all components of and complies with the Green Building Program: Green Building, Low-Impact Development, and Drought Tolerant Landscaping. The project does not conflict with the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code. No impact would occur.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)? □ □ □ □

Appendix F, Section 1 of the CEQA Guidelines requires evaluation of energy efficiency only for Environmental Impact Reports. The environmental determination for this project is a mitigated negative declaration. Therefore, this checklist item is not applicable.
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

   The Alquist-Priolo Act requires the California State Geologist to identify areas in the state that are at risk from surface fault rupture; these areas are called Earthquake Fault Zones. There is no fault trace within the project site on the Torrance Quadrangle Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone map (CDMG, 1986).

   The nearest active faults with a surface trace are the Newport Inglewood Fault, mapped approximately 5 miles east of the site, and the Palos Verdes Fault, approximately 4.2 miles southwest of the site. The Newport Inglewood fault zone is located approximately 3.1 miles northeast of the project site. The Newport Inglewood fault system is ~66km long on shore and extends northwest from Huntington Beach through Lang Beach to Culver City and Cheviot Hills. Several earthquakes occurred along this fault zone, such as the “Long Beach” earthquake on March 10, 1993, whose epicenter off Newport Beach had a reading of maximum moment magnitude (Mw) 6.4 (Converse 2016, see Appendix C). The Newport Inglewood fault is considered to be active and capable of producing a Mw 7.1 earthquake. The concealed trace of the Palos Verdes fault is located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the project site along the base of the Palos Verdes Peninsula. The Palos Verdes fault is approximately 80km long with onshore and offshore branches. The California Geologic Survey considers the Palos Verdes fault a “Potentially Active” fault, and it is considered capable of producing 6.0 – 7.0 Mw earthquake depending on the number of fault segments that rupture (Converse 2016). Due to the project site distance from the aforementioned faults, the potential for surface rupture is low.

   The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from earthquakes due to potential surface rupture of an active fault. The impact would be a less than significant.

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

   Although there are no known faults directly on the project property, there are still a few active faults in the area as discussed in response a). These regional faults are likely to result in strong ground shaking at the project site. However, the proposed project would comply with the recommendations in the geotechnical report prepared by Converse Consultants, and applicable County and State building standards. The project, therefore, would not expose structures (or people around them) to potential adverse effects and would result in a less than significant impact.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

Liquefaction is the sudden decrease in the strength of cohesion less solids due to dynamic or cyclic shaking. The project site is not located within a designated soil liquefaction area (CDMG, 1999). In the geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project, Converse Consultants performed liquefaction analyses using LiquefPyPro Version 5.8n, 2012, by Civil Tech Software for the upper 50 feet below ground surface. The results indicate the site soils are not susceptible to liquefaction, and therefore no impact would occur.

iv) Landslides?

The project site is not near any steep slopes, and is not located within an identified landslide zone (CDMG, 1999). No impact would occur.

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

Topsoil is used to cover surface areas for the establishment and maintenance of vegetation due to its high concentrations of organic matter and microorganisms. The proposed project site would be covered with two feet of clean fill, which would provide an additional barrier between the contaminated soil on site and the park visitors. The proposed approximately 8.1-acre park would also be subject to a General Construction Permit (due to the project being greater than one-acre), which would require the preparation of a SWPPP regardless of if the Building Official requests it or not. Typical construction BMPs include covering and/or binding the soil surface using mulch, geotextiles, mats, hydro-seeding, earth dikes, and swales. Following project construction, paving, structures, and landscaping would cover the entire site. Impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations.

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

Lateral spreading of the ground surface during a seismic activity usually occurs along the weak shear zones within a liquefiable soil layer and has been observed to generally take place toward a free face (i.e. retaining wall, slope, or channel) and to lesser extent on ground surfaces with a very gentle slope. Lateral spreading is not likely to be a substantial hazard due to the relatively flat nature of the project site and project area. Liquefaction can also cause subsidence and an accompanying loss of bearing strength. Potential for subsidence is unlikely as the project site is not subject to liquefaction. The project is required to be constructed in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC includes a requirement that any City- or County-approved recommendations contained in the soils report be made conditions of the building permit. Compliance with existing CBC regulations would limit hazard impacts arising from unstable soils to less-than-significant levels. The geotechnical report concludes the potential for lateral spreading is considered very low (Converse 2016) and would result in a less than significant impact.

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?

[Check boxes provided]
The geotechnical report has identified the upper five feet of soils as having a “low” expansion potential, and has made recommendations to reduce any risks to life or property that may be posed by expansive soils. The project will incorporate these recommendations as design features. This impact would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No onsite wastewater treatment systems are proposed for the project. The park would be connected to the local public sewer system. This impact would be less than significant.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

The project site does not contain any areas of slope with grades greater than 25 percent that are proposed for development. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or any other hillside design standards. No impact would occur.
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The proposed park site currently consists of vacant land and therefore does not have existing sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project site would result in short-term GHG emissions from construction activities, and long-term GHG emissions from park operation.

**Short-Term Emissions**

The proposed project will result in short-term greenhouse gas emissions from construction and installation activities. Greenhouse gas emissions will be released by equipment used for demolition, grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating activities. GHG emissions would also result from worker and vendor trips to and from the project site. Table 4 (Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions) summarizes the estimated yearly emissions from construction activities. Unlike the Air Quality section that presents criteria air pollutants for hauling Scenarios 1 and 2, this GHG impact analysis will only present emissions from Scenario 2 since it would have the greatest construction GHG emissions. Carbon dioxide emissions from construction equipment and worker/vendor trips were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.1. Construction activities are short-term and cease to emit greenhouse gases upon completion, unlike operational emissions that are continuous year after year. Because of this difference, SCAQMD recommends in its draft threshold to amortize construction emissions over a 30-year operational lifetime. This normalizes construction emissions so that they can be grouped with operational emissions in order to quantify the project’s GHG inventory. Amortized construction emissions are included in Table 4.

---

5 Scenario 1 would generate a total of approximately 936 MTCO₂e during project construction. Scenario 2 would generate a total of approximately 1,000 MTCO₂e during project construction (see Appendix B).
Table 4
Construction GHG Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>GHG Emissions (MT/YR)</th>
<th>Total (MTCO(_2)e)(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO(_2)</td>
<td>CH(_4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>430.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>566.51</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Total</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIG 2016. See Appendix B.

(A) The reference gas for measuring GWP is CO2, which has a GWP of one. By comparison, CH4 has a GWP of 25, which means that one molecule of CH4 has 25 times the effect on global warming as one molecule of CO2. Multiplying the estimated emissions for non-CO2 GHG by their GWP determines their carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e), which enables a project’s combined global warming potential to be expressed in terms of mass CO2 emissions.

Long-Term Emissions
Proposed project activities will result in long-term GHG emissions from mobile and other operational sources. Mobile sources, including vehicle trips to and from the project site, will result primarily in emissions of carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)) with minor emissions of methane (CH\(_4\)) and nitrous oxide (N\(_2\)O). The most significant GHG emission from natural gas usage will be methane. Electricity usage by the proposed project and indirect usage of electricity for water and wastewater conveyance will result primarily in emissions of carbon dioxide. Disposal of solid waste will result in emissions of methane from the decomposition of waste at landfills coupled with CO\(_2\) emission from the handling and transport of solid waste. These sources combine to define the long-term greenhouse gas emissions inventory for the build-out of the proposed project.

Table 5 below presents the estimated emissions from operational use of the neighborhood park.

Table 5
Proposed Long-Term GHG Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO(_2)</th>
<th>CH(_4)</th>
<th>N(_2)O</th>
<th>Total (MTCO(_2)e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>74.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water / Wastewater</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>31.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>105.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIG 2016. See Appendix B.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory
Table 6 (Proposed GHG Emissions Inventory) summarizes the yearly estimated greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project. The project will generate an additional 139.50 MTCO\(_2\)e over existing conditions, annually.
A numerical threshold for determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) has not officially been adopted by the SCAQMD. In 2008, the SCAQMD adopted interim GHG thresholds (SCAQMD 2008). The latest threshold developed by SCAQMD is 3,000 MTCO$_2$E per year for residential and commercial projects. This threshold is based on the review of 711 CEQA projects.

Although this 3,000 MTCO$_2$E threshold is designed to be used for residential and commercial projects, it is the most applicable threshold available for use on this project$^6$. As such, the County of Los Angeles has elected to use this threshold for determining this specific project’s GHG emission significance. As seen in Table 6 above, the project’s estimated emissions are substantially below the 3,000 MTCO$_2$E threshold. The park would not be a substantial generator of GHGs as it does not involve new, stationary sources, and it was designed to serve the existing local community. Thus, the project would not generate short-term or long-term GHGs in quantities that would have a significant impact on the environment. This impact would be less than significant.

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

The County has adopted the 2013 edition of the California Building Code (County Code Title 26 (Building Code), including the California Green Building Standards Code (County Code Title 31 (Green Building Standards Code). The project would be subject to the California Green Building Standards Code, which requires new buildings to reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies for large buildings, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. The project does not include any feature (i.e. substantially altered energy demands) that would interfere with implementation of these state and County codes and plans. No impact would occur.

---

$^6$The SCAQMD has established a GHG significance threshold of 10,000 MTCO$_2$E for industrial sources (e.g. petroleum refineries, food processing plants, cement manufacturing plants, etc.). Utilization of this threshold for the proposed project would be inappropriate, as the project is not similar in any way to an industrial source. Therefore, the lower GHG interim guidance threshold of 3,000 MTCO$_2$E for residential/commercial projects has been applied to the project.
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

The proposed project would consist of the construction and operation of a neighborhood park. The project would not involve the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

In May 2015, Weston Solutions, Inc. (Weston) conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) which identified the following:

- Soil located in the western portion of the subject property is contaminated with DDT at concentrations below regulatory threshold limits (26 mg/kg).
- Metal slag material or “blue lava rock” is buried seven feet below ground surface in a trench capped with asphalt located in the western portion of the subject property (adjacent to and below the southern portion of the proposed basketball court). The rock contains arsenic, copper, lead and zinc in concentrations of potential concern.
- The groundwater and soil gas beneath the subject property is contaminated with chlorobenzene and other chemicals predominately originating from the Montrose Superfund site and limited benzene potentially from the Del Amo Superfund site, with contamination extending downward through several water-bearing units.

Per the Phase I ESA, no further inquiry is needed for purposes of all appropriate inquiries; therefore, the property is suitable for exchange and/or acquisition (Weston, 2015). DTSC subsequently determined the only COI is lead (DTSC 2015).

Also in 2015, the DTSC requested that the proposed park site be evaluated per current health-based screening levels. As such, a Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant & Restrictions was prepared for the project. Based upon the evaluation contained in this technical memorandum, DTSC concluded that DDT levels at the site have been remediated to the levels that are acceptable for park use. But DTSC also found that lead exists at the property at levels greater than the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg in a few areas at a depth of three to five feet below ground surface. No other chemicals have been identified as a potential risk at the site.

Based on the numerous site investigations and the prior excavation and removal of impacted soils from the site, the EPA, CDHS, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, LA County Department of Public Health and DTSC have determined the appropriateness of the property for park use, provided certain actions are taken. Specifically, DTSC’s approval is contingent on addressing shallow lead in site soils, which
the proposed project accomplishes by covering the site with imported soil. The EPA has also recommended placing vapor barriers under enclosed structures (e.g., restrooms, maintenance building, etc.) as identified in the Draft Final RAW.

Due to the project’s proximity to two superfund sites, and the site’s history of contamination, the proposed park site contains one existing groundwater monitoring well and four existing soil vapor monitoring wells. The County would implement the control measures as identified in the Draft Final RAW (see Appendix A) as mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse impacts related to project construction and operation:

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:** To reduce the risks to human health and the environment from the release or potential release of site contamination, DANP shall obtain DTSC approval and implement a Final Removal Action Workplan, consistent with DTSC’s approved *Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant & Restrictions* and EPA’s recommendations included in its September 2015 *Reasonable Steps Letter* for the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project prior to the start of any site remediation or construction work.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires DANP to obtain DTSC approval of a Final RAW intended to protect human health and the environment from the release or potential release of site contaminants. Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-6 are control measures identified in the Draft Final RAW.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.1):** Entry of personnel and equipment into the construction areas (exclusion zones) will be controlled to avoid contact with constituents of interest (COIs) (e.g., lead) and related transfer of site soil. The surfaces of construction equipment will be brushed off to remove loose soil prior to their removal from the site. Prior to leaving the site, trucks will go through a decontamination process to ensure that site soils are not spread beyond the borders of the site. Specifics of the decontamination process will be finalized upon selection of subcontractors, but will adhere to specifications as set forth in the transportation plan. The anticipated decontamination procedure would include a dry procedure with “rumble strips” to shake off large particles and brooms and brushes to remove smaller particles. Daily street sweeping will be conducted to minimize impacts to the community. It is not anticipated that wet decontamination will be required. However, contingencies for inclement weather will include wet decontamination and the subsequent onsite collection of any excess water.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 (Draft Final RAW, Section 9.0 and Appendix G):** A site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared for the site in accordance with current health and safety standards as specified by the federal and California OSHAs and submitted to DTSC prior to initiation of field work. The DANP shall require the on-site contractor and its subcontractors doing fieldwork in association with the project to either adopt and abide by the HASP, or develop their own safety plans which, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the HASP. All onsite personnel shall read the HASP and sign the “Personal Acknowledgment Form” (Attachment G-1 of the HASP) before starting site activities.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 (Draft Final RAW, Appendix C, Section 4.2, and Appendix E, Section 3.0):** The DANP shall implement a soil management plan to address potential adverse impacts related to disturbed, contaminated soils. The soil management plan shall address the following components:

- While excavation activities are taking place during grading, removed soil will be utilized as fill material at the site and placed below import cover fill material, underlain with a visual barrier. If the volume is greater than needed, it may be taken off site.
- In the event that excavation for off-site disposal or unknown materials is required during
grading, soil samples will be collected and analyzed for COIs to ensure the soils subject to excavation do not pose a health risk for the construction workers and neighborhood residents. No disturbing activities of the shallow soil rather than the anticipated activities described in the RAW shall be allowed prior to DTSC’s approval.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.5):** The DANP shall install and maintain vapor barriers in any enclosed buildings built on site.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.4):** Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, tan bark, or gravel.

In addition to the above mitigation measures, the County, as a lessee would be bound by the terms of the LUC. The LUC (as presented in the Draft Final RAW, Section 6.3) is summarized below.

**Prohibited Uses.** The Environmentally Restricted Area shall not be used for any of the following purposes without prior written approval by the DTSC:

a) A residence, including any mobile home or factory built housing, constructed or installed for use as residential human habitation.

b) A hospital for humans.

c) A public or private school for persons under 21 years of age.

d) A day care center for children.

**Soil Management.**

a) No activities that will disturb the soil in the Environmentally Restricted Area at or below pre-construction grade shall be allowed at the Property without a Soil Management Plan (SMP) pre-approved by the DTSC in writing. Final grade will be determined upon completing import soils activities.

b) Any soil brought to the surface by grading, excavation, trenching or backfilling shall be managed onsite and if necessary characterized and disposed of appropriately offsite in accordance with the SMP and all applicable provisions of state and federal law.

c) Any breach of the clean cover soil or its equivalent shall upon discovery be repaired immediately by reinstalling the clean cover soil or an equivalent in the breached area.

**Prohibited Activities.** The following activities shall not be conducted at the Property:

a) Drilling for any water, oil, or gas without prior written approval by the Department.

b) Extraction or removal of groundwater without pre-approval by the Department in writing.

In addition to the items listed above, the LUC would also specify that the DTSC and/or USEPA would also have reasonable right of entry and access to the park property for inspection, investigation, remediation, monitoring, and other activities as deemed necessary by DTSC and/or USEPA in order to protect the human health or safety or the environment.

**Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-6, as well as the provisions set forth in the**
LUC and the project design feature, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a neighborhood park. Sensitive land uses within one-quarter mile of the project site include residences adjacent to the project site on the west, south, and east; there are no schools or hospitals within a quarter-mile. Project construction activities would release diesel particulate matter (DPM), a toxic air contaminant (TAC) through the use of internal combustion engines. However, as described in Air Quality response d), project construction emissions would be less than significant and would not generate substantial pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptor locations. Operation of the proposed park would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses. The impact would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The proposed project is located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5. However, as discussed in response b) above, because the DANP is currently coordinating with the DTSC to remediate existing lead contamination that could pose a risk to the public or the environment there is no significant impact. Prior to construction or operation of the proposed park, the DANP would obtain a letter of “no further action” or letter of similar effect from the DTSC. The impact would be less than significant.

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?

The proposed project is located approximately 3.3-miles from the nearest airport, Torrance Airport. The airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport operates in some capacity between the hours of 5:00 AM and 10:00 PM, seven days a week. The airport has two runways, running from the northwest to the southeast. The Air ion Influence Zone encompasses airport property, general commercial use to the west and north, business park use, and light industrial uses. Runway protection zones are located at each end of the runways (northwest and southeast portions of the Air ion Influence Zone) (Torrance, 2010). Thus, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur.

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?

The proposed project is located approximately 3.3-miles from the nearest airport, Torrance Airport. The airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport operates in some
capacity between the hours of 5:00 AM and 10:00 PM, seven days a week. The airport has two runways, running from the northwest to the southeast. The Airport Influence Zone encompasses airport property, general commercial use to the west and north, business park use, and light industrial uses. Runway protection zones are located at each end of the runways (northwest and southeast portions of the Airport Influence Zone) (Torrance, 2010). Thus, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of an approximately 8.1-acre neighborhood park. It would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

**h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:**

i) **within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?**

The project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Cal Fire, 2012). No impact would occur.

ii) **within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?**

The project site is not within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access. The project site is located in an urbanized area with easy access to arterial roads such as Normandie Avenue, South Vermont Avenue, and West Del Amo Boulevard. The Los Angeles Fire Department Station 79 is approximately 1.7 miles from the project site, and Torrance Fire Department is located approximately 2.7 miles away. No impact would occur.

iii) **within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?**

The proposed park would be served by existing utilities at and around the project site. The project would be designed to provide adequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards. No impact would occur.

iv) **within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?**

The project site is not located in proximity to land uses with a potential for dangerous fire hazard. The project site is surrounded by residential uses to the west, south, and east; and to the north by the former Del Amo Waste Pits (which are covered with a Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)-equivalent cap). None of these land uses are a dangerous fire hazard. No impact would occur.
i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? ☒

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a neighborhood park. Park use does not entail the regular use of large amounts of hazardous or highly flammable materials or substances. Thus, the proposed use would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. No impact would occur.
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</table>

Would the project:

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

Construction activities are regulated by the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ (General Permit) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Based on the nature of the removal activities, project construction may potentially impair storm water quality. A notice of intent (NOI) to obtain coverage under the General Permit may be necessary. Like Mitigation Measures HAZ-2 through HAZ-6, Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3 are consistent with the language provided in the Draft Final RAW. Implementation HYD-1 through HYD-3 would ensure the protection of stormwater.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-1 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Prior to removal action activities, any storm drains located near the site (offsite) will be identified and temporarily protected by placing waterproof covers over the drains or berms (e.g., straw wattles and fiber rolls) around them to prevent an unauthorized release. These temporary controls will be inspected daily to ensure proper placement and integrity.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-2 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** During soil importation activities, surface water shall be prevented from ponding or causing excessive erosion in the earthwork areas by placing berms (e.g., soil berms, straw wattles, or fiber rolls) around the areas to prevent water run-on or run-off. Soil piles will also be covered with plastic sheets and surrounded by berms.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-3 (Draft Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Excess stormwater may be diverted or containerized on-site in order to continue the field work. Depending on the risk level and potential contacts with the residual soil, the diverted or containerized water may be sampled for COIs in accordance with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and based upon the results of the analysis, disposed of, through existing stormwater inlets on-site, at a pre-approved treatment facility, or any other suitable manner that is approved by DTSC. A list of COIs for characterization of the diverted/containerized water will be provided to DTSC. The characterization of the water will be sufficient for DTSC to evaluate and determine if the method of disposal is appropriate.

The project site will be connected to an existing municipal wastewater system. In unincorporated Los Angeles County, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Low-Impact Development Ordinance, as well as the requirements of the County’s MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System), in order to control and minimize potentially polluted runoff. This impact would be less than significant through implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such
that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The proposed park would be served by a public water system and would not use the local, contaminated groundwater as specified in the Land Use Covenant. No impact would occur.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

The site is relatively level, but does contain drainage courses and storm drains that were constructed in 2001. These drainage courses and storm drains were later accepted to the LA County Flood Control District as Private Drain No. 2518. Existing storm drains are tied into Budlong Avenue, Catalina Avenue, and Berendo Avenue. These storm drains were designed to manage the entire project site.

Construction of the proposed park would result in a new, onsite storm drain system that would tie into the existing storm drain system along New Hampshire Avenue. Where possible, existing drainage areas would be maintained in order to provide the least amount of impact to the existing storm drain system. The project would be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance. Table 7 presents potential drainage BMPs that may be incorporated into the project to help improve storm water quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMP</th>
<th>Parking Lot</th>
<th>Edge of Paved Path</th>
<th>Planted Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catch Basin Filter Inserts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Filterra” Curb Opening Inlet</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Modular Wetlands”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioswale with Underdrain</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetated Swale</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS “Stormceptors”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cartridge/Jellyfish” Filter Units</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Huit-Zollars 2016.

The BMPs identified in Table 7, once implemented, would help filter water before it enters the municipal storm system. It should be noted that the potential drainage BMPs listed in Table 7 are only options at this point, and no specific BMPs have officially been selected. Regardless of which BMPs are finally chosen for implementation, the site would be reviewed to ensure compliance with the County’s MS4 Permit (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System). This impact would be less than significant.
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

The site is relatively level, and does not contain any substantial drainage courses. Construction of the proposed park would include construction of a new onsite storm drain system that ties into the existing storm drain system along New Hampshire Avenue. Where possible, existing drainage areas (left over from the past residential developments) would be maintained in order to provide the least impact to the existing storm drain system. The project would be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements, as well as the LID Ordinance. Table 7 above presents potential drainage BMPs that may be incorporated into the project to help improve storm water quality. This impact would be less than significant.

c) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a neighborhood park. The project would not create conditions in which standing water could accumulate, increasing the habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors. No impact would occur.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

The proposed project would be subject to the County’s Low Impact Development Ordinance to minimize or reduce runoff. Furthermore, DANP would be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements. This impact would be less than significant.

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

The proposed project would be subject to the County’s Low Impact Development Ordinance to minimize or reduce runoff. Furthermore, DANP would be required to submit an approved drainage plan and comply with all NPDES and MS4 requirements. This impact would be less than significant.

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?

The project will be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance.
No impact would occur.

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

The project site is located inland from the coastal portions of Los Angeles County and connects to the municipal storm drain system. Since the project is subject to the County’s Low Impact Development Ordinance, adherence to the requirements would prevent any substantial discharge of nonpoint sources of pollutants.

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)-designated Area of Special Biological Significance identified on the SWRCB website. This impact would be less than significant.

j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

The proposed project does not propose the use of onsite wastewater treatment plants. No impact would occur.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The project will be connected to the existing public water and sewer systems. This impact would be less than significant.

l) 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, or within a floodway or floodplain?

The project does not propose housing and the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Map. No impact would occur.

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Map. No impact would occur.

n) 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?

There are no flood zones, levees, or designated damn inundation areas in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.
0) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The project site is not located within a seiche or landslide zone, or within a tsunami inundation area. No impact would occur.
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<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>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?

The proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project is located in a residential area, and would not result in a physical division of an established community. The proposed project does not require the construction of new freeways, rail lines, or flood control channels, and the proposed project would conform to the existing street grid. The proposed project would be designed to enhance the neighborhood connectivity. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

The site of the proposed project is designated as H-18 Residential by the General Plan 2035 Land Use Policy Element (LA County 2015b, c). The proposed park use is consistent with applicable County plans. No impact would occur.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

The proposed project is zoned Residential (R-2) (LA County 2015c). As specified in Chapter 22.20.200 of the Los Angeles County Municipal Code, parks and playgrounds are an approved property use in Zone R-2. Since this is a County project, no conditional use permit is required for compliance with the zoning designation, and no impact would occur.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

The proposed project site does not contain any area exceeding 25 percent in slope and is not subject to the requirements of the Hillside Management Ordinance. The proposed project site is not located within any Significant Ecological Area. No impact would occur.
12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project would be located in a built environment within urban Los Angeles County. The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, as the proposed project site is not identified as a mineral resource area (CGS 2012). No impact would occur.

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?

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, as the proposed project site is not identified as a Mineral Resource Zone as identified in the Los Angeles County General Plan (LA County 2015c). No impact would occur.
13. NOISE

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</table>

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new neighborhood park. The proposed park site is currently vacant, therefore any noise (construction or operational) would increase the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed park, as discussed below.

**Short-Term Construction Noise**

Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440 identifies specific restrictions regarding construction noise. The code prohibits the use of construction tools and equipment between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday to Saturday, as well any time on Sundays and legal holidays, in such a manner that the sound from this equipment creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line. The code further states that contractors shall conduct construction activities in such a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected buildings will not exceed those listed in Table 8. In addition, the code requires all mobile and stationary internal-combustion-powered equipment and machinery to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air-intake silencers in proper working order. Noise from motor vehicles operating in a legal manner is generally exempt from the County’s construction noise control requirements.
Construction of the proposed park would generate noise from deliveries and the use and operation of construction equipment. The noise levels generated by typical construction equipment such as the type that would be used to construct the proposed park project are shown in Table 9.

### Table 9
**Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Without Feasible Noise Control</th>
<th>With Feasible Noise Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dozer or Tractor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactor</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-end Loader</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPA 1971

1 Feasible noise control includes the use of intake mufflers, exhaust mufflers, and engine shrouds in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.

The proposed project construction activities would primarily include site preparation (soil import and stockpiling, grading, and minor amounts of excavation) and installation of park facilities, which would not require substantial amounts of equipment given the proposed hardscaping and structural facilities. Thus, in general, the first stage of construction (site preparation), which would involve importing soil from off-site locations, earth moving, and compaction of soils, is anticipated to be the noisiest. The equipment that
would be used during this stage of construction would include heavy-duty trucks, scrapers, graders, backhoes, and front-end loaders. As shown in Table 9, a single piece of equipment operating at a distance of 50 feet from a sensitive receptor, such as the single and multi-family residences that are adjacent to the project area's southern, eastern, and western boundaries, would generate noise levels of between 79 and 85 dB. If two or more pieces of equipment were operating at the same time, the resulting noise levels would be between approximately 82 and 90 dB, and as high as approximately 96 dB if equipment were to operate at or within 25 feet of the adjoining property line. These noise levels exceed the construction noise restrictions listed in Table 8 above for both single-family (75 dB noise restriction) and multi-family (80 dB noise restriction) residential land uses and would also be physically annoying, disturbing, and intrusive of normal residential activities. However, it is worth noting that three pieces of equipment operating at a distance of 175 feet from the adjoining property line would only produce noise levels of 79 dB, below the County’s construction noise restriction for multi-family residential land uses. Thus, since the proposed site is approximately 360 feet long (on its north-south axis) by 1,050 feet wide (on its east-west axis), construction activities would not uniformly impact adjacent sensitive receptors, but would rather increase and decrease as site preparation and grading areas approached and moved away from the residences situated along the southern, eastern, and western boundaries of the proposed park site. Nonetheless, project construction would have the potential exceed the requirements set forth in the County code. Accordingly, DPR has incorporated Mitigation Measure NOI-1 into the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** To reduce potential temporary, construction-related increase in ambient noise levels at sensitive residential receptors:

- All construction occurring on the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project shall occur in compliance with the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Construction Noise Standards set forth in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.400, including but not limited to the requirement for all internal combustion engines to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air intake silencers.
- Construction work hours shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday to Saturday.
- Truck trips shall be routed to minimize travel on neighborhood residential roads to the maximum extent feasible.
- Construction and equipment staging areas shall be setup as far away as possible from adjacent residential areas. If feasible, staging areas shall be at least 175 feet from all adjacent residences. However, factors such as site specific ingress and egress requirements and the final planned sequence of construction activities may require staging areas to be located closer than 175 feet from adjacent residential areas.
- The following best management practices shall apply to equipment used on-site:
  - If feasible electrical service connections are available, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools as much as possible. If electric power is not feasible, use “quiet” generators (e.g., MQ Whisperwatt or equivalent) rates no greater than 60 dBA at 50 feet or 67 dBA at 23 feet.
  - All diesel compression-ignition equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall be operated with closed engine doors/mechanical compartments and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
- Prior to issuance of grading permits, the DANP shall submit a mitigation plan prepared by a qualified engineer or other acoustical expert for review and approval by the County’s
Departments of Regional Planning and Public Health that identifies the additional noise control measures that would be implemented construction activities within 175 feet of adjacent residences. These measures shall be designed to achieve compliance with the County’s construction noise control requirements contained in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440, and shall be designed to achieve a minimum 16 dB reduction from combined construction noise levels. Additional measures may include:

- Restrict engine idling to no more than five minutes.
- Use of temporary sound barriers at the property boundary or adjoining property lines. However, the inside face of any such barrier installed in close proximity to construction equipment shall be absorptive so that sound energy is not reflected back into the ambient environment.
- Use of a sound enclosure (e.g., three sides with a partial top) to shield stationary noise sources (generators, pumps, compressors).

- Provide notification to residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 48 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas (e.g., work activities within 50 feet of residences). This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a contact name and telephone number for the construction contractor and DANP staff member responsible for receiving and resolving construction-related noise complaints.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the proposed project’s temporary on-site construction noise levels would be compliant with County requirements and rendered a less than significant impact. The proposed project would also result in off-site construction noise from truck trips associated with soil hauling and equipment and material deliveries. It is noted that, in general, a doubling of traffic results in a 3 dB increase in ambient noise levels (Caltrans 2013). The proposed project would not result in a long-term doubling of vehicle traffic on any roadway and, furthermore, noise from motor vehicles legally operating is exempt from the County’s construction noise requirements. Thus, off-site construction activities would not expose persons to, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the County. This impact would be less than significant.

**Long-Term Operational Noise**

The new noise sources that would be generated as a result of the project would include activities at the ball field, soccer field, futsal courts, basketball court, and children playing on the play structures. Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.170 (C) provides an exemption for outdoor activities, such as those listed above. Thus, operation of the proposed park would not expose persons to, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the County. This impact would be less than significant.

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

For structural damage, the California Department of Transportation uses a vibration limit of 0.3 inches/second, peak particle velocity (inches/second, PPV) for older residential buildings. If this ground borne vibration level threshold is exceeded, the result may be “architectural” damage to normal dwellings.
Site construction and development would involve the intermittent use of construction equipment such as graders and bulldozers throughout the park property that would generate ground-borne vibration. Vibratory rollers/compactors, large bulldozers, haul trucks, and jack hammers are estimated to produce ground-borne vibration levels, in terms of PPV, of approximately 0.21, 0.09, 0.08, and 0.04 inches per second, respectively, at a distance of 25 feet (FTA 2006). These values are below the Caltrans’ 0.3 inches per second PPV standard for architectural damage.

At their closest, earth moving activities would take place approximately 25 feet from residences. As indicated above, under applicable limits these activities would not be anticipated to damage any structures around the project site. However, some earthmoving activities may be slightly perceptible by residents in their homes. These earthmoving activities would be temporary, intermittent, occur during the daytime hours when most people are at work or school, and would typically be located more than 25 feet from residences. Thus, the project would not expose persons to the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. This impact would be less than significant.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a new community park which would be open from sunrise to sunset. Although the project would increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity from existing conditions, it would not substantially impact the residences around the site. The largest presumed noise generating activities would take place at the basketball court, futsal courts, baseball field/soccer field, and the parking lot. As discussed in a) above, the park would only be open during daytime hours and the noise that would be generated would be typical of a community park including conversation, referee whistles, children playing, etc. Low level noise generated from those enjoying the park would generally be located on the interior of the park and not adjacent to residences. The setback would reduce the amount of noise reaching residences bordering the proposed park site. This impact would be less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

As discussed in response a) above, the project would generate noise at levels that could be inconsistent with the standards established by the County. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would render the proposed project’s potential temporary increases in noise a less than significant impact.

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?

The proposed project is located approximately 3.3 miles from the nearest airport, Torrance Airport. The airport serves approximately 500 aircraft, housing primarily private aircraft. The airport operates in some capacity between the hours of 5:00 AM and 10:00 PM, seven days a week. The airport has two runways, running from the northwest to the southeast. The Airport Influence Zone encompasses airport property,
general commercial use to the west and north, business park use, and light industrial uses. The proposed park site is not located within the Torrance Airport influence area or any noise contour area or noise-impacted zone associated with Torrance Airport. This impact would be less than significant.

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?

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a new neighborhood park. The park is intended to serve the existing population. The project would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a new neighborhood park on land that is currently vacant. It would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would not displace any people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

The project would involve the construction and operation of a neighborhood park. The project would not induce population growth. No impact would occur.
15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

The proposed project would not create capacity or service level problems, and it would not require the physical alteration of fire departments. The neighborhood park does not involve any tall structures requiring ladder trucks or any other new vehicles that may be needed for site specific responses beyond current services provided to the neighborhood. The Los Angeles County Fire Department Station 158 is approximately 3.6 miles from the project site via surface streets, and the Los Angeles Fire Department Station 36 is approximately 2.4 miles away via surface streets. Based on the project’s location within an existing service area, the park would be adequately served by either of these stations. After a preliminary review of the site plan through LA County’s “one-stop” permit consultation service, the County of Los Angeles Fire Department did not indicate a need for any new or substation facilities to serve the new neighborhood park. The Los Angeles County Fire Department will provide additional review of the project’s design-level details, including compliance with the 2016 California building and fire codes, during the building permit application process. This impact would be less than significant.

Sheriff protection?

The proposed project would be a neighborhood park mainly frequented by local residents. However, it would have the potential to attract visitors from other areas, potentially resulting in a slight increase in the number of existing calls for service to the site over the existing conditions. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Carson Station is located approximately 1.85 miles southeast of the proposed project site. The potential increase in calls for service is not expected to impact police protection services that would require the construction of a new police station. Additionally, given the close proximity between the proposed project and the Sheriff's Carson Station, it is unlikely that response times for police protection services would be adversely affected to the point of requiring a new police station. During the building permit application process, the County will review the Project’s design-level details for security provisions (e.g. lighting, emergency alarms, etc.). The proposed project would not create a need for new or physically altered facilities to maintain adequate service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. This impact would be less than significant.

Schools?

The proposed project would not create any additional increase school-age population for the Los Angeles Unified School District. No impact would occur.

Parks?

The proposed project is a neighborhood park. The project would not result in substantial adverse impacts to
other parks. No impact would occur.

Libraries?

The closest libraries are: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, located approximately two miles northeast; Gardena Mayme Dear Library, located approximately 2.4 miles northwest; and Carson Library, located approximately 2.85 miles southeast, of the proposed project site. The proposed project would be a neighborhood park mainly frequented by local residents. However, it would have the potential to attract visitors from other areas that would also visit the local libraries. This impact would not create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

The proposed project is not perceived to create capacity or service levels problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts for any other public facility. This impact would be less than significant.
16. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</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?

The proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project would create a neighborhood park that would likely alleviate the current use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities located near the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would provide a neighborhood park available to local residents and the general public. The project would not require the construction or expansion of other neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. This impact would be less than significant.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?

The proposed project would not interfere with regional open space connectivity. The project would improve regional open space connectivity by opening a neighborhood park where there is an existing vacant lot. This impact would be less than significant.
17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) 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)?  

There are no records of Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) within the project site and one isolated archaeological record (19-000099) within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) as identified by the CHRIS record. The record shows the presence of archaeological artifacts (mortars) reported by a third-party, the description of which is consistent with Native American artifacts. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search. As requested by the NAHC (an extension of the SLF search), scoping letters to local tribal representatives were sent informing them of the project and requesting any relevant information on TCRs within the local vicinity of the project site. In response to these scoping letters, a Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation) Representative reported the presence of a significant TCR in the area surrounding the project.

The DPR had been previously contacted by the Kizh Nation requesting formal notification on CEQA projects under Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) and Section 21080.3.1 (d) of the California Public Resources Code (PRC). The Kizh Nation were contacted by the DPR on October 11, 2016 informing the tribe of the proposed project and beginning the consultation process. This, in addition to the response to the IS scoping letter sent to the Kizh Nation, led to the determination that TCR eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) could be present and significantly affected by ground moving activities (see Appendix D). The consultation was completed on November 22, 2016 with the agreement of adopting specific mitigation measures (see below) designed to protect potential TCRs.

TCRs are legally protected in the California Public Resources Code (PRC), and per consultation between the Kizh Nation and DPR as set out in AB52, the following mitigation measure will be implemented to safeguard unknown TCRs.

**Mitigation Measure TRC-1:** If subsurface deposits believed to be Tribal Cultural Resources or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:
• If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.

• If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a Tribal Cultural Resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

• If the find represents a Native American or potentially Native American resource that does not include human remains, then he or she shall further notify the Kizh Nation and the NAHC. The agency shall consult with the NAHC on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or CRHR. Work cannot resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP or CRHR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

Mitigation Measure TRC-2: At the southwest side of the project site (where a driveway is proposed), the southeast side of the project site (where a sidewalk is proposed), and all other areas where grading and excavation activities are proposed, shall be monitored by one tribal monitor representing the Kizh Nation. The tribal monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities within 100 feet of a TCR or a potential TCR to determine if significant or potentially significant resources will be adversely affected by continuing construction activities. The tribal monitor shall use flagging tape, rope, or some other means, as necessary, to delineate the area of the find within which construction shall halt and the procedures in TRC-1 shall apply. Construction shall not take place within the delineated find area until the County consults on appropriate treatment. Tribal monitor may suggest options for treatment of finds for consideration. The County shall have ultimate authority over the treatment of new finds.

As described above, the project would have a less than significant impact on tribal resources with the implementation of Mitigation Measures TRC-1 and TRC-2.

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

Under CEQA a significant resource is one that is listed in a California or local historic register. However, in addition to assessing whether resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the California Register criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project’s impacts to historical resources (PRC...
§21084.1, 20174, 14 CCR § 15064.5(3). As it is possible for a lead agency to determine that an artifact is considered significant to a local tribe, and thus would be considered a significant resource under CEQA, all Native American resources are to be considered significant until the lead agency has enough evidence to consider an artifact, or other find that is not be eligible for listing, not significant. To safeguard finds which could be considered significant at the later discretion of the DPR, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

**Mitigation Measure TRC-3**: Consider All Potential Tribal Resources to be Significant. All Native American artifacts and finds suspected to be Native American in nature are to be considered as significant tribal cultural resources until the DPR has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative of the Kizh Nation and any other tribe as designated by the NAHC.

As described above, the project would have a less than significant impact on tribal resources with the implementation of Mitigation Measures TRC-3.
**18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

<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) 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>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy established for maintaining the effectiveness or performance of the circulation system. The project site consists of approximately 8.1-acres of vacant land, surrounded by residential and industrial development in the unincorporated community of West Carson. Due to the barren nature of the site, all trips associated with the project are presumed to be new trips.

Project construction would add temporary vehicle trips to South Vermont Avenue, Torrance Boulevard, and Normandie Avenue from construction crews, vehicles carrying extra wide and/or long loads (including scrapers, excavators, bulldozers, etc.) and cement/soil hauling trucks. Project construction-related trips would be temporary and intermittent, occurring throughout the day. The DANP anticipates the project would generate approximately 3,980 total trips in Scenario 1, or 5,640 total trips in Scenario 2 (see Air Quality) for debris hauling, soil hauling, and concrete trucks over the course of the 15-month construction schedule. This equates to an average of approximately 12 truck trips per day for Scenario 1 vs. approximately 17 truck trips per day for Scenario 2 over the 15-month construction period. However, truck trips would not be evenly distributed throughout the construction period. Rather, most truck trip activity would occur during the initial grading phase, when the 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill would need to be imported to the site. As described under discussion d) below, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require the DANP or its contractor to prepare and implement a construction traffic control plan that, in part, identifies the final haul route for the project, and requires the DANP or its contractor to avoid potential conflicts with the existing transportation system such as insufficient turning radii, pedestrian conflicts, or truck noise issues by using flagmen, identifying alternate haul routes, or limiting the time when deliveries and hauling activities can occur.

Neighborhood parks are designed to serve the surrounding community and typically do not generate a substantial number of trips per day. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition), the project is expected to generate 41 AM peak hour trips and 32 PM peak hour trips once it is operational. Throughout the day, the project may generate 160 new vehicle trips to local roadways. These new trips can be accommodated by the existing transportation infrastructure surrounding the project site, such as West Del Amo Boulevard, South Vermont Avenue, and Normandie Avenue. Due to the minor number of trips the project could generate, the project would not conflict with the performance measures established by the Department of Public Works. This impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?

Pursuant to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Congestion Management Plan (CMP), any project that adds 150 or more vehicle trips to freeway segments or 50 or more vehicle trips to roadway segments during peak hours must be examined for impact of CMP roadways and intersections. As discussed above, project construction has the potential to introduce a large quantity of trucks to the roadways in the vicinity of the project site, including Interstate 110. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would ensure haul trucks during the grading phase would not conflict with the applicable CMP.

Once constructed, the proposed project would serve the local community. It would not add more than 150 vehicle trips to Interstate 110 during peak hours, which is approximately 0.4 miles from the project site. Furthermore, the project would not generate 50 or more vehicle trips on the roadway segments during peak hours. As such, the project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or level of service standard established by the congestion management agency. This impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

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?

The proposed project is located approximately 3.3-miles from the nearest airport, Torrance Airport. The project would not result in changes to air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

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

The proposed project would add construction-related vehicle trips to some, if not all, of the following roadways: Normandie Avenue, South Vermont Avenue, Torrance Boulevard, and Interstate 110. In particular, the proposed project could generate up to 5,640 total truck trips (debris hauling, soil hauling, and concrete trucks) over the course of the 15-month construction schedule. This equates to an average of approximately 17 truck trips per day over the 15-month construction period. However, truck trips would not be evenly distributed throughout the construction period. Rather, most truck trip activity would occur during the initial grading phase, when the 33,800 cubic yards of clean fill would need to be imported to the site. A large number of heavy duty trucks converging on the project site would have the potential to clog the roadways and lead to potential truck queues (e.g., trucks waiting to turn into or out of the proposed park site), which could cause traffic backups. This is considered a potentially significant impact. As such, the County would require the DANP to implement Mitigation Measure TRA-1 to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure TRA-1 (Draft Final RAW, Sections 6.5.6 and 8.2, and Figure 9).** DANP and/or its contractor will implement the Traffic Control Plan that has been prepared for the proposed project. During soil transport activities, trucks will enter the site though Del Amo Boulevard. A flagman will be located at the site to assist the truck drivers to safely drive into the site.
Transportation will be coordinated in such a manner that at any given time, on-site trucks will be in communication with the site trucking coordinator. In addition, all vehicles will be required to maintain slow speeds (i.e., less than 15 mph) for safety and for dust control purposes (see Mitigation Measure AIR-2).

Prior to exiting the site, the site manager will be responsible for inspecting each truck to ensure that the trucks are empty of clean soil, the trucks do not contain extra soil from site areas, and that the truck’s manifest has been completed and signed by the generator (or its agent) and the transporter. As the trucks leave the site, the flagman will assist the truck drivers so that they can safely merge with traffic on Del Amo Boulevard.

As described in Mitigation Measure TRA-1, the DANP or its contractor would implement a construction traffic control plan to avoid potential hazards in the existing transportation system. The project, therefore, would not substantially increase transportation related hazards due to any design feature or incompatible land use and construction activity. This impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  

As described in discussion d) above, construction activities associated with the proposed project has the potential to result in a large number of heavy duty trucks converging on the roadways around the project site. Through the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, backups and other potential conflicts such as trucks blocking intersections would not occur, allowing emergency vehicles to pass without issue.

Once the park is constructed, emergency access to the park site would be provided via West Del Amo Boulevard on the east, West 204th Street on the west, and residential streets on the south. A large path, which traverses the park site from West 204th Street to Berendo Avenue, would provide emergency access to the interior of the site. The project would not block or provide inadequate emergency access to the site or the surrounding area. This impact would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

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?  

The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The proposed park site is not located in a transit oriented district. However, the park site is surrounded by sidewalks, and the County’s Bicycle Master Plan identifies the segment of Del Amo Boulevard between Normandie Avenue and Interstate 110 as location for a Class II Bikeway project. A Class II bicycle lane is a striped and signed lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway. This improvement would enhance access to the site for non-motorized vehicles.

As discussed in the project description and various other locations in the document, the proposed park was designed to be consistent with DPR’s Park Design Guidelines and Standards document. This document, among other things, provides goals and standards to include features that benefit those who wish to use alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the Bikeway Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Transit Oriented District development standards in the County General Plan Mobility.
Element, or other adopted policies, plans, or other programs supporting alternative transportation. The park development will continue to comply with all applicable policies and regulations. This impact is less than significant.
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

The construction and operation of the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project would not exceed treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. All public wastewater disposal (sewer) systems are required to obtain and operate under the terms of an NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit, which is issued by the local Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). All municipal wastewater treatment facilities are required to obtain NPDES permits from the RWQCB. Subsequently, any project that connects to such a system would be required to comply with the same standards imposed by the NPDES permit. As such, these connections would ensure compliance of the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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?

The proposed project would be located in Sanitation District 8 within Los Angeles County. Sanitation District 8 encompasses 31.3 square miles that contain 87.6 miles of District sewers and three pump stations. Sanitation District 8 uses the Joint Outfall System for wastewater management (LACSD 2014). Wastewater generated in the area is treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson. The proposed project would connect to existing infrastructure present at, or adjacent to, the site. Prior to 1999, the proposed project area supported approximately 55 residences and its wastewater needs (LA County 2000). Existing sewer lines run under New Hampshire Avenue, Catalina Street, 204th Street and Berendo Avenue (DRC 2015). Sewage increases from project conditions would likely be below levels prior to 1999. Sewage increase due to the proposed project would be less than significant and further capacity analysis of wastewater reclamation plants is not necessary.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, 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?

The proposed project would comply with the most recently approved hydrology, and drainage and grading plans prior to being issued a building permit to ensure that the proposed project would not create drainage system capacity problems, and that no construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. The proposed project would comply with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (LID) as part of the approved hydrology plan to comply with storm water quality runoff requirements. This impact would be less than significant.
d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

The proposed project would result in a slight increase in demand for potable water from existing conditions. However, prior to 1999 the proposed project area supported the water demands of approximately 55 residences (LA County 2000). The proposed project would connect to existing water mains located under New Hampshire Avenue, 204th Street, Budlong Avenue, and Berendo Avenue (DRC 2015). This impact would be less than significant.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The proposed project would not significantly impact the availability of adequate energy supplies, create energy utility capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Energy needs would be provided by existing utility entitlements present at, or adjacent to the site. Any on-site construction will be subject to the Cal Green building standards, which is required to provide energy saving measures to further reduce the amount of energy consumed by the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

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

Development at the proposed location is planned for under the existing Los Angeles County Regional Waste Management Plan. Due to the relatively small scale of the solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project, the plan to develop approximately 8.1 acres of vacant county land into a neighborhood park would not significantly impact solid waste disposal capacity. This impact would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires the County of Los Angeles to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 mandates that expanded or new development project to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the existing design. The project will include sustainable elements, such as recycling bins, to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste. It is anticipated that these project elements will comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations to reduce the amount of solid waste. The proposed project will not displace an existing or proposed waste disposal, recycling, or diversion site. This impact would be less than significant.
20. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</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, 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?

Project construction activity could potentially impact nesting birds if it were to occur within the nesting season (February 1st to August 31st). Pre-construction surveys and establishing buffer zones around nests or roosts as identified in Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would avoid potential impacts. The project site does not contain fish or wildlife habitat, or support special-status plants or animal species. The project would not affect fish, wildlife, or plant populations. The project site does not contain archaeological or historic resources, and the incorporation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 to CUL-2 and Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3 would avoid and/or reduce potential impacts to unrecorded cultural/tribal resources to a less than significant level.

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

The proposed project does not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals. The proposed use complies with the existing Air Quality Plan, General Plan, and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact.

c) 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)?

The proposed project does not have cumulative impacts. The proposed project will not be an inducement to future growths, as the project does not require additional infrastructure beyond that necessary to serve the project. The potential for combined impacts would be primarily limited to short-term emissions and construction traffic. As noted in “Air Quality,” the proposed project would not result in cumulative considerable emissions of criteria air pollutants, and would implement Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2 to reduce NOx and dust emissions, respectively. Similarly, as noted in “Traffic,” DANP would implement Mitigation Measure TRA-1 to control potential traffic disruptions and safety issues resulting from
construction truck traffic. This measure would render potential cumulative construction traffic impacts less than significant. The project would not result in any other impact of sufficient magnitude such that it would constitute a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse environmental effects.

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

The project could result in adverse air quality, noise, and vehicle safety impacts to neighborhood residents during project construction. However, design features and mitigation measures incorporated into the project would be implemented to reduce these potential adverse effects on human beings to less than significant levels.
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Section 1: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, which state:

To ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency [County of Los Angeles County, Department of Parks and Recreation] shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. (§15097(a))

The public agency may choose whether its program will monitor mitigation, report on mitigation, or both. “Reporting” generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision-making body or authorized staff person. A report may be required at various stages during project implementation or upon completion of the mitigation measure. “Monitoring” is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight. There is often no clear distinction between monitoring and reporting and the program best suited to ensuring compliance in any given instance will usually involve elements of both. (§15097 (c))

Table 1, below, lists the potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Table 1 also describes the timing of and responsibility for implementing the mitigation measures related to the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The mitigation measures listed here will be implemented by the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP), or by its appointee, on behalf of the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation (County).

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a)(2), “Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, mitigation measures can be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.” Therefore, the County will consider whether to adopt the mitigation measures when it considers whether to approve the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact AIR-1:</strong> If 12 cubic yard trucks are used, maximum daily emissions of NOx would exceed the SCAQMD’s Threshold.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure AIR-1:</strong> If 12 cubic yard trucks are used to import or export soil to the project site, to reduce NOx emissions generated during park construction to a less than significant level, a minimum of 66% of the diesel fueled off-road construction equipment used during project construction shall have engines certified to meet US EPA Tier 2 emission standards (or higher). This may be achieved by using engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on exhaust gas management devices, and/or other options as such become available.</td>
<td><strong>Implementation:</strong> DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans). <strong>Timing:</strong> To be implemented during construction activities.</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring:</strong> The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of dust control measures. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>County Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</strong> Potentially Significant</td>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</strong> Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Timing of and Responsibility for Implementing the Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact AIR-2: Project construction could result in localized fugitive dust emissions.** | **Mitigation Measure AIR-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.2):** The DANP shall prepare and implement a dust control plan that includes the following dust control strategies: | **Implementation:** DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents. | **Monitoring:** The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of dust control measures. | **County Approval**
|        | Water shall be misted or sprayed by a water truck at least twice per day but also as often as needed to prevent formation of visible dust while clearing the Site, excavating, transferring soil on-Site, stockpiling, or loading or decontaminating transportation vehicles. | **Timing:** To be implemented during construction activities. | Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office. | **Initials:**
|        | Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on the Site. | | | **Date:**
|        | Soil shall be sprayed or misted as it is unloaded from transport vehicles if minimizing the drop heights does not adequately prevent dust generation. | | | **DTSC Verification**
|        | Vehicle tires shall be cleaned prior to leaving the Site. | | | **Initials:**
|        | Adjacent public streets shall be inspected at least three times per day including once at the end of the shift and shall be swept using a vacuum street sweeper if necessary. | | | **Date:**
<p>|        | Dust monitoring will be conducted to ensure that workers and other individuals in the vicinity, including community members, are not affected by fugitive dust. Dust monitoring will be conducted in compliance with Site-specific Air Monitoring Plan (see Appendix D of the | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final RAW). In the event that wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour for more than 5 minutes in any one hour or when dust control measures are not able to prevent visible dust emissions, soil moving activities shall be halted until wind speeds decrease and no visible emissions are observed.</td>
<td>DANP or its Contractor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All stockpiled soil that is not actively handled shall be securely covered with plastic sheeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Impact BIO-1:** Project construction activities during the bird nesting season could result in nest abandonment that would have an adverse impact on bird species and violate state and federal laws.

**Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:** Potentially Significant

**Significance of Impact After Mitigation:** Less than Significant

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of state and federal laws pertaining to birds, if construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to September 15 or per local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot buffer for non-raptors and 1,000-foot buffer for raptors shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist. Surveys for nesting birds shall occur no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has eggs or chicks in it, or adults are observed carrying food to the nest.

**Implementation:**
- DANP or its Contractor.

**Timing:** February 1 through August 31, no more than five days in advance of the start of project construction.

**Monitoring:** The biologist shall prepare a written record of survey results and implementation of any avoidance and minimization measures and submit the report to both DANP and the County.

**Survey Results Submitted:**
- Initials:_________
- Date:_________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact BIO-2:</strong> Project construction activities during the bird nesting season could result in nest abandonment that would have an adverse impact on bird species and violate state and federal laws.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure BIO-2: If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment including, but not limited to, equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal/modification, fence installation, demolition, and grading shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist. Monitoring shall be required to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor. <strong>Timing:</strong> February 1 through August 31, no more than five days in advance of the start of project construction.</td>
<td>Monitoring: The biologist shall monitor any active nests to determine when young have matured sufficiently to have fledged. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>Monitoring Completed: <strong>Initials:</strong>_________ <strong>Date:</strong>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact BIO-3/HAZ-6:</strong> Construction activities could adversely impact the roots of the trees on the northwestern portion of the project site. Improper cover of the soil near the trees could result in public exposure to lead.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Final RAW, Section 6.4):</strong> Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved to the extent feasible for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, bark, or gravel.</td>
<td><strong>Implementation:</strong> DANP or its Contractor DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents.</td>
<td><strong>Timing:</strong> Tree protection measures shall be installed prior to site construction activity, and appropriate cover material shall be laid before the park is open to the public.</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring:</strong> A licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall be retained to ensure that recommended protective measures are implemented. The arborist shall submit photographs and a brief email to the County to document that the protective measures were installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CUL-1:</strong> Project construction could impact undiscovered archaeological resources.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure CUL-1:</strong> In the event that historical archaeological, non-tribal, resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated; the artifact(s) shall be left in place until a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards has evaluated the artifact(s). A buffer area of at least 60 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Archaeological Sensitivity Training will be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in ground moving activities on the site. DPR shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If</td>
<td><strong>Implementation:</strong> DANP or its Contractor</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring:</strong> If archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, a qualified professional archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological report detailing the finds. The report shall be submitted to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).</td>
<td><strong>Report Submitted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | | **Date:**________

Report Submitted
| Impact CUL-2: Project construction could impact undiscovered human remains. | Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures, including establishing a no work buffer area of at least 60 feet, are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, then the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the | Implementation: DANP or its Contractor | Monitoring: If human remains are encountered during project construction, the County Coroner shall produce a written record of all human remains and their findings to be kept on file. If the remains are considered archaeological a, qualified professional archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological report detailing the finds. The report shall be submitted to the California Historical Resources Report Submitted | Initials:_________ | Date:___________ |
Table 1: Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Timing of and Responsibility for Implementing the Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recommendations of the MLD, then the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the County in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.</td>
<td>Information System (CHRIS) South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 1: Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Timing of and Responsibility for Implementing the Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HAZ-1:</strong> Project implementation could result in risks to human health and the environment.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:</strong> To reduce the risks to human health and the environment from the release or potential release of site contamination, DANP shall obtain DTSC approval and implement a Final Removal Action Workplan, consistent with DTSC's approved <em>Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant &amp; Restrictions</em> and EPA's recommendations included in its September 2015 <em>Reasonable Steps Letter</em> for the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project prior to the start of any site remediation or construction work.</td>
<td><strong>Implementation:</strong> DANP or its Contractor. DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans)</td>
<td><strong>Monitoring:</strong> The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of RAW mitigation measures. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td><strong>County Approval</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</strong> Potentially Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</strong> Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date:</strong>___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DTSC Verification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Initials:</strong>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date:</strong>___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Timing of and Responsibility for Implementing the Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact HAZ-2: Project construction could lead to the track out of contaminated soils.</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.1): Entry of personnel and equipment into the construction areas (exclusion zones) will be controlled to avoid contact with constituents of interest (COIs) (e.g. lead) and related transfer of site soil. The surfaces of construction equipment will be brushed off to remove loose soil prior to their removal from the site. Prior to leaving the site, trucks will go through a decontamination process to ensure that site soils are not spread beyond the borders of the site. Specifics of the decontamination process will be finalized upon selection of subcontractors, but will adhere to specifications as set forth in the transportation plan. The anticipated decontamination procedure would include a dry procedure with “rumble strips” to shake off large particles and brooms and brushes to remove smaller particles. Daily street sweeping will be conducted to minimize impacts to the community. It is not anticipated that wet decontamination will be required. However, contingencies for inclement weather will include wet decontamination and the subsequent onsite collection of any excess water.</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor. DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans)</td>
<td>Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of RAW mitigation measure.</td>
<td>County Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing: To be implemented during construction activities.</td>
<td>Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>Counts Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</strong></td>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</strong></td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact HAZ-3: Project construction could result in worker exposure to contaminants in the soil. | Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 (Final RAW, Section 9.0 and Appendix G): A site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared for the site in accordance with current health and safety standards as specified by the federal and California OSHAs and submitted to DTSC prior to initiation of field work. The DANP shall require the on-site contractor and its subcontractors doing fieldwork in association with the project to either adopt and abide by the HASP, or develop their own safety plans which, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the HASP. All onsite personnel shall read the HASP and confirm their acceptance in writing before starting site activities. | Implementation: DANP or its Contractor. DANP shall include the HASP on all appropriate bid, and contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents. **Timing:** To be implemented during construction activities. | Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office. | County Approval  
Initials:________  
Date:___________  
DTSC Verification  
Initials:________  
Date:___________ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HAZ-4: Project construction could result in adverse impacts related to disturbed contaminated soils.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 (Final RAW, Appendix C, Section 4.2 and Appendix E, Section 3.0): The DANP shall implement a soil management plan to address potential adverse impacts related to disturbed, contaminated soils. The soil management plan shall address the following components:</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor. DANP shall include the soil management plan on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents. Timing: To be implemented during construction activities.</td>
<td>Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>County Approval Initials:_________ Date:___________ DTSC Verification Initials:_________ Date:___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact HAZ-5: Project operation could result in public exposure to contaminant vapor exposure. | Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.5): The DANP shall install and maintain vapor barriers in any enclosed buildings built on site. | Implementation: DANP or its Contractor. DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents. **Timing:** To be implemented during construction activities. | Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure. Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office. | County Approval  
Initials:  
Date:  
DTSC Verification  
Initials:  
Date: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact BIO-3/HAZ-6: Construction activities could adversely impact the roots of the trees on the northwestern portion of the project site. Improper cover of the soil near the trees could result in public exposure to lead.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Final RAW, Section 6.4): Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved to the extent feasible for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, bark, or gravel.</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents.</td>
<td>Monitoring: A licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall be retained to ensure that recommended protective measures are implemented. The arborist shall submit photographs and a brief email to the County to document that the protective measures were installed.</td>
<td>Documentation Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials:________ Date:________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTSC Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials:________ Date:________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact HYD-1: Construction activities could result in disturbed soils flowing into storm drains. | Mitigation Measure HYD-1 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3): Prior to removal action activities, any storm drains located near the site (offsite) will be identified and temporarily protected by placing waterproof covers over the drains or berms (e.g., straw wattles and fiber rolls) around them to prevent an unauthorized release. These temporary controls will be inspected daily to ensure proper placement and integrity. | Implementation: DANP or its Contractor DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents. **Timing:** Storm water protection measures shall be installed prior to site construction activity and maintained throughout the duration of project construction. | Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure. | County Approval  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________  
DTSC Verification  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________ |

Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant

Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HYD-2: During construction activities, surface waters could pond or cause excessive erosion in the earthwork areas.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure HYD-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3): During soil importation activities, surface water shall be prevented from ponding or causing excessive erosion in the earthwork areas by placing berms (e.g., soil berms, straw wattles, or fiber rolls) around the areas to prevent water run-on or run-off. Soil piles will also be covered with plastic sheets and surrounded by berms.</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents.</td>
<td>Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure.</td>
<td>County Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing: Storm water protection measures shall be installed prior to site construction activity and maintained throughout the duration of project construction.</td>
<td>Monitoring activities shall be conducted in accordance with the project SWPPP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>DTSC Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HYD-3: During construction activities, excess, contaminated storm water could be generated on site that would eventually flow to in storm drains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</strong> Potentially Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</strong> Less than Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure HYD-3 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):</strong> Excess stormwater may be diverted or containerized on-site in order to continue the field work. Depending on the risk level and potential contacts with the residual soil, the diverted or containerized water may be sampled for COIs in accordance with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and based upon the results of the analysis, disposed of, through existing stormwater inlets on-site, at a pre-approved treatment facility, or any other suitable manner that is approved by DTSC. A list of COIs for characterization of the diverted/containerized water will be provided to DTSC. The characterization of the water will be sufficient for DTSC to evaluate and determine if the method of disposal is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Responsibility/Timing:</strong> DANP or its Contractor shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents. <strong>Monitoring:</strong> The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of this RAW mitigation measure. <strong>Monitoring:</strong> Storm water protection measures shall be implemented during to site construction activity. <strong>Monitoring:</strong> Monitoring activities shall be conducted in accordance with the project SWPPP. <strong>Monitoring:</strong> Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Potentially Significant Impact | Standards set forth in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.400, including but not limited to the requirement for all internal combustion engines to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air intake silencers.  
- Construction work hours shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday to Saturday.  
- Truck trips shall be routed to minimize travel on neighborhood residential roads to the maximum extent feasible.  
- Construction and equipment staging areas shall be setup as far away as possible from adjacent residential areas. If feasible, staging areas shall be at least 175 feet from all adjacent residences. However, factors such as site specific ingress and egress requirements and the final planned sequence of construction activities may require staging areas to be located closer than 175 feet from adjacent residential areas.  
- The following best management practices shall apply to equipment used on-site:  
  - If feasible electrical service connections are available, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools as much as possible. If electric power is not feasible, use “quiet” generators (e.g., MQ Whisperwatt or equivalent) rates no greater than 60 dBA at 50 feet or 67 dBA at 23 feet. | Improvement plans) documents. **Timing:** During design, construction and operation of address system speakers, bells and other alarms. | Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.                                                   | Verified Implementation |

Table 1: Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Timing of and Responsibility for Implementing the Mitigation Measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All diesel compression-ignition equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall be operated with closed engine doors/mechanical compartments and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permits, the DANP shall submit a mitigation plan prepared by a qualified engineer or other acoustical expert for review and approval by the County’s Departments of Regional Planning and Public Health that identifies the additional noise control measures that would be implemented construction activities within 175 feet of adjacent residences. These measures shall be designed to achieve compliance with the County’s construction noise control requirements contained in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440, and shall be designed to achieve a minimum 16 dB reduction from combined construction noise levels. Additional measures may include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Restrict engine idling to no more than five minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Use of temporary sound barriers at the property boundary or adjoining property lines. However, the inside face of any such barrier installed in close proximity to construction equipment shall be absorptive so that sound energy is not reflected back into the ambient environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of a sound enclosure (e.g., three sides with a partial top) to shield stationary noise sources (generators, pumps, compressors).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide notification to residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 48 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas (e.g., work activities within 50 feet of residences). This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a contact name and telephone number for the construction contractor and DANP staff member responsible for receiving and resolving construction-related noise complaints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact <strong>TRA-1</strong>: Haul trips related to soil import could impact traffic flow in the vicinity of the project.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure <strong>TRA-1</strong> (Final RAW, Section 6.5.6 and 8.2, and Figure 9): DANP and/or its contractor will implement the Traffic Control Plan that has been prepared for the proposed project. During soil transport activities, trucks will enter the site though Del Amo Boulevard. A flagman will be located at the site to assist the truck drivers to safely drive into the site. Transportation will be coordinated in such a manner that at any given time, on-site trucks will be in communication with the site trucking coordinator. In addition, all vehicles will be required to maintain slow speeds (i.e., less than 15 mph) for safety and for dust control purposes (see Mitigation Measure <strong>AIR-2</strong>).</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor DANP shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of these noise control measures.</td>
<td>Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of these noise control measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation:</strong> Potentially Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Impact After Mitigation:</strong> Less than Significant</td>
<td>Prior to exiting the site, the site manager will be responsible for inspecting each truck to ensure that the trucks are empty of clean soil, the trucks do not contain extra soil from site areas, and that the truck’s manifest has been completed and signed by the generator (or its agent) and the transporter. As the trucks leave the site, the flagman will assist the truck drivers so that they can safely merge with traffic on Del Amo Boulevard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of all documentation shall be kept on file at the County office.</td>
<td>County Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials:________ Date:________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials:________ Date:________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure TRC-1: If subsurface deposits believed to be Tribal Cultural Resources or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 60-foot radius of the discovery and the artifact(s) shall be left in place. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:</td>
<td>Implementation: DANP or its Contractor</td>
<td>Monitoring: If tribal cultural resources are encountered during project construction, a qualified professional archaeologist shall prepare a report detailing the finds. The report shall be submitted to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).</td>
<td>Report Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact TRC-1: Project construction could unearth unknown tribal cultural resources.</td>
<td>If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Impact Before Mitigation: Potentially Significant</td>
<td>If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a Tribal Cultural Resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Impact After Mitigation: Less than Significant</td>
<td>Timing: To be implemented if tribal cultural resources are encountered during project construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initials: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or the Los Angeles County Register of Landmarks and Historic Districts (LACR). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP, CRHR or LACR or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.</td>
<td>Gabrieleño Ancestry and the NAHC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Impact TRC-2:** Project construction in the southwest side of the project site could unearth unknown tribal cultural resources. | **Mitigation Measure TRC-2:** At the southwest side of the project site (where a driveway is proposed), the southeast side of the project site (where a sidewalk is proposed), and all other areas where grading and excavation activities are proposed, shall be monitored by a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry. The tribal monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities within 60 feet of a TCR or a potential TCR to determine if significant or potentially significant resources will be adversely affected by continuing construction activities. The tribal monitor shall use flagging tape, rope, or some other means, as necessary, to delineate the area of the find within which construction shall halt and the procedures in TRC-1 shall apply. Construction shall not take place within the delineated find area until the County consults on appropriate treatment. Tribal monitor may suggest options for treatment of finds for consideration. The County shall have ultimate authority over the treatment of new finds. | **Implementation:** DANP or its Contractor and the County  
**Timing:** To be implemented during earth moving activities in the southwest side of the project site. | **Monitoring:** A tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry. | **Tribal Monitor Signature**  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________  
**County Verification**  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility/Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact TRC-3:** Project construction could unearth unknown potentially significant tribal cultural resources. | **Mitigation Measure TRC-3:** All Native American artifacts and finds suspected to be Native American in nature are to be considered as significant tribal cultural resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a) until the DPR [County] has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative(s) for Native Americans of Gabríeleño Ancestry and any other tribe as designated by the NAHC. | **Implementation:** DANP or its Contractor and the County **Timing:** To be implemented during project construction. | **Monitoring:** DANP, its Contractor, or the Tribal Monitor | County Approval  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________  
Tribal Approval  
Initials:_________  
Date:___________ |
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Project title: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project

Lead Agency name and address: County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90020

Contact person and phone number: Julie Yom, AICP, Park Planner (213) 351-5127

Project location: The proposed approximately 8.5-acre park site is located at 1000 West 204th Street in the unincorporated community of West Carson, near the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and South Vermont. Torrance Boulevard is approximately 1,200 feet (0.23 miles) south of the park site. South Vermont Avenue and Interstate 110 are approximately 380 feet (0.07 miles) and 1,900 feet (0.35 miles) east of the site, respectively. The project site is generally bound by an unpaved road to the north, residences on Budlong Avenue, Berendo Avenue, and Catalina Street to the south, and residences on South New Hampshire Avenue and West 204th Street border the park site to the east and west, respectively.

Description of project: The Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP) in coordination with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation propose the construction and operation of the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project (Project). Park facilities would include a variety of playing fields and courts (e.g., baseball, soccer, futsal), play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building with an office/community meeting room, a maintenance building, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment, landscaping, and parking. The Project would also include amenities such as benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, BBQs, bike racks, and litter receptacles. Project construction would begin in the fourth quarter of 2017 and take approximately 15 months to complete.

The Project would incorporate environmental mitigation measures to ensure protection of park users. Implementation of these measures related to environmental media would be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) through a Removal Action Workplan. These measures are detailed below and would principally include: a durable cover over the existing ground surface composed of hardscaped material, such as asphalt or concrete, or clean soil underlain by a marker material; vapor barriers under enclosed structures; and a requirement that ensures that the durable cover be maintained and groundwater not be used.

Proposed Finding: Based on the information contained in the Initial Study, the County of Los Angeles finds that there would not be a significant effect to the environment because the mitigation measures described herein would be incorporated as part of the Project.

Public Review Period: March 29, 2017 to April 28, 2017
Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Project to Avoid Significant Effects:

**Air Quality**

**AIR-1:** If 12 cubic yard trucks are used to import or export soil to the project site, to reduce NOx emissions generated during park construction to a less than significant level, a minimum of 66% of the diesel fueled off-road construction equipment used during project construction shall have engines certified to meet US EPA Tier 2 emission standards (or higher). This may be achieved by using engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on exhaust gas management devices, and/or other options as such become available.

**AIR-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.2):** The DANP shall prepare and implement a dust control plan that includes the following dust control strategies:

- Water shall be misted or sprayed by a water truck at least twice per day but also as often as needed to prevent formation of visible dust while clearing the Site, excavating, transferring soil on-Site, stockpiling, or loading or decontaminating transportation vehicles.
- Vehicle speeds shall be limited to 15 miles per hour on the Site.
- Soil shall be sprayed or misted as it is unloaded from transport vehicles if minimizing the drop heights does not adequately prevent dust generation.
- Vehicle tires shall be cleaned prior to leaving the Site.
- Adjacent public streets shall be inspected at least three times per day including once at the end of the shift and shall be swept using a vacuum street sweeper if necessary.
- Dust monitoring will be conducted to ensure that workers and other individuals in the vicinity, including community members, are not affected by fugitive dust. Dust monitoring will be conducted in compliance with Site-specific Air Monitoring Plan (see Appendix D of the Draft Final RAW). In the event that wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour for more than 5 minutes in any one hour or when dust control measures are not able to prevent visible dust emissions, soil moving activities shall be halted until wind speeds decrease and no visible emissions are observed.
- All stockpiled soil that is not actively handled shall be securely covered with plastic sheeting.

**Biological Resources**

**BIO-1:** To avoid impacts to nesting birds and violation of state and federal laws pertaining to birds, if construction and construction noise occurs within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to September 15 or per local requirements), all suitable habitats located within the project’s area of disturbance including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot buffer for non-raptors and 1,000-foot buffer for raptors shall be thoroughly surveyed, as feasible, for the presence of active nests by a qualified biologist. Surveys for nesting birds shall occur no more than five days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed. Active nesting is present if a bird is sitting in a nest, a nest has eggs or chicks in it, or adults are observed carrying food to the nest. The results of the surveys shall be documented. If it is determined that birds are actively nesting within the survey area, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall apply. Conversely, if the survey area is found to be absent of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 shall not be required.
BIO-2: If pre-construction nesting bird surveys result in the location of active nests, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment including, but not limited to, equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal/modification, fence installation, demolition, and grading shall take place within 250 feet of non-raptor nests and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified biologist. Monitoring shall be required to ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings shall be documented.

BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Final RAW, Section 6.4): Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved to the extent feasible for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, bark, or gravel.

Cultural Resources

CUL-1: In the event that historical archaeological, non-tribal, resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated; the artifact(s) shall be left in place until a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards has evaluated the artifact(s). A buffer area of at least 60 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Archaeological Sensitivity Training will be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in ground moving activities on the site. DPR shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If appropriate, the archaeologist may introduce archaeological monitoring on all or part of the site. An archaeological report will be written detailing all archaeological finds. The archaeological report shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Mitigation Measure TRC-1 will be implemented as provided in Section 17, “Tribal Cultural Resources.”

CUL-2: If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures, including establishing a no work buffer area of at least 60 feet, are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, then the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD)
for the project (§5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, then the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reininternment document with the County in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**HAZ-1:** To reduce the risks to human health and the environment from the release or potential release of site contamination, DANP shall obtain DTSC approval and implement a Final Removal Action Workplan, consistent with DTSC’s approved Technical Memorandum Data Evaluation Summary of Findings Justification for Land Use Covenant & Restrictions and EPA’s recommendations included in its September 2015 Reasonable Steps Letter for the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project prior to the start of any site remediation or construction work.

**HAZ-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.1):** Entry of personnel and equipment into the construction areas (exclusion zones) will be controlled to avoid contact with constituents of interest (COIs) (e.g. lead) and related transfer of site soil. The surfaces of construction equipment will be brushed off to remove loose soil prior to their removal from the site. Prior to leaving the site, trucks will go through a decontamination process to ensure that site soils are not spread beyond the borders of the site. Specifics of the decontamination process will be finalized upon selection of subcontractors, but will adhere to specifications as set forth in the transportation plan. The anticipated decontamination procedure would include a dry procedure with “rumble strips” to shake off large particles and brooms and brushes to remove smaller particles. Daily street sweeping will be conducted to minimize impacts to the community. It is not anticipated that wet decontamination will be required. However, contingencies for inclement weather will include wet decontamination and the subsequent onsite collection of any excess water.

**HAZ-3 (Final RAW, Section 9.0 and Appendix G):** A site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) has been prepared for the site in accordance with current health and safety standards as specified by the federal and California OSHAs and submitted to DTSC prior to initiation of field work. The DANP shall require the on-site contractor and its subcontractors doing fieldwork in association with the project to either adopt and abide by the HASP, or develop their own safety plans which, at a minimum, meet the requirements of the HASP. All onsite personnel shall read the HASP and confirm their acceptance in writing before starting site activities.

**HAZ-4 (Final RAW, Appendix C, Section 4.2, and Appendix E, Section 3.0):** The DANP shall implement a soil management plan to address potential adverse impacts related to disturbed, contaminated soils. The soil management plan shall address the following components:

- While excavation activities are taking place during grading, removed soil will be utilized as fill material at the site and placed below import cover fill material, underlain with a visual barrier. If the volume is greater than needed, it may be taken off site.
In the event that excavation for off-site disposal or unknown materials is required during grading, soil samples will be collected and analyzed for COIs to ensure the soils subject to excavation do not pose a health risk for the construction workers and neighborhood residents. No disturbing activities of the shallow soil rather than the anticipated activities described in the RAW shall be allowed prior to DTSC’s approval.

**HAZ-5 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.5):** The DANP shall install and maintain vapor barriers in any enclosed buildings built on site.

**BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Final RAW, Section 6.4):** Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved to the extent feasible for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, bark, or gravel.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

**HYD-1 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Prior to removal action activities, any storm drains located near the site (offsite) will be identified and temporarily protected by placing waterproof covers over the drains or berms (e.g., straw wattles and fiber rolls) around them to prevent an unauthorized release. These temporary controls will be inspected daily to ensure proper placement and integrity.

**HYD-2 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** During soil importation activities, surface water shall be prevented from ponding or causing excessive erosion in the earthwork areas by placing berms (e.g., soil berms, straw wattles, or fiber rolls) around the areas to prevent water run-on or run-off. Soil piles will also be covered with plastic sheets and surrounded by berms.

**HYD-3 (Final RAW, Section 6.5.3):** Excess stormwater may be diverted or containerized on-site in order to continue the field work. Depending on the risk level and potential contacts with the residual soil, the diverted or containerized water may be sampled for COIs in accordance with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and based upon the results of the analysis, disposed of, through existing stormwater inlets on-site, at a pre-approved treatment facility, or any other suitable manner that is approved by DTSC. A list of COIs for characterization of the diverted/containerized water will be provided to DTSC. The characterization of the water will be sufficient for DTSC to evaluate and determine if the method of disposal is appropriate.

**Noise**

**NOI-1:** To reduce potential temporary, construction-related increase in ambient noise levels at sensitive residential receptors:

- All construction occurring on the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project shall occur in compliance with the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Construction Noise Standards set forth in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.400, including but not limited
to the requirement for all internal combustion engines to be equipped with suitable exhaust and air intake silencers.

- Construction work hours shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday to Saturday.
- Truck trips shall be routed to minimize travel on neighborhood residential roads to the maximum extent feasible.
- Construction and equipment staging areas shall be setup as far away as possible from adjacent residential areas. If feasible, staging areas shall be at least 175 feet from all adjacent residences. However, factors such as site specific ingress and egress requirements and the final planned sequence of construction activities may require staging areas to be located closer than 175 feet from adjacent residential areas.
- The following best management practices shall apply to equipment used on-site:
  - If feasible electrical service connections are available, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools as much as possible. If electric power is not feasible, use “quiet” generators (e.g., MQ Whisperwatt or equivalent) rates no greater than 60 dBA at 50 feet or 67 dBA at 23 feet.
  - All diesel compression-ignition equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall be operated with closed engine doors/mechanical compartments and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
- Prior to issuance of grading permits, the DANP shall submit a mitigation plan prepared by a qualified engineer or other acoustical expert for review and approval by the County’s Departments of Regional Planning and Public Health that identifies the additional noise control measures that would be implemented construction activities within 175 feet of adjacent residences. These measures shall be designed to achieve compliance with the County’s construction noise control requirements contained in Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440, and shall be designed to achieve a minimum 16 dB reduction from combined construction noise levels. Additional measures may include:
  - Restrict engine idling to no more than five minutes.
  - Use of temporary sound barriers at the property boundary or adjoining property lines. However, the inside face of any such barrier installed in close proximity to construction equipment shall be absorptive so that sound energy is not reflected back into the ambient environment.
  - Use of a sound enclosure (e.g., three sides with a partial top) to shield stationary noise sources (generators, pumps, compressors).
  - Provide notification to residential occupants adjacent to the project site at least 48 hours prior to initiation of construction activities that could significantly affect outdoor or indoor living areas (e.g., work activities within 50 feet of residences). This notification shall include the anticipated hours and duration of construction and a description of noise reduction measures. The notification shall include a contact name and telephone number for the construction contractor and DANP staff member responsible for receiving and resolving construction-related noise complaints.

Transportation/Traffic

TRA-1 (Final RAW, Sections 6.5.6 and 8.2, and Figure 9). DANP and/or its contractor will implement the Traffic Control Plan that has been prepared for the proposed project. During soil transport activities, trucks will enter the site through Del Amo Boulevard. A flagman will be located at
the site to assist the truck drivers to safely drive into the site. Transportation will be coordinated in such a manner that at any given time, on-site trucks will be in communication with the site trucking coordinator. In addition, all vehicles will be required to maintain slow speeds (i.e., less than 15 mph) for safety and for dust control purposes (see Mitigation Measure AIR-2).

Prior to exiting the site, the site manager will be responsible for inspecting each truck to ensure that the trucks are empty of clean soil, the trucks do not contain extra soil from site areas, and that the truck's manifest has been completed and signed by the generator (or its agent) and the transporter. As the trucks leave the site, the flagman will assist the truck drivers so that they can safely merge with traffic on Del Amo Boulevard.

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

**TRC-1:** If subsurface deposits believed to be Tribal Cultural Resources or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 60-foot radius of the discovery and the artifact(s) shall be left in place. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.
- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a Tribal Cultural Resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or the Los Angeles County Register of Landmarks and Historic Districts (LACR). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP, CRHR or LACR or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
- If the find represents a Native American or potentially Native American resource that does not include human remains, then he or she shall further notify Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry and the NAHC. The agency shall consult with the NAHC on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or LACR. Work cannot resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, or LACR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

**Mitigation Measure TRC-2:** At the southwest side of the project site (where a driveway is proposed), the southeast side of the project site (where a sidewalk is proposed), and all other areas where grading and excavation activities are proposed, shall be monitored by a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry. The tribal monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities within 60 feet of a TCR or a potential TCR to determine if significant or potentially significant resources will be adversely affected by continuing construction activities. The
tribal monitor shall use flagging tape, rope, or some other means, as necessary, to delineate the area of the find within which construction shall halt and the procedures in TRC-1 shall apply. Construction shall not take place within the delineated find area until the County consults on appropriate treatment. Tribal monitor may suggest options for treatment of finds for consideration. The County shall have ultimate authority over the treatment of new finds.

**Mitigation Measure TRC-3:** All Native American artifacts and finds suspected to be Native American in nature are to be considered as significant tribal cultural resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a) until the DPR [County] has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative(s) for Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry and any other tribe as designated by the NAHC.
Section 3: Introduction
Introduction

It is the intent of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to solicit information from agencies and the public about a project’s environmental effects and, in doing so, to avoid or reduce impacts of the project. This section addresses the public review process for the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation (County) Initial Study (IS) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project, State Clearinghouse # 2017031064.

Section 15074 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

“Prior to approving a project, the decision making body of the lead agency shall consider the proposed mitigated negative declaration together with any comments received during the public review process. The decision-making body shall adopt the proposed mitigated negative declaration only if it finds on the basis of the whole record before it (including the initial study and any comments received), that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that the mitigated negative declaration reflects the lead agency’s independent judgment and analysis.”

The County provided a 30-day public review period for interested individuals and public agencies to submit comments on the IS/MND from Wednesday, March 29, 2017 to Friday, April 28, 2017. The County provided a Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt a MND for the project via: 1) direct mailing to properties within a quarter-mile radius of the project site; 2) posting of the notice in a local newspaper, the Daily Breeze; 3) posting of the notice at the Los Angeles County Clerk’s office; and 4) posting of the notice on the County’s website under “News and Special Events” (http://parks.lacounty.gov/wps/portal/dpr). The NOI and IS/MND were also mailed to the State Clearinghouse and posted on March 29, 2017 for review by state agencies. In addition to being able to be viewed on the County’s website, a copy of the IS/MND was made available at the Carson Regional Library.

The County also held a joint community meeting on April 12, 2017 with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control at the Carson Regional Library to discuss the IS/MND and Final Draft Removal Action Workplan (RAW) developed for the project site.

Project Description

The Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC (DANP) in coordination with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation propose the construction and operation of the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project (Project). Park facilities would include a variety of playing fields and courts (e.g., baseball, soccer, futsal), play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building with an office/community meeting room, a maintenance building, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment, landscaping, and parking. The Project would also include amenities such as benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, BBQs, bike racks, and litter receptacles. Project construction would begin in the fourth quarter of 2017 and take approximately 15 months to complete.

The Project would incorporate environmental mitigation measures to ensure protection of park users. Implementation of these measures related to environmental media would be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) through a Removal Action Workplan. These measures are detailed below and would principally include: a durable cover over the existing ground surface composed of hardscaped material, such as asphalt or concrete, or clean soil underlain by a marker material; vapor barriers under enclosed structures; and a requirement that ensures that the durable cover be maintained and groundwater not be used.
Project Location

The proposed approximately 8.5-acre park site is located at 1000 West 204th Street in the unincorporated community of West Carson, near the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and South Vermont. Torrance Boulevard is approximately 1,200 feet (0.23) miles south of the park site. South Vermont Avenue and Interstate 110 are approximately 380 feet (0.07 miles) and 1,900 feet (0.35 miles) east of the site, respectively. The project site is generally bound by an unpaved road to the north, residences on Budlong Avenue, Berendo Avenue, and Catalina Street to the south, and residences on South New Hampshire Avenue and West 204th Street border the park site to the east and west, respectively.
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Comments Received and Responses to Comments

In totality, the County received seven written letters on the project during the public review period, and took oral comments and written comments during the community meeting. Comments received during the public comment period were directed at both the IS/MND and the RAW.¹ ²

Because the County collected comments on the IS/MND and the Final Draft RAW during the same public comment period, some comment letters address both the IS/MND and the Final Draft RAW. Therefore, the following responses solely address those comments pertaining to the IS/MND. For responses to comments pertaining to the Final Draft RAW, see Section 8.

¹ On May 11, 2017, the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation received a letter from the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) informing the County two comments from State agencies were received after the end of the state review period. These comment letters were from the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (Comment C) and California Department of Transportation (Comment H); both of which had been received by the County prior to receiving the letter from the State Clearinghouse. As such, the letter from OPR has been included as Comment I.

² The written transcript of oral comments received at the community meeting has been included as Section 6 of this document due to its length. In lieu of presenting the full oral comment prior to response, the meeting attendee’s comment has instead been summarized before the response.
April 18, 2017

Ms. Julie Yom  
Department of Parks and Recreation  
County of Los Angeles  
510 South Vermont Avenue, Room 201  
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Re: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Yom,

The Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District concurs with County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation Mitigated Negative Declaration finding that there would not be a significant effect to the environment due to the mitigated measures being incorporated as part of the project.

Sincerely,

Jane I. Beesley  
District Administrator

c: Safouh Sayed, Department of Toxic Substances Control
Comment A:  Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District

Comment A1: The Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District concurs with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation Mitigated Negative Declaration finding that there would not be a significant effect on the environment due to the mitigated measures being incorporated as part of the project.

Response to Comment A1: Comment noted. The County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation (also referred to as County and DPR) thanks the Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District for their review and concurrence of the findings presented in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project.
Dear Ms. Yom: I am following up on a public comment that I made on 4/12/2017 regarding the monitoring by a tribal representative for the construction of the proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project.

I spoke to Ms. Gayle Totton, Associate Governmental Program Analyst at California Native American Heritage Commission, who covers Los Angeles County. She said there are five documented tribes or bands of Gabrieleno Tongva which have met the criteria to be on their list and they are all regarded as equal.

The lead agency for the park project should contact and consult with each tribe or band and seek information regarding their relationship with the park site and any information that they can provide.

As to monitoring the soil excavation, there are two Tongva bands on the approved list for AB-52 and I am requesting that the" lead agency" for the park project consult with both bands and share that information with the public before signing a contract with the Gabrieleno-Kizh Nation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Margaret Manning, M.A., Dip.Ed.
Adjunct Assistant Professor
Negotiation, Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding
Editor-in-Chief www.ejournalncrp.org
(310) 863-0240
Comment B:  Margaret Manning

Comment B1: The commenter states the lead agency, the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation, should contact and consult the five documented tribes or bands of Gabrieleño Native Americans. Additionally, the commenter specifically requests the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation consult with the Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe on the approved list for AB-52 before signing a contract with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation.

Response to Comment B1: In accordance with AB 52, California Native American tribes must request, in writing, to be informed when the County of Los Angeles, as the lead agency under CEQA, considers projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe. The County maintains a list of tribes who have submitted requests for notification. When the County conducted the AB 52 consultation for the Del Amo Neighborhood Project in November 2016, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation was the only tribe with cultural and geographical affiliation who had submitted a request for notification letter. The Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe submitted their request to consult letter in December 2016, after the AB 52 consultation for the project was completed. As a courtesy, the County notified the Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe about the project so they could have an opportunity for consultation as well.

Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3 and CUL-1 have been updated stating that a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry will be involved in the project, as opposed to specifically the Kizh Nation.
April 26, 2017

Ms. Julie Yom
Park Planner
County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation

Dear Ms. Yom:

COMMENTS ON THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE DEL AMO NEIGHBORHOOD PARK PROJECT, SCH# 2017031064

Thank you for including the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (Division) in the environmental review process for the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The Division received a copy of the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project proposed by the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC in coordination with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation.

We have reviewed the MND and would like to offer the following comments:

- If the potable water is to be provided to the project site, the layouts of the new potable water pipelines must comply with the Water Main Separation requirements of Chapter 16, California Waterworks Standards of the Title 22, California Code of Regulations (CCR). It may be necessary to use upgraded piping materials, depending on the characteristic of soil and other environmental factors present at the site. The water purveyor serving the proposed site should submit project plans and specifications to the Division for review and approval.

- If potable water is to be provided to the project site, the water purveyor must ensure that adequate backflow protection is provided for all potable water service connections to the site per Section 7585 of Title 17, CCR.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Dmitriy Ginzburg, P.E. at (818) 551-2022 or me at (818) 551-2045.

Sincerely,

Shu-Fang Orr, P.E.
District Engineer
Angeles District
cc: State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044  

Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC,  
315 W 9th St #950  
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Comment C: State Water Resources Control Board

Comment C1: If the potable water is to be provided to the project site, the layout of the new potable water pipelines must comply with the Water Main Separation requirements of Chapter 16, California Waterworks Standards of the Title 22, California Code of Regulations (CCR). It may be necessary to use upgraded piping materials, depending on the characteristic of soil and other environmental factors present at the site. The water purveyor serving the proposed site should submit project plans and specifications to the Division for review and approval.

Response to Comment C1: The project will comply with the Water Main Separation requirements of Title 22 Chapter 16, CCR. The civil engineering firm for the project, Huitt-Zollars, has reviewed this comment and will incorporate it into pipe design specifications, as required by law. Huitt-Zollars has indicated they will comply with all applicable regulations, and provide the water purveyor serving the site with project plans and specifications.

Comment C2: If potable is to be provided to the project site, the water purveyor must ensure that adequate backflow protection is provided for all potable water service connections to the site per Section 7585 of Title 17, CCR.

Response to Comment C2: The project will comply with Section 7585 of Title 17, CCR. Huitt-Zollars, the civil engineering firm for the project, has reviewed this comment and will ensure project design provides adequate backflow protection for all potable water service connections.
From: Cynthia Babich [mailto:delamoactioncommittee@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 28, 2017 3:56 PM
To: Julie Yom <jyom@parks.lacounty.gov>; Mark Glassock <mglassock@lanlt.org>
Cc: Florence Gharibian <florencegharibian@yahoo.com>; margaret manning <margaretmanning3@hotmail.com>; Mallory Graves <poofbgone@gmail.com>
Subject: Comments "Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project" Wishing Tree Park

Julie Yom, AICP, Park Planner

Dear Julie,
Thank you for attending the recent meeting at the Carson Library and allowing us to comment on this important document. CEQA review and input from the public allows for the protection of communities and a means to mitigate impacts through a proactive approach. It is important.

We have reviewed the documents: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the DTSC RAW, the Environmental Checklist Form, CalEEMod Emissions Estimate, the Geotechnical Report and tribal communications. We find these documents to be comprehensive, well written and protective of the community. We will offer two comments/requests; one is to continue working with Margaret Manning to ensure the proper tribal representation for the site is consulted.

The second has to do with the trucks bringing clean soil to the site and the equipment that will be used to transform this eyesore to a community jewel. We would request vehicles and construction equipment to utilized that use clean fuel and best available emission control equipment. Our community already bears an unfair burden of air pollution and since there are great emission control devices readily available please give our lungs a break.
Thanks again for being so protective in this environmental review.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Babich

Director, Del Amo Action Committee
Comment D: Cynthia Babich

Comment D1: We will offer two comments/requests; one is to continue working with Margaret Manning to ensure the proper tribal representation for the site is consulted.

Response to Comment D1: Please see Response to Comment B1. In accordance with AB 52, California Native American tribes must request, in writing, to be informed when the County of Los Angeles, as the lead agency under CEQA, considers projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe. The County maintains a list of tribes who have submitted requests for notification. When the County conducted the AB 52 consultation for the Del Amo Neighborhood Project in November 2016, the Gabríañeño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation was the only tribe with cultural and geographical affiliation who had submitted a request for notification letter. The Gabríañeño-Tongva Tribe submitted their request to consult letter in December 2016, after the AB 52 consultation for the project was completed. As a courtesy, the County notified the Gabríañeño-Tongva Tribe about the project so they could have an opportunity for consultation as well.

Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3 and CUL-1 have been updated stating that a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabríañeño Ancestry will be involved in the project, as opposed to specifically the Kizh Nation.

Comment D2: The second has to do with the trucks bringing clean soil to the site and the equipment that will be used to transform this eyesore to a community jewel. We would request vehicles and construction equipment to utilize that use clean fuel and best available emission control equipment. Our community already bears an unfair burden of air pollution and since there are great emission control devices readily available please give our lungs a break.

Response to Comment D2: As described in Section “3. Air Quality” (pages 17 – 19) of the IS/MND, the project would result in construction criteria air pollutant emissions that are lower than the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD’s) Thresholds of Significance for the 17-cubic yard haul truck option, and would apply Mitigation Measure AIR-1 if the 12-cubic yard truck size is selected for project implementation. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would require the County to, at a minimum, require 66% of off-road construction equipment used for project construction to have US EPA Tier 2 engines. US EPA Tier 2 engines produce less Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrous Oxide (NOx), and particulate matter (PM) than standard equipment and US EPA Tier 1 engines. Regardless of which haul truck scenario is selected for the project, on-road and off-road construction equipment would be subject to the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles (In-Use) Regulation and In-Use Off-Road Diesel Equipment Programs, respectively.

CARB’s In-Use Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled regulation (also known as the Truck and Bus Regulation) is intended to reduce emission of NOx, PM, and other criteria pollutants generated from existing on-road diesel vehicles operating in California. The regulation applies to nearly all diesel fueled trucks and buses with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 14,000 pounds that are privately or federally owned, and for privately and publicly owned school buses. Heavier trucks and buses with a GVWR greater than 26,000 pounds must comply with a schedule by engine model year or owners can report to show compliance with more flexible options. Fleets complying with the heavier trucks and buses schedule must install the best available PM filter on 1996 model year and newer engines, and replace the vehicle 8 years later. Trucks with 1995 model year and older engines had to be replaced starting 2015. Replacements with a 2010 model year or newer engines meet the final requirements, but owners can also replace the equipment with used trucks that have a future compliance date (as specified in regulation).
CARB’s In-Use Off-Road Diesel Equipment regulation is intended to reduce emissions of NOx and PM from off-road diesel vehicles, including construction equipment, operating within California. The regulation imposes limits on idling; requires reporting equipment and engine information and labeling all vehicles reported; restricts adding older vehicles to fleets; and requires fleets to reduce their emissions by retiring, replacing, or repowering older engines or installing exhaust retrofits for PM. The requirements and compliance dates of the off-road regulation vary by fleet size, and large fleets (fleets with more than 5,000 horsepower) must meet average targets or comply with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements beginning in 2014. CARB has off-road anti-idling regulations affecting self-propelled diesel-fueled vehicles 25 horsepower and up. The off-road anti-idling regulations limit idling on applicable equipment to no more than five minutes, unless exempted due to safety, operation, or maintenance requirements.

It is unclear what type of fuel the commenter refers to when she asks haul trucks to utilize clean fuel. CEQA mitigation is prefaced on performance standards, not prescriptions. The intent of CEQA is to ensure that a project is meeting standard emissions requirements, not to identify specific equipment that would be required to implement a project. Although a good faith attempt to identify potential truck fleets that utilize natural gas via a web search of vehicle technologies and local construction companies was made, CEQA does not require identification of a proposed technology, only that the air quality standards for the project are met. This project has identified the Tier of equipment, construction schedule, model inputs, etc. and determined that implementation, as defined in the project description, is in compliance with the required emissions standards. Although CARB and the SCAQMD are petitioning EPA to work towards, “ultra-low” NOx exhaust emissions standard (0.02 g/bhp-hr) for on-road heavy-duty engines with other state air quality districts it will likely be several years before the equipment is readily available.3,4

Since it is unlikely that a fleet capable of providing hauling services that utilizes natural gas as a form of fuel in the project vicinity required for project, it has been determined after review that this is an infeasible option. The project will comply with all rules and regulations applicable to the project, and would result in emissions that are less than the thresholds established by the SCAQMD.

---


Dear Sir or Madam,

I received the community notice in mail.

Name: Kanji Kitamura

Address: 920 Del Amo Blvd Unit 4, Torrance CA 90502

Please add me to the Del Amo Neighborhood Park mailing list.

I live in Ponderosa West, the condo community right next to the site. I just wanted to say thank you very much for your work. I fully support the proposed workplan. It is a wonderful community project!

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Kanji
Comment E:  Kanji Kitamura

Comment E1 is not directed to the IS/MND, and is therefore responded to in Section 8.
This form allows you to make comments regarding the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The County is soliciting comments from agencies and the public. You may submit your comments at this community meeting, by mail, or by email to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (contact information below). Written comments will be accepted until April 28, 2017. All comments received, written, mailed, or emailed will become part of the public record.

Name: Karen Cruz
Organization (if applicable): DAAC
Address: 20511 Trena Berendo Ave, Torrance CA 90602
City/State/ZIP:

Comments:
F1
where will the vapor barriers be installed?

F2
we do not want graph tape. We want something said. Can that be done?

Send Comments to:
County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation
Attn: Ms. Julie Yom
Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project
510 South Vermont Avenue, Room 201
Los Angeles, California 90020
E-mail: jyom@parks.lacounty.gov

Safouh Sayed
Department of Toxic Substances Control
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, CA 90630
Email: Safouh.Sayed@dtsc.ca.gov
This form allows you to make comments regarding the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The County is soliciting comments from agencies and the public. You may submit your comments at this community meeting, by mail, or by email to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (contact information below). Written comments will be accepted until April 28, 2017. All comments received, written, mailed, or emailed will become part of the public record.

Name: Lydia Baffy
Organization (if applicable): Del Amo Action Committee
Address: P.O. Box 549
City/State/ZIP: Rosamond, CA 93566

Comments:

2 feet of soil vs. 12 inches - This is a precautionary measure - How could DTSC not support this - DTSC needs to raise its bar on this - I am very upset that DTSC has not supported our community needs and it seems as though it just doing the same ole thing - Need to take the communities lead - If the LANLT did not support and stand firm on 2' of soil cap this park would not happen.

Safouh Sayed
Department of Toxic Substances Control
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, CA 90630
Email: Safouh.Sayed@dtsc.ca.gov

Trucks bringing in new soil should use natural gas Not Diesel
This form allows you to make comments regarding the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The County is soliciting comments from agencies and the public. You may submit your comments at this community meeting, by mail, or by email to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (contact information below). Written comments will be accepted until April 28, 2017. All comments received, written, mailed, or emailed will become part of the public record.

Name: Cristal Martinez
Organization (if applicable):
Address: 20523 Bidloung Ave Torrance CA 90502
City/State/ZIP:

Comments:
I do not want tape around the barrier. I want a solid plate in the whole park. I want it covered all!!!

Send Comments to:
County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation
Attn: Ms. Julie Yom
Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project
510 South Vermont Avenue, Room 201
Los Angeles, California 90020
E-mail: jyom@parks.lacounty.gov

Safouh Sayed
Department of Toxic Substances Control
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, CA 90630
Email: Safouh.Sayed@dtsc.ca.gov
Comment F:  Written Comments Obtained at the Community Meeting\textsuperscript{5}

Comment F5: Trucks bringing in new soil should use natural gas, not diesel.

Response to Comment F5: Please see Response to Comment D2. Research was conducted for haul trucks utilizing natural gas; it was determined this is not a feasible option.

\textsuperscript{5} Comments F1, F2, F3, F4, and F6 are not directed to the IS/MND, and are therefore responded to in Section 8.
Comment G: Oral Comments Obtained at the Community Meeting

Comment G1: The commenter, Ms. Medina, asked who to contact to repair a fence on the project site.

Response to Comment G1: An owner’s representative responded in the meeting that the owner, Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC is the correct contact. The fence has been repaired since the request was made at the meeting.

Comment G2: The commenter, Margaret Manning, expressed her concerns about tribal consultation.

Response to Comment G2: Please see Response to Comment B1.

In accordance with AB 52, California Native American tribes must request, in writing, to be informed when the County of Los Angeles, as the lead agency under CEQA, considers projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe. The County maintains a list of tribes who have submitted requests for notification. When the County conducted the AB 52 consultation for the Del Amo Neighborhood Project in November 2016, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation was the only tribe with cultural and geographical affiliation who had submitted a request for notification letter. The Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe submitted their request to consult letter in December 2016, after the AB 52 consultation for the project was completed. As a courtesy, the County notified the Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe about the project so they could have an opportunity for consultation as well.

Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3 and CUL-1 have been updated stating that a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry will be involved in the project, as opposed to specifically the Kizh Nation.

Comment G3: The attendee expressed concerns regarding construction traffic and noise, and asks if the IS/MND states the time project construction would be permitted to occur.

Response to Comment G3: Page 48 of the IS/MND states that pursuant to Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.440, construction activities are prohibited between the hours of 7:00 pm and 7:00 am Monday to Saturday, as well as any time on Sundays and legal holidays, in such a manner that the sound from this equipment creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line. The IS/MND goes on to further provide the construction equipment noise restrictions in Table 8, found on page 49 of the IS/MND. The maximum daytime noise levels for mobile equipment and stationary equipment for single-family residential areas and multi-family residential areas are 75dBA and 50dBA, respectively.

Comment G4: The attendee asked if the project will be using environmentally safe trucks.

Response to Comment G4: Please see Response to Comment D2. The haul trucks used for the project would comply with CARB’s In-Use Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled regulation (also known as the Truck and Bus Regulation), which is intended to reduce emission of NOx, PM, and other criteria pollutants generated from existing on-road diesel vehicles operating in California.

Comment G18: The commenter, Cynthia Babich, expressed concerns about scarification of top soils during construction activities, and the potential risks it may pose to cultural and/or tribal resources. Ms. Babich also expressed support for Ms. Manning’s

---

6 Comments G5 – G8, and G9 – G17 are not directed to the IS/MND, and are therefore responded to in Section 8.

7 This comment is not related to the IS/MND, but is noted here for the record.
comments regarding Native American representation during the project’s construction.

**Response to Comment G18:** The IS/MND has set out numerous mitigation measures to prevent the accidental destruction or desecration of archaeological resources, human remains, and tribal cultural resources. Mitigation Measure CUL-1, presented on page 26 of the IS/MND, provides mitigation should archaeological, non-tribal resources be unearthed during project construction. Mitigation Measure CUL-2, presented on page 27 of the IS/MND, provides mitigation should human remains be discovered during project construction. Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3, presented on pages 58 through 60 of the IS/MND, provide mitigation measures should tribal cultural resources be discovered during earth moving activities. Mitigation Measures TRC-1 through TRC-3 have been updated to reflect a tribal monitor representing Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry, as opposed to specifically the Kizh Nation, would provide tribal monitoring. See responses to comments B1, D1, and G2 regarding Native American representation concerns.
April 27, 2017

Julie Yom
County of Los Angeles
Department of Parks and Recreation
510 S. Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90020

RE: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project
SCH # 2017031064
GTS# 07-LA-2017-00799
P.M. LA-110-7.838

Dear Ms. Yom:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the proposed mitigated negative declaration of Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. The proposed project is approximately 8.1 acre park site is located at 1000 West 204th Street in the unincorporated community of West Carson, near the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and South Vermont Avenue. Site is bordered by an unpaved road to the north, which is the County’s planned right of way for a 0.2 mile extension of West Del Amo Boulevard. Proposed project would include a variety of playing fields and courts, play areas, lawn and turf areas, a walking trail, a restroom building with an office/community meeting room, a maintenance building, pedestrian plaza, shade structures, outdoor fitness equipment, landscaping and parking.

Based on the information received, the nearest State facility to the proposed project is the SR-110 freeway. Caltrans does not expect project approval to result in a direct adverse impact to the State facility.

Please note that any work performed within State right of way will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans. In addition, please be reminded that transportation of heavy construction equipment materials, or other special equipment, which require the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. Caltrans recommends that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute hours.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact Melanie Bradford, the project coordinator at (213) 897-9446 and refer to GTS# 07-LA-2017-00799.

Sincerely,

DIANNA WATSON
LD-IGR Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Comment H: California Department of Transportation

Comment H1: Based on the information received, the nearest State facility to the proposed project is the ST-110 freeway. Caltrans does not expect project approval to result in a direct adverse impact to the State facility.

Please note that any work performed within State right of way will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans. In addition, please be reminded that transportation of heavy construction equipment materials, or other special equipment, which require the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require Caltrans transportation permit. Caltrans recommends that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute hours.

Response to Comment H1: Comment noted. The project does not require an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans. Offsite improvements described in the Mitigated Negative Declaration will require Encroachment Permits from the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. The project will seek Caltrans transportation permit(s) for those pieces of equipment requiring one for transit to the site.
Comment I

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR
May 1, 2017

KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

Julie Yom
Los Angeles County
510 S. Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project
SCH#: 2017031064

Dear Julie Yom:

The enclosed comment (s) on your Mitigated Negative Declaration was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on April 27, 2017. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2017031064) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
Comment I: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research

Comment I1: California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research requested responses to State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water and California Department of Transportation.

Response to Comment I1: Comment noted. Responses have been provided to the Water Board and Department of Transportation in responses to comments for Comment C and Comment H, respectively.
Section 5: Errata
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Errata
Amended text for the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project IS/MND is presented below. Text revisions are organized by MND and IS page number when applicable. Additions to the Draft IS/MND text are shown with underlining and text removed from the Draft IS/MND is shown with strikethrough.

Global Changes

The lead agency has revised setback to a 60’ radius for tribal and cultural resources for consistency and to avoid contractor confusion. 60’ represents a typical setback widely accepted as within the industry standard (typically 50’ to 100’). This revision does not change the intent of the mitigation measures; no additional analysis is required.

The IS/MND incorrectly stated the project site was 8.1 acres, when it is actually 8.5 acres. The project site of 8.5 acres is comprised of 62 adjoining parcels owned by the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC and land owned by the County of Los Angeles, as depicted on Figure 2 of the IS/MND. The portion owned by the Del Amo Neighborhood Park LLC totals 8.1 acres. The analysis of the park’s environmental impacts was based on the entire project area of 8.5 acres, consistent with the figures shown in the IS/MND. This error does not alter the analysis or conclusions drawn for the project; no additional analysis is required.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Pages 3 and 4) and IS (Pages 23 and 37)

Mitigation Measure BIO-3/HAZ-6 (Final RAW, Section 6.4): Existing Eucalyptus trees in the northwest corner of the property shall be preserved to the extent feasible for the community and therefore the clean fill soil shall not be placed within the tree’s vicinity and the existing grade adjustments to these trees will be maintained. Based on historic field investigation and sampling activities, lead concentrations (above the DTSC residential risk based screening level of 80 mg/kg) may exist within the vicinity of the tree. To avoid potential future exposure, a licensed landscape architect and/or arborist shall identify an appropriate cover material that will not harm the tree and will reduce the potential exposure of future site occupants to the impacted soil. Such cover material may include mulch, tan bark, or gravel.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Page 3) and IS (Page 26)

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: In the event that historical archaeological, non-tribal, resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated; the artifact(s) shall be left in place until a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards has evaluated the artifact(s). A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Archaeological Sensitivity Training will be carried out by a qualified archaeologist for all personnel who will engage in ground moving activities on the site. DPR shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. If appropriate, the archaeologist may introduce archaeological monitoring on all or part of the site. An archaeological report will be written detailing all archaeological finds. The archaeological report shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric,
Mitigation Measure TRC-1 will be implemented as provided in Section 17, “Tribal Cultural Resources.”

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Page 3) and IS (Page 27)

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures, including establishing a no work buffer area of at least 60 feet, are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the County Coroner (per §7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and Assembly Bill 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, then the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the project (§5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, then the NAHC can mediate (§5097.94 of the Public Resources Code). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the County in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Page 6) and IS (Page 58)

Mitigation Measure TRC-1: If subsurface deposits believed to be Tribal Cultural Resources or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery and the artifact(s) shall be left in place. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a Tribal Cultural Resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or the Los Angeles County Register of Landmarks and Historic Districts (LACR). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP, or CRHR, or LACR 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

- If the find represents a Native American or potentially Native American resource that does not include human remains, then he or she shall further notify the Kizh Nation Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry and the NAHC. The agency shall consult with the NAHC on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the
find is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or LACR. Work cannot resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, or LACR; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Page 7) and IS (Page 59)

**Mitigation Measure TRC-2:** At the southwest side of the project site (where a driveway is proposed), the southeast side of the project site (where a sidewalk is proposed), and all other areas where grading and excavation activities are proposed, shall be monitored by one a tribal monitor representing the Kizh Nation Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry. The tribal monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities within 100 feet of a TCR or a potential TCR to determine if significant or potentially significant resources will be adversely affected by continuing construction activities. The tribal monitor shall use flagging tape, rope, or some other means, as necessary, to delineate the area of the find within which construction shall halt and the procedures in TRC-1 shall apply. Construction shall not take place within the delineated find area until the County consults on appropriate treatment. Tribal monitor may suggest options for treatment of finds for consideration. The County shall have ultimate authority over the treatment of new finds.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (Page 7) and IS (Page 60)

**Mitigation Measure TRC-3:** Consider All Potential Tribal Resources to be Significant. All Native American artifacts and finds suspected to be Native American in nature are to be considered as significant tribal cultural resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a) until the DPR [County] has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative(s) of the Kizh Nation for Native Americans of Gabrieleño Ancestry and any other tribe as designated by the NAHC.
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Section 6: Oral Transcript of the April 12, 2017 Community Meeting
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In the Matter Of:

DEL AMO PARK PROPOSED WORK PLAN

DTSC PUBLIC MEETING

April 12, 2017

Case No:
DTSC PUBLIC MEETING

DEL AMO NEIGHBORHOOD PARK PROPOSED WORK PLAN

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2017

REPORTED BY:

KELVIN DO

CSR NO. 13803
CARSON, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 2017

6:14 P.M. - 7:17 P.M.

---000---

MR. GLASSOCK: WE HAVE JUST A QUICK ANNOUNCEMENT FROM OUR INTERPRETER.

INTERPRETER: HELLO. THIS IS FOR ANY SPANISH-SPEAKING PERSONS.

(IN SPANISH.)

MR. GLASSOCK: GREAT, THANK YOU.

HI, EVERYONE. MY NAME IS MARK GLASSOCK, AND I AM THE DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL PROJECTS AT THE L.A. NEIGHBORHOOD LAND TRUST. WE ARE THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY IN DEL AMO. I AM VERY EXCITED FOR THIS PARK PROJECT. WE HAVE COME IN AT THE TAIL END OF THIS WORK AND HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING THE YEARS AND YEARS OF STRUGGLE OF THE COMMUNITY ON THIS PROJECT AND ARE VERY GRATEFUL TO BE WORKING WITH, ACTUALLY, EVERYONE IN THE ROOM, WORKING WITH EVERYONE IN THE ROOM ON THIS PROJECT.

SO I KNOW PRETTY MUCH EVERYONE IN HERE IS VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT, SO I WON'T GO TOO, TOO DEEP INTO THE BACKGROUND. BUT I DID WANT TO START WITH JUST SOME INTRODUCTIONS. WE ARE A SMALLER CROWD TODAY. I THINK IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF WE DID GO AROUND THE ROOM AND STAND UP, INTRODUCE YOUR NAME, AND IF YOU'RE AFFILIATED WITH SOMEONE, THAT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL.
AGAIN, I AM MARK FROM THE LAND TRUST.

WHO WOULD LIKE TO START?

MS. KAREN: MY NAME IS KAREN, AND I AM FROM THE DEL AMO COMMUNITY.

MR. GLASSOCK: THANK YOU, KAREN.

MR. MCPHAUL: I'M PHIL MCPHAUL. I AM FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE DTSC, AND I AM THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECIALIST WITH THE ORGANIZATION.

MR. SCANDURA: I AM JOHN SCANDURA WITH DTSC AS WELL.

MR. SAYED: I AM SAFOUH SAYED FROM DTSC, PROJECT MANAGER.

MS. MORAN: I AM LAURA MORAN FROM MIG, AND MIG IS DOING THE DESIGN FOR THE PROJECT. AND I AM ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR CEQA.

MS. MEDINA: HI, MY NAME IS SAVANNAH MEDINA AND I AM A YOUTH IN THE DEL AMO COMMUNITY.

GO AHEAD.

MR. GLASSOCK: IT'S OKAY. IT'S OKAY. WHERE SHOULD WE GO NEXT.

MS. CRYSTAL: MY NAME IS CRYSTAL; THIS IS JESUS; THAT'S LALA. WE'RE ALL FROM THE DEL AMO COMMUNITY.

MS. MANNING: HI, I AM MARGARET MANNING, AND I
AM A RESIDENT ON FUDLONG (PHONETIC) AVENUE.

(INAUDIBLE)


MR. GLASSOCK: YAY. GRANTS AND FUNDING.

MR. SENGA: I AM ROBERT SENGA. I AM WITH THE DTSC.

MS. BOWEN: MY NAME IS PATRICE BOWEN AND I AM CHIEF IN THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WITH THE DTSC. THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE.

MS. YOM: HI, I AM JULIE FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION.

MR. ADAMS: MY NAME IS SAMUEL ADAMS. I AM WITH THE L.A. COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND REC.

INTERPRETER: MY NAME IS EMMANUEL FLORES. I AM THE INTERPRETER.

MR. GLASSOCK: YOUR WORDS ARE ENCOURAGED TONIGHT.

MS. GUERRERO: HI, I'M MELISSA. I DON'T HAVE A JOKE FOR YOU YET. I AM FROM THE L.A. NEIGHBORHOOD LAND TRUST, AND I AM THE PROJECT MANAGER FOR THIS WONDERFUL PARK. THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE.

THE REPORTER: HI, MY NAME IS KELVIN AND I AM JUST A STENOGRAPHER BACK HERE. SO IF ANYONE IS GOING TO
SPEAK, PLEASE SPEAK LOUDLY, SUCCINCTLY, SO THAT I CAN
GET THE WORDS DOWN VERBATIM. THANK YOU.

MR. GLASSOCK: WOW. JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.
THAT'S A TOUGH JOB. MY HATS OFF TO YOU.
SO THANK YOU, EVERYONE. IT'S NOT OFTEN THAT
WE GET TO GO AROUND THE ROOM LIKE THAT IN A COMMUNITY
MEETING, BUT I THINK IT'S VERY HELPFUL ON A PROJECT LIKE
THIS WITH SO MANY PARTNERS. I WELCOME YOU TONIGHT AND
AM VERY APPRECIATIVE OF YOUR TIME.

SO IS THIS FAMILIAR TO EVERYONE IN THE ROOM?
OKAY. THIS IS THE DEL AMO NEIGHBORHOOD
PROJECT, PARK PROJECT. IT WILL BE CALLED THE WISHING
TREE PARK VERY, VERY SOON. WE'RE VERY EXCITED ABOUT
MOVING THIS FORWARD. WE'RE IN THE LATTER STAGES OF OUR
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS. WE WILL BE TALKING TONIGHT
ABOUT OUR ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS AROUND CEQA AND OUR
REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN.

JUST WANT TO PROVIDE A BIG PICTURE. SO THE
PARK PROJECT, THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS THAT HAVE GONE
INTO THE PARK PROJECT, AND THE PRINCIPAL ONE OF THOSE
FEATURES HAVE BEEN THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP ON IT.
WE'VE GOT ZACK IN THE HOUSE TONIGHT. WE'VE
GOT MARGARET MANNING IN THE HOUSE TONIGHT. WE REALLY
APPRECIATE YOUR FEEDBACK, YOUR WISDOM, AND YOUR
DIRECTION FOR US OVER THESE PAST TWO AND A HALF YEARS
THAT THE LAND TRUST HAS BEEN INVOLVED TO MAKE BETTER
PROJECTS, AND WE'RE REALLY LOOKING FOR -- TO BREAK SOME
GROUND ON THE PROJECT AND THEREAFTER.

PARTNERSHIP IS ALSO A VITAL PIECE OF THIS
PROJECT. EVERYONE IN THE ROOM IS A PARTNER WITH THE
PROJECT, AND WE APPRECIATE AND VALUE EACH OF THESE
PARTNERSHIPS. WE WOULD NOT BE IN THIS ROOM AFTER 24
YEARS TALKING ABOUT THIS PROJECT IF IT WAS NOT FOR
EVERYONE IN THIS ROOM.

PROJECT DESIGN, THAT'S WHAT MELISSA AND OUR
PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS LEADING. WE HAVE BEEN MAKING
SOME FAIRLY SMALL CHANGES FROM OUR LAST MEETING, AND WE
WILL OUTLINE SOME OF THE ISSUES AROUND SOIL THIS EVENING
AS WELL.

AND THEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL PIECE.
THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS ARE WHAT WE WILL BE
DISCUSSING TONIGHT. I DEFINITELY ENCOURAGE YOU TO BRING
YOUR COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS TO THE TABLE. AT THE
SIGN-IN SHEET, WE DO HAVE COMMENT CARDS. PLEASE DO NOT
FEEL LIKE THAT'S ALL YOU CAN WRITE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE
MORE OR IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS IN A
DIFFERENT WAY, PLEASE LET US KNOW AND WE WOULD BE HAPPY
TO ACCOMMODATE.

THE OTHER FOLKS THAT ARE IN THE ROOM ARE THE
L.A. CONSERVATION CORE. CONSERVATION CORE, FOR THOSE
THAT ATTENDED THE MEETING WHEN WE INTRODUCED THEM, THEY
WILL BE HELPING US BUILD THE PROJECT. THEY'RE A VITAL
PIECE OF THE PROJECT.

THE L.A. COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND
RECREATION ARE FRIENDS OF THE PARKS DEPARTMENT AND WILL
BE HELPING US TO OPERATE THE PARK, WHICH WE ARE VERY
EXCITED ABOUT.

MIG IS HELPING US TO DESIGN THE PARK. SO THE
LIST GOES ON AND ON WITH PARTNERS. SO JUST A LITTLE BIT
ABOUT THESE LARGE DOCUMENTS, VERY COMPLEX DOCUMENTS THAT
WE WILL BE TALKING ABOUT TONIGHT.

FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES
CONTROL, WE WILL BE TALKING ABOUT THE REMOVAL ACTION
WORK PLAN. AND THEN FROM THE COUNTY, FROM JULIE, WE
WILL BE TALKING ABOUT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION. THIS IS OUR CEQA DOCUMENT, AND CEQA STANDS
FOR THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT. AND LAURA
WILL BE HELPING US WITH THAT AS WELL.

SO THAT'S MY PRESENTATION. I'M GOING TO HANG
OUT IN THE BACK. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AFTER THE
MEETING, I WILL BE HAPPY TO STAY AROUND. I'M GOING TO
BE PASSING IT OFF TO PHIL -- OR JOHN -- SORRY -- JULIE.
JULIE. SORRY. COMING DOWN WITH A COLD, SO MY MIND IS A
LITTLE SCATTERED. MIGHT WANT TO WASH THE MICROPHONE.

MS. YOM: HELLO, AGAIN. I AM JULIE YOM FROM
THE L.A. COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT, AND ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY, I WELCOME AND THANK EVERYONE FOR BEING HERE. AND AS MARK MENTIONED, THE DEL AMO NEIGHBORHOOD PARK, OR TO BE CALLED WISHING TREE PARK, IS A GREAT PROJECT WITH MANY PARTNERS, AND WE ARE ALL VERY EXCITED TO BRING A MUCH NEEDED AND MUCH DESERVING COMMUNITY PARK IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF WEST CARSON.

THE COUNTY IS THE LEAD AGENCY FOR THE PUBLIC CEQA DOCUMENTS, THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AND I WANTED TO REMIND YOU THAT WE ARE CURRENTLY IN THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD; SO WE ARE CURRENTLY RECEIVING YOUR QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, CONCERNS OR ANYTHING THAT YOU MAY WANT TO PROVIDE AND INPUT FOR THE PROJECT.

YOU ARE WELCOME TO PROVIDE THEM TO ME, AND THE TEAM AND I WILL WORK VERY HARD TO ENSURE THAT ALL THE COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ARE APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED. MY CONTACT INFORMATION IS LISTED ON THE COMMENT FORM THAT'S AT THE SIGN-IN TABLE. AND LAURA MORAN FROM MIG WILL EXPLAIN FURTHER ABOUT THE CEQA PROCESS IN THE SECOND PART OF THE PRESENTATION.

AND WITH THAT SAID, I'M GOING TO HAND IT OFF TO PHIL FROM DTSC. THANK YOU.

MR. MCPHAUL: THANKS, JULIE.

AGAIN, I AM PHIL MCPHAUL WITH THE DTSC. I AM
THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECIALIST WITH THIS PROJECT AND MANY OTHER PROJECTS.

SO THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL, WE ARE BASICALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DOING THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN. AND YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR FROM SAFOUH -- YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR FROM, ACTUALLY, JOHN. AND THEN SAFOUH IS GOING TO COME UP AND PRESENT THE REMEDIAL -- I'M SORRY -- THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN TONIGHT.

SO JUST, AGAIN, I WANTED TO REMARK ON WHAT MARK HAD SAID EARLIER. COMMENTS, WE DEFINITELY WELCOME YOUR COMMENTS. WE HAVE COMMENT CARDS IN THE BACK. MELISSA IS BACK THERE. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYBODY IS AWARE THAT WE WANT TO DEFINITELY HEAR YOUR COMMENTS TONIGHT. TOWARDS THE END, IF YOU WANT TO SPEAK, YOU KNOW, IN FRONT OF EVERYBODY, YOU CAN PROVIDE VERBAL COMMENTS. BUT YOU ALSO HAVE THE ABILITY TO MAIL THEM, E-MAIL THEM. AND I WILL GO OVER THAT A LITTLE LATER.

LET ME BRING UP JOHN. JOHN IS GOING TO DO OUR FIRST -- HE'S GOING TO TALK ABOUT -- HE'S GOING TO DO AN OVERVIEW FOR YOUR REAL QUICK. AND THEN SAFOUH WILL BE UP AFTER THAT.

MR. SCANDURA: SOUNDS GOOD. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, PHIL. THIS LIGHT HERE.
FIRST OF ALL, ON BEHALF OF BARBARA NILAND, DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL, WELCOME TO THIS MEETING. THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING TONIGHT. I KNOW WE HAVE A SMALL GROUP TONIGHT, BUT WHETHER WE HAVE A LARGE GATHERING OR A SMALL GATHERING, NEVERTHELESS, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE COMMUNICATE THIS IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO YOU AND ALSO HEAR YOUR INPUT.

AND I WOULD LIKE TO ALSO THANK OUR PARTNERS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH ON DEL AMO PARK OR WISHING TREE PARK, L.A. NEIGHBORHOOD LAND TRUST, L.A. COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION ON THIS PROJECT.

I WANT TO GIVE A SPECIAL SHOUT-OUT TO THE DEL AMO ACTION COMMITTEE, MARK AND CYNTHIA AND MARK, THE DEL AMO ACTION COMMITTEE YOUTH.

LET ME SAY TO YOU, I AM SO THRILLED YOU'RE ALL HERE TODAY. LET ME SAY TO YOU THAT WHEREVER YOUR LIFE TAKES YOU, GET INVOLVED IN YOUR COMMUNITY NO MATTER WHERE YOUR LIVE. IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU DO THIS. THANK YOU ESPECIALLY FOR COMING TONIGHT AND PROVIDING INPUT TO US.

WELL, DTSC IS THE PRIME HAZARDOUS WASTE REGULATORY AGENCY HERE IN CALIFORNIA. WE REGULATE THE FACILITIES THAT TREAT IN DISPOSING HAZARDOUS WASTES, AND
WE ALSO OVERSEE CLEANUPS OF SITES THAT WOULD BE CONTAMINATED BY HAZARDOUS WASTE AND SUBSTANCES. 

TWO OF THE SITES THAT WE'RE INVOLVED WITH IS THE DEL AMO SITE AND THE MONTROSE CHEMICAL SITE. THOSE ARE TWO SITES THAT ARE ACTUALLY ON THE FEDERAL NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST, AND WE WORK ON THE CLEANUP OF THOSE TWO SITES. WE HAVE HUNDREDS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. 

THIS PARTICULAR PROPERTY WHERE THE PARK IS LOCATED WAS ONCE UPON A TIME A NEIGHBORHOOD WITH QUITE A NUMBER OF HOUSES THERE. THEY UNFORTUNATELY BECAME CONTAMINATED BY A NUMBER OF SUBSTANCES, SUBSTANCES FROM THE MONTROSE CHEMICAL SITE. 

WELL OVER 20 YEARS AGO, THE DECISION WAS MADE BY SHELL, ONE OF THE RESPONSIBLE PARTIES AT DEL AMO, TO BUY OUT ALL OF THE HOMES, DEMOLISH THE HOMES, AND THEN CLEAN OUT MOST OF THE HAZARDOUS WASTE AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES THAT WERE OUT THERE. 

SOME RESIDUAL HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES HAD REMAINED ON THE PROPERTY; NAMELY, SOME LEAD AND SOME OTHER THINGS. AND SO WHAT OUR REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN -- BASICALLY THAT'S A RATHER BUREAUCRATIC TERM FOR WHAT AMOUNTS TO A PLAN THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO YOU TONIGHT ON HOW WE ARE GOING TO PROTECT PARK USERS FROM THOSE RESIDUAL SUBSTANCES. THAT ENTAILS PLACING A CAP -- NOT A CAP -- A COVER ON THE PROPERTY, AND THEN
SOME OTHER PROTECTIVE MEASURES THERE.

ONE THING THAT -- THE HIGHEST PRIORITY FOR
DTSC IS TO ENSURE THAT WHATEVER ACTIONS WE TAKE ARE
PROTECTIVE TO HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT. BUT
ALSO ANOTHER VERY IMPORTANT PRIORITY IS THAT WE SEE THAT
这些 PROPERTIES ARE REUSED.
SO WE HAVE QUITE A NUMBER OF PROPERTIES THAT,
ONCE WERE CONTAMINATED, WERE PUT BACK INTO PRODUCTIVE
USES. CONVERSION OF THESE KINDS OF SITES TO PARKS IS
ESPECIALLY A VERY IMPORTANT USE. IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT
USE FOR ALL OF US.

PARKS ARE SO IMPORTANT TO OUR COMMUNITY. I AM
A FORMER PARKS COMMISSIONER OF A CITY OF 200,000 PEOPLE.
AND I LEARNED BACK THEN HOW IMPORTANT IT IS TO HAVE OUR
PARKS. COMMUNITIES THAT DON'T HAVE THAT MANY PARKS ARE
OFTEN AT A SIGNIFICANT DISADVANTAGE. SO THIS IS GOING
TO BE A TREMENDOUS, TREMENDOUS BOOST FOR THE WHOLE
COMMUNITY. WE ARE VERY PROUD TO BE PART OF THE EFFORT.

MARK MENTIONED A LITTLE BIT EARLIER ABOUT --
WE ACTUALLY HAD TWO DOCUMENTS THAT WE PRESENTED TO THE
PUBLIC FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT. ONE IS THE REMOVAL
ACTION WORK PLAN. DTSC CANNOT APPROVE A DOCUMENT UNTIL
IT HAS CONSIDERED PUBLIC COMMENTS -- WELL, PUBLIC
COMMENTS HAD THEIR REVIEW. THE OTHER THING IS THAT ALL
PROJECTS HAVE TO BE ANALYZED ACCORDING TO THE CALIFORNIA
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT OR CEQA AS MARK MENTIONED. SO DTSC IS REQUIRED TO PERFORM THAT ANALYSIS.

HOWEVER, THIS PROJECT IS A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT BECAUSE THE ACTIVITIES UNDER THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN ARE ACTUALLY PART OF THE PARK CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.


THE LAW DOES NOT ALLOW TWO SEPARATE AGENCIES TO ANALYZE THE VERY SAME PROJECT. THAT'S CALLED PROJECT SPLITTING. THAT'S NOT ALLOWED UNDER THE LAW. SO L.A. COUNTY IS TAKING THE LEAD. THE DTSC HAS PROVIDED SIGNIFICANT INPUT TO THE COUNTY AND THEIR ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN. SO YOU'RE ALSO BEING ASKED TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION REPAIR UNDER CEQA.

NOW, ONE THING YOU'RE GOING TO NOTICE IS THAT WE'RE ASKING YOU TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON TWO DOCUMENTS, THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN, THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS. YOU MAY SAY, HOW DO I KNOW WHICH DOCUMENT I AM COMMENTING ON? PLEASE, DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT. ENTER YOUR COMMENTS. WHATEVER COMMENTS, CONCERNS, YOUR
INPUT YOU CAN PROVIDE WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED. WE WILL DETERMINE HOW BEST TO RESPOND TO THOSE COMMENTS. NO COMMENTS WILL BE UNRESPONDED. ALL COMMENTS WILL BE RESPONDED TO.

SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMING TONIGHT.
NOW I WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT TO YOU OUR PROJECT MANAGER, SAFOUH SAYED, THE PERSON ACTUALLY OVERSEEING THE ACTIVITIES IN THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN.

MR. SAYED: THANK YOU, JOHN.

MR. GLASSOCK: WOULD IT BE HELPFUL IF WE TURNED DOWN THE LIGHTS IN THE FRONT?

MR. SAYED: OKAY. I WILL BE TALKING ABOUT THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN. AND WE HAVE THE SITE LOCATION, WHICH THE ADDRESS AT THIS TIME IS 1000 WEST 204TH STREET, CITY OF TORRANCE. AND THE SITE IS SURROUNDED BY RESIDENTIAL SOUTHEAST AND WEST. AND TO THE NORTH, WE HAVE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PARK, AS WELL WE HAVE DEL AMO PIT SITE. AND ALSO WE HAVE THE DEL AMO STUDY ON THE OUTSIDE. AND TO THE NORTHWEST WE HAVE THE MONTROSE SITE.

SO SOME BACKGROUND ABOUT THE PROJECT. THE SITE IS APPROXIMATELY 8.1 ACRES OF VACANT LAND AND ALSO CONSISTS OF 62 PARCELS. AND A SERIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS WERE CONDUCTED BETWEEN 1983 TO 2006. SO REALLY IN THOSE INVESTIGATIONS, ELEVATED DDT LEVELS WERE
FOUND. AND IN 1990, DDT CONTAMINATED SOIL WAS REMOVED. ALSO, ADDITIONAL SAMPLING OCCURRED DURING THE 2000S. SO WE HAVE -- LEAD WAS FOUND ABOVE THE RESIDENTIAL LEVELS AT DEPTHS OF THREE FEET AND FIVE FEET.

SO IN DECEMBER 2015, DTSC, THE DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL, SIGNED AN AGREEMENT WITH THE DEL AMO NEIGHBORHOOD PARK, LLC, TO ADDRESS THE CONTAMINATION AT THE SITE.

AND IN MAY 2016, LAST YEAR, OUR DEPARTMENT RECEIVED THE DRAFT DOCUMENT, DRAFT RAW FOR REVIEW. SO AFTER THE REVIEW AND SEVERAL REVISIONS, DTSC ACCEPT THE DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC INPUT. SO DTSC DECIDED TO PUT TWO FEET OF SOIL INTO THE SITE FOR PUBLIC PROTECTION AND TO ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL FOR NOW INTO THE FUTURE.

SO THE ALTERNATIVE EVALUATED IN THIS DOCUMENT, THERE ARE THREE. THE FIRST ONE, NO FURTHER ACTION. AND IT IS STANDARD PRACTICE FOR THE DEPARTMENT THE FIRST ONE WOULD BE USED AS A BASELINE. THE SECOND ALTERNATIVE, HOT SPOT REMOVAL, OFFSITE DISPOSAL. THE THIRD ONE, PLACEMENT OF TWO FEET OF SOIL.

SO IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THOSE THREE ALTERNATIVES, OUR DEPARTMENT USES DEFINED CRITERIA, AND THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE NINE CRITERIA.

THE FIRST ONE, TO OVERALL PROTECT HUMAN HEALTH
AND THE ENVIRONMENT. THE SECOND ONE, COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATION, AND OTHER APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS. AND ALSO WE USE THE LONG-TERM EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE, AS WELL, REDUCTION OF TOXICITY AND MOBILITY.

AND ANOTHER ONE WITH SHORT-TERM EFFECTIVENESS, AND THIS WE USUALLY USE DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE PROJECT TO ENSURE THAT THE PUBLIC AND THE COMMUNITY AS WELL AS THE WORKERS WHO ARE BUILDING ARE SAFE. AND ANOTHER ONE TO IMPLEMENT IS THE REMEDY.


SO BASED ON THE EVALUATION, ALTERNATIVE NO. 3 IS PROPOSED AS OF RIGHT NOW. SO WHAT DOES THE ALTERNATIVE NO. 3 INVOLVE? IT WOULD BE TO PLACE TWO FEET OF CLEAN SOIL ON THE SITE AS WELL AS THE INSTALLATION OF VAPOR BARRIER SYSTEMS UNDER ALL ON-SITE STRUCTURE AND FOR PREPARATION OF A SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN AS WELL AS TO RECORD A LAND USE COVENANT. SO THE LAND
USE COVENANT IS A LEGAL DOCUMENT THAT WILL BE REPORTED TO ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC AND THE ENVIRONMENT IS LONG-TERM.

SO NEXT STEP IS GOING TO BE WE HAVE THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THAT ENDS UNTIL OF APRIL 28 OF THIS MONTH. SO WHENEVER THESE COMMENTS ARE RECEIVED, OUR DEPARTMENT WILL EVALUATE THESE COMMENTS AND WE WILL PREPARE A RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. AND BASED ON THAT, BASED ON THE COMMENTS THAT WE RECEIVE, DTSC WILL APPROVE THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN.


SO WHEN THE PROJECT IS COMPLETE, THE DEL AMO PARK WILL SUBMIT A COMPLETION REPORT TO DTSC, OUR DEPARTMENT.

THIS IS WHAT I WANTED TO PRESENT TO YOU REGARDING THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN. THANK YOU.

MR. MCPHAUL: THANKS, SAFOUH. THERE YOU HAVE IT. THAT'S OUR REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN. IF YOU HAVE -- I DON'T KNOW IF WE MADE IT CLEAR, WE WOULD LOVE YOUR COMMENTS. I WANT TO GIVE YOU A REMINDER, OUR
COMMENT PERIOD, WE ARE SMACK DAB IN THE MIDDLE OF IT. IT IS NOW APRIL 12TH. WE ARE TWO WEEKS INTO IT.

WE HAVE ABOUT A LITTLE OVER TWO WEEKS LEFT IN THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. SO IF YOU DON'T HAVE COMMENTS READY TONIGHT, BY ALL MEANS, YOU CAN SUPPLY THEM TO US. SAFOUH'S INFORMATION IS HERE. WE HAVE AN E-MAIL ADDRESS HERE ALSO THAT YOU CAN SEND THEM TO.

AND YOU CAN ALSO OBVIOUSLY, IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS TONIGHT, WE HAVE COMMENT CARDS IN THE BACK -- AGAIN, WE TALKED ABOUT THAT -- WITH MELISSA. WE WOULD LOVE TO HEAR FROM ANY AND EVERYONE.

INFORMATION REPOSITORY. IF YOU WANT TO SEE HARD COPIES OF THIS INFORMATION, WE ACTUALLY HAVE ONE HERE LOCATED IN THIS LIBRARY. ADDITIONALLY, WE HAVE ONE AT OUR OFFICE HERE IN CYPRESS. SO CYPRESS, NOT TOO FAR FROM HERE, FOR THOSE WHO ARE NOT FAMILIAR -- I CAN'T TALK TODAY.

AND WE ALSO HAVE OUR DTSC WEBSITE, THE DTSC.CA.GOV. THERE YOU HAVE IT. WE WON'T GET INTO QUESTIONS RIGHT NOW, BUT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS INTRODUCE LAURA MORAN, AND SHE IS GOING TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THE CEQA DOCUMENT.

MS. MORAN: OKAY. AGAIN, I AM LAURA MORAN AND I AM WITH MIG. WE'RE THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT AND DESIGN FIRM HELPING WITH THE PARK. TONIGHT I'M GOING TO
DISCUSS WITH YOU THE CEQA INITIAL STUDY MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION THAT THE COUNTY HAS PREPARED FOR
THE PROJECT.

JUST A QUICK BACKGROUND ON CEQA. GOVERNOR
REAGAN SIGNED CEQA INTO LAW BACK IN 1970. THESE ARE THE
STATUTES AND GUIDELINES, THE PUBLIC RESOURCE CODE AND
THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS WHERE YOU CAN FIND
ALL OF THE CEQA STATUTES AND LOTS AND LOTS OF REALLY
EXCITING READING. SO, YOU KNOW, I ENCOURAGE YOU TO GO
LOOK THAT UP AND READ THROUGH THAT STUFF. IT WILL ONLY
TAKE YOU A COUPLE OF YEARS.

CEQA APPLIES TO ALL PROJECTS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC
AGENCY DISCRETIONARY ACTION. WHAT THAT MEANS IS THE
COUNTY IS GOING TO OWN AND OPERATE OR THEY'RE GOING TO
LEASE AND OPERATE THIS PARK. THEY'RE THE LEAD AGENCY
FOR THIS PROJECT BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO OVERSEE THE
CONSTRUCTION.

SO DTSC IS A RESPONSIBLE AGENCY BECAUSE THEY
ARE ACTUALLY PROVIDING DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL THROUGH
APPROVAL OF THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN, WHICH IS
INTRINSICALLY TIED TO THIS PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION TO THIS
PROJECT.

THE MAIN OBJECTIVES OF CEQA ARE FOR THE
PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND TO INFORM THE PUBLIC.
AS SAFOUH WAS SAYING, THEY WILL ENTER INTO A LUC, WHICH
WILL ACTUALLY ENSURE THE SAFETY OF THE PUBLIC, WHICH IS AN INTRINSIC PART OF THE CEQA PROCESS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE PUBLIC IS SAFEGUARDED.

AGAIN, THIS IS THE BEAUTIFUL LAYOUT OF THE FUTURE WISHING TREE PARK. I THINK YOU'RE ALL PRETTY FAMILIAR WITH THIS. THERE'S ANOTHER BOARD BACK THERE THAT DESCRIBES THE ELEMENTS.

SO THERE'S FOUR STEPS TO CEQA. ONE IS THE PRELIMINARY REVIEW, WHICH I THINK YOU CAN GUESS WHAT THAT IS. EVERYBODY LOOKS AT THE PROJECT AND STARTS TO IDENTIFY ANY AREAS THAT MIGHT NEED ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.

THE WAY WE DO THIS IS THROUGH THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST. THE COUNTY LOOKS AT THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST WHICH LOOKS AT THINGS LIKE AESTHETICS, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, AIR QUALITY, NOISE, HAZARDS, ET CETERA, AND DETERMINES UNDER THAT CHECKLIST IF THERE ARE ANY ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT THAT ARE GOING TO POTENTIALLY CAUSE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

THE NEXT STEP IS TO DETERMINE WHAT LEVEL OF CEQA ANALYSIS WOULD BE REQUIRED IN ORDER TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE THOSE POTENTIAL IMPACTS. SO A NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS PREPARED WHEN THERE ARE NOT GOING TO BE ANY IMPACTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT. BASICALLY THERE'S NOTHING THAT'S GOING TO OCCUR THAT'S GOING TO IMPACT THE
ENVIRONMENT.

A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION MEANS THAT THERE ARE THINGS THAT COULD POTENTIALLY IMPACT THE ENVIRONMENT, BUT THROUGH BMPS AND MITIGATION MEASURES, EVERYTHING THAT COULD BE POTENTIALLY AN IMPACT WILL BE MITIGATED TO A LESS SIGNIFICANT LEVEL.

THEN THERE'S AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT WHICH YOU HAVE TO GO TO IF YOU IDENTIFIED ANY POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED OR REQUIRING OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION IN ORDER TO INCORPORATE THAT INTO THE PROJECT CONSTRUCTION.

FOR THIS PROJECT, WE'RE DOING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION. EVERYTHING THAT THE REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN AND THE CEQA ANALYSIS HAS LOOKED AT CAN BE FULLY MITIGATED UNDER THIS PLAN. SO MITIGATION MEASURES APPLY TO THIS PROJECT WHERE POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ARE IDENTIFIED OCCUR BOTH IN THE RAW, WHICH IS, AGAIN, AN INTERNAL PART OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT, AND THEN ALSO FOR SOME OF THE OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS WE WILL DISCUSS.

SO THIS ISMND INCORPORATES MITIGATION MEASURES STRICTLY RELATED TO POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT CEQA IMPACTS. THERE'S OTHER THINGS THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE HEARD ABOUT THROUGH ACCESS TO THIS PROJECT, LIKE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE. THAT IS NOT SOMETHING THAT IS LOOKED AT UNDER
CEQA. THAT'S A NEPA IMPACT. THE THINGS THAT ARE LOOKED
AT UNDER CEQA CAN BE A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT THAN SOME OF
THE BIGGER ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT THAT YOU MAY HAVE
HEARD OF SO FAR.

THE LAST STEP IN -- AFTER WE GET ALL YOUR
COMMENTS BACK AND FINALIZE THE DOCUMENT IS TO CREATE A
MITIGATION LONG-TERM REPORTING PROGRAM, WHICH GETS
INCORPORATED INTO THE APPROVAL PROCESS OF THE PROJECT.

SO, IF YOU HAVE EVER TRIED TO EVEN DO A
PROJECT ON YOUR HOUSE, YOU'RE DOING YOUR DRIVEWAY OR
SOMETHING, YOU MAY HAVE A CONDITION OF APPROVAL IN YOUR
PERMITS. IT'S VERY SIMILAR TO THAT. IT'S A LIST OF
ITEMS THAT REQUIRE MONITORING, REPORTING, AND A SEQUENCE
OF EVENTS THAT NEED TO OCCUR IN ORDER TO BE IN
COMPLIANCE WITH YOUR PERMITS.

SO FOR THE RAW -- AS WE SAID, THERE'S TWO
DOCUMENTS HERE, BUT SINCE THEY ARE BOTH PART OF
CONSTRUCTING THE PARK, WE HAVE HAD TO LOOK AT
MITIGATIONS PROVIDED IN THE RAW AND MITIGATIONS PROVIDED
STRICTLY UNDER CEQA, AND THEN INCORPORATE THEM ALL INTO
THE ISMND.

SO FOR THE RAW MITIGATION MEASURES, THEY
LOOKED AT SPECIFICALLY AIR QUALITY, DUST MANAGEMENT, IN
PARTICULAR, DURING CONSTRUCTION, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS,
HYDROLOGY AND TRAFFIC.
AND THEN FOR THE CEQA MITIGATION MEASURES, WE LOOKED AT AIR QUALITY AS FAR AS THE EMISSIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, CULTURAL RESOURCES AND NOISE.

AND FOR AIR QUALITY, JUST FOR YOUR -- SO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT MEANS TO LOOK AT IT AND GET MITIGATION MEASURES TO, YOU KNOW, ENSURE THE AIR QUALITY IS OKAY DURING CONSTRUCTION. YOU KNOW, THINGS LIKE WATERING OF THE SITE DURING GRADING AND SOIL IMPORT, VACUUM AND STREET SWEEPER, IF NECESSARY, TO CLEAN UP ANY MATERIALS LEFT BEHIND FROM CONSTRUCTION, DUST MONITORING CONDUCTED DURING SOIL IMPORT, GRADING IMPACTION. AND THEN FOR THE CEQA ASPECTS OF AIR QUALITY USING TIER-TWO ENGINES ON TRUCKS WHICH REQUIRE SPECIFIC EMISSIONS CONTROLS TO LESSEN THE IMPACTS.

FOR BIOLOGY, WE'RE RETAINING THE EUCALYPTUS TREES THAT ARE ON THE SITE. SO WE WILL BE REQUIRED UNDER THE MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT TO DO PRELIMINARY NESTING BIRD MITIGATION MEASURES, WHICH IS BASICALLY MAKING SURE THERE ARE NO NESTING BIRDS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION AND/OR SETTING UP AN ADEQUATE BUFFER SO THAT THEY ARE NOT DISTURBED UNTIL THE YOUNG ARE FLEDGED.

FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES, WE HAVE PRETTY STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES. THIS SITE IS A FORENSIC REDEVELOPMENT SITE. IT'S GOT LOTS OF IMPORT FILL
ALREADY. WE'RE NOT EXPECTING TO FIND ANY NEW SIGNIFICANT CULTURAL RESOURCES; HOWEVER, THE COUNTY HAS CONSULTED WITH LOCAL TRIBES WHO ARE INTERESTED, AND THERE WILL BE A TRIBAL MONITOR ON-SITE. SOMETIMES FILL BROUGHT IN FROM OTHER PLACES HAS ARTIFACTS THAT WERE IMPORTED TOO.

SO TO SAFEGUARD EVERYTHING, WE PUT MITIGATION MEASURES TO MAKE SURE THAT ANY SIGNIFICANT HUMAN RESOURCE REMAINS OR PALEONTOLOGICAL FINDS OR TRIBAL ARTIFACTS ARE WELL ACCOUNTED FOR. AND WE HAVE MEASURES IN PLACE TO STOP CONSTRUCTION, RECORD THE FINDS, AND TAKE CARE OF THEM APPROPRIATELY UNDER THE LAW.

FOR HAZARDS, COMPLIANCE MITIGATION MEASURES UNDER THE RAW INCLUDE DECONTAMINATION OF EQUIPMENT, CREATION OF A HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN FOR WORKERS ON THE SITE, AND A SOIL MANAGEMENT PLAN WHICH IS PART OF RAW.

FOR HYDROLOGY, PROTECTION OF THE STORM DRAINS AND GENERAL SOIL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES, A SWIF (PHONETIC) WILL BE PREPARED FOR THINGS LIKE -- I'M SURE YOU'VE SEEN THESE AT CONSTRUCTION SITES -- THERE WILL BE BERMS AND WADDLES AND THINGS TO PROTECT THE STORM DRAIN SO THAT IN THE EVENT THAT WE DO GET RAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION, THINGS DON'T GO DOWN THE DRAIN AND ENTER THE STORM WATER SYSTEM.

NOISE. MEASURES TO REDUCE NOISE GENERATED
ON-SITE INCLUDE LIMITING THE HOURS OF CONSTRUCTION, STAGING EQUIPMENT, AND NOTIFICATION OF POINT PERSON FOR COMPLAINTS. SO PEOPLE WHO LIVE AROUND THE SITE, IF THERE ARE NOISES OUTSIDE OF THE PARAMETERS REQUIRED UNDER THE PERMITS, THEN THERE WILL CERTAINLY BE SOMEBODY YOU CAN NOTIFY.

AGAIN, WE DID MENTION THERE WILL BE A TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES PERSON ON SITE DURING EXCAVATION. AND THEN THERE'S ALSO GOING TO BE A TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN OUTLINED IN THE RAW AS WELL, HOW OR WHEN OR WHERE TRUCKS ENTER AND LEAVE THE SITE.

SO THE NEXT STEPS ARE -- YOU KNOW, WE ARE HERE TO RECEIVE COMMENTS. THIS IS THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. THE CEQA PROCESS IS A PUBLIC PROCESS. SO PLEASE, AS PEOPLE ARE MENTIONING, GO AHEAD AND MAKE COMMENTS. YOU CAN EITHER DO THEM ONLINE OR YOU CAN DO THEM ON THE COMMENT FORMS. IT DOESN'T MATTER. YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE DISCRETE ABOUT WHAT YOUR COMMENTS YOU'RE MAKING ON THE RAW OR THE ISMND. WE CAN FIGURE OUT WHO THE APPROPRIATE PERSON IS TO ANSWER THE COMMENTS. ALL THE COMMENTS WILL BE LOGGED IN AND RESPONDED TO IN A RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FORMAT AND THEN INCORPORATED INTO THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.

WE ASK THAT IF YOU MAKE EXTENSIVE VERBAL COMMENTS THAT YOU ALSO PLEASE RECORD THEM. WE DO HAVE A
RECORER IN-HOUSE. ALSO, IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL IF THE COMMENTS TONIGHT WERE Regarding OUR PRESENTATION TONIGHT. AND ANYTHING --

THE WITNESS: THE RAW?

MS. MORAN: MMM-HMM. AND ANYTHING TECHNICAL, SUPER TECHNICAL IN NATURE, WE DEFINITELY EMPHASIZE TO PLEASE PUT IT IN WRITING AS WELL.

I JUST WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT ALL COMMENTS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. AND THEN ALL COMMENTS, VERBAL OR WRITTEN, AS WE SAID, WILL BE RESPONDED TO.

AND THEN ON THE LAST SLIDE, WE DID PROVIDE -- THESE ARE THE WEBSITES WHERE YOU CAN GO AND SEE BOTH THE RAW AND THE CEQA ISMND IN ADDITION TO THE HARD COPIES THAT ARE HERE AND AT DTSC.

I WILL HAND IT BACK TO PHIL.

MR. MCPHAUL: THANK YOU. GOOD JOB.

OKAY. SO LAURA TOOK MY LAST -- LAST FEW -- HER LAST SLIDE TOOK MY THUNDER.

WE WOULD LIKE AT THIS POINT TO OPEN UP FOR COMMENTS, VERBAL COMMENTS. AGAIN, IF YOU COULD PLEASE WRITE DOWN AS MUCH AS YOU CAN IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS. AND LIKE LAURA SAID, IF THEY'RE SUPER TECHNICAL, WE WILL TRY BEST TO ANSWER WITH THE CREW WE HAVE HERE TONIGHT. BUT IF WE ARE UNABLE TO ANSWER IT, WE WILL RESPOND TO
YOU IN A TIMELY FASHION VIA E-MAIL OR WHATEVER YOU PREFER.

SO WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO OPEN IT UP.

IS THERE ANYONE THAT WOULD LIKE TO VERBAL --

HAS ANY VERBAL COMMENTS HERE?

MS. MEDINA: I HAVE A QUESTION. IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD, ON THE STREET OF CATALINA, THE FENCE IS KNOCKED DOWN. WHO WOULD I GO TO ABOUT THAT?

MR. GLASSOCK: SAVANNAH, YOU CAN TALK TO ME, MARK.

OKAY. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING? IT'S DOWN?

MS. MEDINA: I CAN PUT MY CAR IN AND EVERYTHING.

MR. MCPHAUL: TALK TO MARK. HE CAN HELP YOU WITH THAT.

MS. MEDINA: OKAY.

MR. MCPHAUL: WAS THERE A HAND BACK THERE? NO? OKAY.

MS. MANNING: I'M INTERESTED IN THE --

THE REPORTER: I CAN'T HEAR, I'M SORRY.

MS. MANNING: I'M MARGARET MANNING. I'M INTERESTED IN THE CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES. I NOTICED IN THE PAPERWORK THAT THERE'S ALREADY BEEN CORRESPONDENCE WITH AN ANDREW SOLACE, AND I WOULD LIKE TO KEEP THAT OPEN RATHER THAN ASSUME THAT HE'S THE RIGHT
PERSON FOR THE PROJECT.

BECAUSE THERE'S A LOT OF DISCUSSION BETWEEN
THE GABRIELINOS AS TO WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO REPRESENT THE
GABRIELINOS AND THE SAN DIEGO MISSION. AND SOME OF
THE -- I KNOW THERE'S A LIST THAT HAS FIVE APPROVED
CULTURAL RESOURCES. AND ANOTHER GROUP SAYS THAT THEY
HAVE BEEN THE REPRESENTATIVES FOR 30 YEARS AND THEY
WOULD LIKE TO BE AT THE SITE.

MR. MCPHAUL: OKAY. THANK YOU. THANK YOU FOR
THAT COMMENT.

AND WERE YOU ABLE TO GET THAT?

MS. YOM: YES. I GUESS I CAN JUST SPEAK FROM
HERE AS TO THAT QUESTION. SO WE HAVE ACTUALLY CONSULTED
WITH GABRIELINOS INDIANS OF THE KIZH NATION, AND ANDREW
SOLACE IS THE CARE PERSON THAT HE'S BEEN IN CONTACT
WITH.

AND THE COUNTY, THROUGH AD52, WHICH IS THE
STATE ASSEMBLY BILL, WE HAVE REACHED OUT TO -- WE HAVE
FORMALLY INVITED TRIBAL GROUPS IN THE LOCAL COUNTIES TO
PLEASE SUBMIT THEIR INTEREST IN PARTICIPATION,
PARTICIPATING IN PROJECTS THAT ARE GOING TO HAPPEN IN
THE COUNTY IF THEY FEEL THEY HAVE ANY CULTURAL OR TRIBAL
RESOURCES WITHIN THE COUNTY THAT COMPLY WITH THE MAP.

AND GABRIELINOS INDIANS IS ONE OF THE TRIBAL
GROUP THAT HAS FORMALLY FILED THEIR INTEREST WITH THE
COUNTY. AND THE OTHER TRIBAL GROUPS, IF THEY WISH TO BE
A PART OF OUR -- THE COUNTY'S LIST, THEY ARE WELCOME TO
SEND IN THEIR CARD TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS. AS OF NOW,
WE HAVE ONLY RECEIVED THE INTEREST LETTER THAT CAME FROM
THE GABRIELINO KIZH NATION.

MS. MANNING: OKAY. THE OTHER GABRIELINOS
INDIANS ARE ON THE LIST.

MS. YOM: THE COUNTY'S LIST?
MS. MANNING: YES.

MS. YOM: THE COUNTY'S LIST IS --
MS. MANNING: HAS FIVE ON IT.

MS. YOM: OKAY.

MS. MANNING: AND THREE ARE IN THE SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA AREA. AND THE OTHER TRIBE --

MS. YOM: MMM-HMM.

MS. MANNING: -- IS ANTHONY MORALES.

MS. YOM: AND THEY HAVE FORMALLY FILED --
MS. MANNING: YEAH, I GOT A COPY OF IT HERE.

MS. YOM: OKAY.

MS. MANNING: SO -- AND THEY DO A LOT OF WORK
FOR THE COUNTY --

MS. YOM: MMM-HMM.

MS. MANNING: -- LIKE CALTRANS, TOPANGA
CANYON. SO THEY HAVE BEEN QUITE ACTIVE. AND THEY, IN
REGARD TO (INAUDIBLE) IS THE TRUE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
MISSION INDIAN FOR THE AREA.

SO WE HAVE A DELICATE SITUATION WITH -- YOU
MIGHT CALL IT TERRITORIAL BETWEEN THE INDIANS. AND WE
CERTAINLY DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE PARK START OFF WITH A
FIGHT ON OUR HANDS.

MS. YOM: OKAY. WELL, SO THE LIST IS
MAINTAINED BY THE DEPARTMENT -- THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
REGIONAL PLANNING. SO I COULD GO BACK AND CHECK THE
LIST TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DO HAVE --

MS. MANNING: YES.

MS. YOM: -- THE OTHER GABRIELINO INDIANS ON
THE LIST AND MAYBE THAT WOULD BE A STARTING POINT.

MS. MANNING: YES.

MS. YOM: BUT AS WE DISCUSSED IN THE
PRESENTATION, THIS SITE HAS A LOT OF, YOU KNOW,
SUBSTANCES THAT'S NOT NATIVE SOIL. SO WE DON'T
ANTICIPATE ANY HUMAN RESOURCES OR CULTURAL ARTIFACTS
THAT WOULD BE OF TRIBAL ARTIFACTS.

BUT IF WE DO, WE ONLY HAVE A COUPLE OF AREAS
THAT'S BEING CONSIDERED AS MITIGATION POINTS WHERE WE
ARE GOING TO HAVE TRIBAL MONITORS. BUT I THINK THE
FIRST THING TO DO IS TO ENSURE THAT THE TRIBAL GROUP
THAT YOU'RE MENTIONING IS ON THE COUNTY LIST.

MS. MANNING: THEY ARE. I CAN GIVE IT TO YOU.

MS. YOM: OKAY. BUT I WOULD HAVE TO GO
THROUGH THEIR SITE TO SEE. I CAN'T JUST SEE THE COPY OF THE LETTER. I NEED TO SEE THE LIST.

MS. MANNING: YEAH, I THINK IT'S MORE THAN JUST MONITORING THE SITE.

MS. YOM: MMM-HMM.

MS. MANNING: I THINK IT'S A QUESTION OF TERRITORY --

MS. YOM: RIGHT.

MS. MANNING: -- AS WELL. AND THAT THEY REALLY DON'T WANT ANOTHER TRIBE OR AN OFF-SHOOT --

MS. YOM: MMM-HMM.

MS. MANNING: -- TO CLAIM THE LAND.

MS. YOM: I THINK IT'S -- IN A DELICATE SITUATION LIKE THIS, WE LOOK TO THE NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE TO SEE WHO THEY FEEL THAT, BASED ON THEIR INFORMATION, IS THE RIGHT TRIBAL GROUP THAT WILL REPRESENT THE AREA. SO THAT COULD BE ANOTHER WAY TO FIGURE OUT WHO REALLY HAS --

MS. MANNING: YES.

MS. YOM: -- THE REPRESENTATION OF THAT PROJECT SITE.

MS. MANNING: RIGHT. THAT SOUNDS REASONABLE.

MR. MCPHAUL: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. AND I BELIEVE YOU WERE NEXT.

ATTENDEE: WHO? ME?
THE COURT: YEAH.

ATTENDEE: I DON'T NEED -- I HAVEN'T HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ ANYTHING YET, BUT I WAS LISTENING TO MS. MORAN WHEN SHE WAS STATING TRAFFIC AND NOISE. SO OUR COMMUNITY RIGHT NOW HAS BEEN UNDER HEAVY -- NO -- HEAVY CONSTRUCTION THERE ON NORMANDY UNTIL FOURTH STREET, WHICH IS THE SAME STREET AS THE PARK. SO WE HAVE HAD 24/7 NOISE. TRACTORS, HORRENDOUS NOISE. AND BEING EXPOSED TO CONTAMINATION.

SO IN YOUR DOCUMENT, DO YOU STATE THE TIMES, EXACT TIME IN THE MORNING, EXACT TIME IN THE NIGHT, MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY OR MONDAY THROUGH SATURDAY OR WHATEVER? AND IF THEY GO PAST THAT, WE CAN REPORT THEM?

MS. MORAN: CORRECT.

ATTENDEE: AND WILL THEY BE USING, YOU KNOW, ENVIRONMENTALLY-SAFE TRUCKS, LIKE, TRUCKS THAT USE GAS AND -- NOT GASOLINE, BUT THEY USE BUTANE -- OR WHAT IS IT?

MS. MORAN: SO THESE ARE TIER-TWO VEHICLES. THEY DO HAVE EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES ON THEM.

ATTENDEE: AND YOU WILL BE USING THEM?

ALSO HELPS LIMIT THE NUMBER OF TRUCK TRIPS DAILY AND, 
YOU KNOW --

ATTENDEE: THEY WILL BE USING THE SHORTEST 
ROUTE, THE SAME ROUTE?

MS. MORAN: EXACTLY.

ATTENDEE: OKAY.

I DON'T HAVE MORE.

MS. MORAN: WELL, THEN, ON-SITE TOO, THE RAW, 
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, THE MITIGATION MONITORING 
PROGRAM I WAS TALKING ABOUT, THAT ALL NEEDS TO BE 
ON-SITE AT ALL TIMES. AND THAT'S AVAILABLE TO YOU TO 
LOOK AT AT ALL TIMES.

IT HAS TO BE ON-SITE. AND SO IT SHOULD BE 
VERY EASY FOR YOU TO ACCESS THOSE MEASURES THAT SHOW 
ONLY DURING THESE TIMES WHEN PEOPLE LEAVE -- YOU KNOW, 
CONDUCTING CONSTRUCTION ON-SITE AND THE NAME OF THE 
PERSON THAT YOU COULD CONTACT WITH ANY COMPLAINTS THAT 
THIS STUFF IS HAPPENING OUTSIDE OF THE WINDOW.

ATTENDEE: ALL RIGHT. THAT'S IT.

MR. MCPHAUL: OKAY. DOES ANYONE ELSE HAVE ANY 
COMMENTS?

YOU SAID YOU HAVE MORE, CORRECT?

ATTENDEE: I DO. BUT I'M GOING TO WRITE IT 
DOWN.
MR. MCPHAUL: OKAY. UNDERSTOOD.

ATTENDEE: BECAUSE I WANT TO READ THE DOCUMENT FIRST.

MR. MCPHAUL: UNDERSTOOD. OKAY.

ATTENDEE: MINE IS A QUESTION, AND IT MAY BE CONSIDERED TOO TECHNICAL FOR HERE, BUT I FIGURED I WOULD JUST PUT IT ON THE RECORD.

I NOTICED FROM THE RAW, THE MITIGATION -- ONE OF THE MITIGATION TECHNIQUES FOR THE DAMAGING -- THE HEALTH IMPACTS ON USERS TO THE PARK WAS A LAYER OF TWO FEET OF TOPSOIL OVER THE AREA.

I KNOW IN ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS, IT MAY HAVE THE ORIGINAL DTSC RECOMMENDATION, THEY ORIGINALLY RECOMMENDED ONE FOOT OF SOIL. I WAS WONDERING IF ANYBODY HERE KNOWS WHY IT WAS CHANGED FROM ONE FOOT OF SOIL TO TWO FEET OF SOIL.

MR. SCANDURA: ESSENTIALLY, BASED ON INPUT FROM THE COMMUNITY AS WELL AS DISCUSSIONS WITH TRIAL DIAGNOSTICS AND L.A. ENABLED LAND TRUST, WHAT'S BEST IS TO PUT A TWO-FOOT LAYER ON JUST TO PUT ADDITIONAL PROTECTION.

SCIENTIFICALLY -- THE REVIEW OF ALL THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE INDICATED THAT ONE FOOT SHOULD BE ADEQUATE, BUT WE'RE ADDING THE EXTRA FOOT AS JUST EXTRA PROTECTION. THE MAIN THING WE'RE PROTECTING FROM IS
LEAD. THE MAIN WAY YOU ARE EXPOSED IS BREATHING IT.
WHEN YOU PUT A LAYER OF TWO FEET OF SOIL, IT'S A PRETTY
SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF MATERIAL THAT'S A VERY EFFECTIVE
BARRIER OF BREATHING THAT.

ATTENDEE: SURE. IF I WOULD BE ALLOWED A
FOLLOW-UP QUESTION?

MR. SCANDURA: OKAY.

ATTENDEE: I DON'T HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO KNOW
WHERE THIS SORT OF MITIGATION HAS BEEN DONE IN THE PAST.
I ASSUME IT'S BEEN DONE SUCCESSFULLY ELSEWHERE. I JUST
WANT -- I AM A DOG LOVER. I KNOW DOGS LIKE TO DIG HOLES
IN THE SAME PLACES.

IF SOMEBODY TAKES THEIR DOG FOR A WALK TO THE
PARK AND IT STARTS DIGGING A HOLE AND STARTS WORKING ON
IT WEEK AFTER WEEK, TWO FEET OF SOIL DOESN'T REALLY SEEM
LIKE THAT MUCH TO GET THROUGH. I JUST WANTED TO KNOW --
I ASSUME THIS HAS BEEN USED SUCCESSFULLY IN OTHER AREAS?

MR. SCANDURA: I COULD ADDRESS THAT. I
BELIEVE WE -- I BELIEVE ONE OF OUR PARKS IN THE SAN
FERNANDO VALLEY IS ALSO EMPLOYING THAT KIND OF
PROTECTION AS WELL. AND THE MAIN THING IS THAT WE WOULD
BE MORE CONCERNED IF THIS WAS A RESIDENTIAL BACKYARD.
BUT BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE ON THERE
OCCASIONALLY, IT'S GOING TO BE HEAVILY MAINTAINED, WE'RE
THINKING TWO FEET SHOULD BE ADEQUATE.
AND THE OTHER KEY THING WE PUT INTO THE
 REMOVAL ACTION WORK PLAN IS THAT MANY TIMES THEY NEED
A -- THEY NEED TO EXCAVATE DOWN WELL INTO THAT BARRIER
EVEN BELOW THAT, AND DTSC WOULD BE NOTIFIED.

WE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT WHAT THEY CALL
A SOIL MANAGEMENT -- BASICALLY A PLAN. FIRST OF ALL, WE
GOT TO (INAUDIBLE) HOW TO REMOVE THEM SAFELY AND
PROMPTLY AND, NUMBER TWO, PROTECTIONS FOR THE WORKERS AS
WELL AS ANYBODY THAT MAY BE AROUND THERE.

NOW, IN THE GREATER WORLD OF HAZARDOUS WASTE
SITE CLEANUPS, THIS IS A COVER. WE HAVE MANY SITES
WHERE IT'S JUST NOT POSSIBLE TO REMOVE THE WASTE BECAUSE
OF SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS OR EXPENSES OR OTHER KINDS OF
THINGS. WHAT WE EMPLOY ARE WHAT ARE CALLED ENGINEER
CAPS, AND THESE ARE SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO PREVENT
EXPOSURE TO THE WASTE.

IN ADDITION TO SOIL, THEY ALSO HAVE POLY --
POLY -- THE PLASTIC MEMBRANE, PLASTIC MEMBRANE. PLUS
THEY'RE ENGINEERED SUCH THAT RUN OFF DRAINS OFF THE SITE
RATHER THAN DOWN INTO THE LAYER. SO THEY'RE VERY
SOPHISTICATED AND THEY HAVE TO BE. THERE'S QUITE A
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. SO THOSE ARE ALL --

ATTENDEE: THAT PLASTIC MEMBRANE YOU'RE
DESCRIBING, IS THAT GOING TO BE USED IN THIS PARK?

MR. SCANDURA: NO. MAINLY WE TEND TO USE
THOSE WHERE YOU HAVE YOUR MORE VOLATILE SUBSTANCES, LIKE SOLVENTS. HOWEVER, THERE IS GOING TO BE, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, A DELINEATION IN THE BOTTOM OF THIS TWO-FOOT COVER. SO PEOPLE KNOW IF THEY HIT THAT, THEY THEN EVENTUALLY START TO GO INTO THE NATIVE FILL. THAT'S ANOTHER WAY.

MS. MORAN: IT'S A VISUAL BARRIER. IT'S BRIGHT YELLOW, I THINK. SO SAY A DOG STARTS DIGGING OR SOMETHING, YOU HIT THAT BARRIER BEFORE YOU GET TO -- ALSO THE WAY THE PARK HAS BEEN DESIGNED, THE AREA WITH THE MOST LIKELY CONTAMINATION IS THE PARKING LOT. SO THAT'S AN EFFECTIVE CAP THAT PRECLUDES ANY INTERACTION WITH (INAUDIBLE).

MR. GLASSOCK: ALL RIGHT.

MS. BABICH: I ALSO HAD SOME COMMENTS.

MR. GLASSOCK: OKAY. SURE. DO YOU WANT THE MIC?

MS. BABICH: I PROBABLY DON'T NEED IT, BUT -- SO, IN GENERAL, I THINK THAT THE DOCUMENT IS GOOD. I THINK THAT THE DOCUMENT IS GOOD BECAUSE OF OUR PARTNERSHIP WITH THE LAND TRUST AND THEIR COMMITMENT TO THE TWO FOOT OF SOIL.

AND I REALLY TAKE TO TASK ON PAGE 2 WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT THE COVER PROGRAM AND THAT THIS SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED A PRECEDENT FOR OTHER REMEDIAL PROJECTS IN
THE AREA. I THINK THAT TWO FOOT IS THE WAY THAT THE
AGENCY SHOULD GO.

AND I KNOW, JOHN, THAT YOU AND I HAVE TALKED
ABOUT THIS, AND I'M NOT LETTING UP ON IT, ESPECIALLY
GIVEN THE FACT THAT DTSC WILL BE OVERSEEING A LOT OF
PARKS COMING INTO LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THERE ARE
SPACES THEY WILL BE USING FOR THESE PARKS, UNLESS YOU
PLAN ON TEARING DOWN PEOPLE'S HOMES, IT'S PROBABLY GOING
TO BE OLD INDUSTRIAL GROUND FILL AND INDUSTRIAL SITES
THAT ARE EMBEDDED IN OUR COMMUNITIES. AND SO I
THINK THAT SHOULD BE REMOVED ON PAGE 2. I FIND IT
OFFENSIVE.

ON PAGE 18, WE JUST SPOKE ABOUT THIS, THE
VISUAL BARRIER THAT'S SUPPOSED TO BE DOWN OVER THE
PROPERTY BEFORE THE IMPORT SOIL COMES IN. IT GIVES AN
EXAMPLE OF FIVE-FOOT GRID TAPE. THAT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE.
WE WANT A COLORFUL -- EITHER CLOTH THAT YOU WOULD USE IN
LANDSCAPING THAT THE WATER CAN GO THROUGH. BUT WE DO
NOT WANT SOME WILLY-NILLY GRID TAPE AND THEN YOU JUST
HAVE TO HOPE THAT SOMEBODY HITS THE EDGE OF THE GRID AND
FINDS THE TAPE. THAT'S NOT WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR.

SOME OF YOU MAY KNOW FROM READING THE RAW THAT
THIS PROPERTY WAS READY TO GO, IN SOME PEOPLE'S MINDS,
IN 2001, AND IT TOOK ALL THIS TIME FOR THE COMMUNITY TO
IMPLEMENT THESE PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES. AND WE WOULD
REALLY LIKE TO SEE THAT DTSC TAKES THAT TO THE NEXT LEVEL. AND SO WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW WE CAN INSTITUTE THAT INTO POLICY AND WORK WITH DTSC TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT HAPPENS.

WE ALSO DID A Foyer REQUEST FOR THE DOCUMENTATION INTERNALLY FROM THE AGENCY ON THIS PARK BECAUSE WE WERE TOLD THAT IT WAS RECOMMENDED FROM AGENCY STAFF THAT THERE WOULD BE TWO FOOT. SO I WOULD NEVER WANT TO HOLD DOWN THE PROCESS OF THE PARK GOING THROUGH BECAUSE WE WAITED WAY TOO LONG, AND I THINK THIS IS A GOOD WORK PLAN, BUT I THINK IT'S A GOOD WORK PLAN BECAUSE WE HAVE A GOOD PARTNERSHIP WITH MARK AND THE L.A. LAND TRUST. AND I WILL TELL YOU RIGHT NOW, THIS PARK WOULD NOT BE GOING THROUGH WITHOUT THE TWO-FOOT CAP.

AND I AM ALSO A LITTLE BIT CONCERNED, I'M NOT VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE TERM ON PAGE 5, I BELIEVE IT'S THE SECOND PART OF THE VOLUME TWO OF THE RAW. AND IT TALKS ABOUT SCARIFICATION, UP TO 12 INCHES OF SCARIFICATION OF THE EXISTING SOIL TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NEW SOIL AND THE OLD SOIL ADHERES.

I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THAT. THAT SOUNDS A LITTLE BIT SCARY TO ME, AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT HOW THAT PROCESS WORKS. I KNOW THAT WITH MARK IN CHARGE THERE WILL BE PLENTY OF
MOISTURES THAT GOES ON, BUT THIS IS A HOT SPOT AREA, AND
WE THINK THAT THE COVER AND THE NEW SOIL IS GOING TO BE
A REALLY GREAT BARRIER.

WE HAVE DONE SOME STUDIES ON THE PHOSPHORUS
BECAUSE PHOSPHORUS WILL BIND LEAD. AND SO WE THOUGHT
THAT WOULD BE ANOTHER GREAT MEASURE. AND I KNOW IN
SPEAKING TO MARK THAT THEY CAN HAVE THEIR SOIL AMENDMENT
THAT THEY WILL BE BRINGING IN, KIND OF -- THEY'RE
BRINGING IN SO MUCH THAT THEY CAN ADD EXTRA PHOSPHORUS
IF THEY WANT, AND WE APPRECIATE THAT.

BUT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT THE
SCARIFICATION BECAUSE THE LIKELIHOOD OF FINDING
SOMETHING IS REAL.

AND THE LAST THING I WOULD LIKE TO TALK
ABOUT -- AND I REALLY DO, JOHN, WANT TO FOLLOW UP WITH
YOU ON THIS TWO FOOT OF SOIL. I MADE MANY CALLS TO YOU.
I'M NOT EVEN GOING TO BRING UP ALL THE OTHER STUFF WE'RE
WORKING ON BECAUSE I'M GOING TO BE SPECIFIC ON WHAT
WE'RE DOING TODAY.

BUT WE HAVE A CHANCE TO DO SOMETHING REALLY
GOOD AND SET THE PACE FOR ALL THE PARKS THAT ARE GOING
TO BE COMING INTO L.A. COUNTY, AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE
THAT PEOPLE DON'T HAVE TO WORRY.

PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY -- HOW WE GOT TO THE
TWO FOOT WAS PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY COMING TO ME AND
SAYING IN VARIOUS FORMS, "HOW DARE YOU ALLOW PEOPLE TO PUT A PARK IN WHERE YOU WON'T LIVE?" BECAUSE, AS MANY KNOW, MY HOUSE WAS THERE.

AND WHEN I TELL THEM SOMEBODY IS GOING TO BRING IN A FOOT OF CLEAN SOIL, 12 INCHES DOESN'T FEEL WARM AND FUZZY. I DON'T KNOW WHY TWO FOOT FEELS BETTER, BUT IT DOES.

AND THAT IS REALLY IMPORTANT. IF PEOPLE ARE NOT COMFORTABLE WITH THIS PARK WITH ALL THIS WORK WE HAVE DONE AND MONEY IT'S GOING TO COST TO BRING THAT AMOUNT OF SOIL, IT'S REALLY GOING TO BE FOR NOT. AND I REALLY WANT MY COMMUNITY, AT THE END OF THIS, TO NOT HAVE TO KEEP LIVING THAT NIGHTMARE. AT LEAST WE NEED ONE PIECE OF PROPERTY IN THE COMMUNITY THAT'S SAFE TO LIVE ON.

THE LAST COMMENTS I WANT TO MAKE FOLLOW UP ON WHAT MARGARET BROUGHT UP. THIS PROPERTY, IN OUR OPINION, HAS BEEN GROSSLY ABUSED, AND WE REALLY WANT TO SET THE TONE. AND THE LAND TRUST HAS BEEN HELPING US WITH THE HEALING PROCESS FOR THAT PROPERTY.

AND WE DO WANT TO HAVE SOME KIND OF A NATIVE TEAM. THAT WAS A TRADE AREA. MARGARET, WHO WORKS AT THE UNIVERSITY, IS EXTREMELY KNOWLEDGABLE ABOUT THIS AREA AND WHAT'S GOING ON. AND IF MARGARET TELLS ME THAT THERE'S A PROBLEM, THERE'S A PROBLEM.
AND IN READING THE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE
PROVIDED BY THE TRIBES IN THE RAW, IT WAS VERY
HORRIFYING TO ME TO READ ABOUT THE ARCO INCIDENT. THE
TRIBES HAVE WARNED THAT PEOPLE SHOULD NOT LISTEN TO
DEVELOPERS WHEN THEY SAY THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE MUCH
SCARIFICATION OR THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE MUCH DIGGING,
BECAUSE IT DOESN'T TAKE MUCH.

AND WHAT HAPPENED AT THE ARCO REFINERY IN
CARSON WHERE THEY DESECRATED GRAVES IS NOT ACCEPTABLE,
AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT DOESN'T HAPPEN HERE.
AND IF IT REQUIRES TWO PEOPLE COMING DOWN AND SPENDING A
COUPLE OF AFTERNOONS, WHAT'S THE PROBLEM? MAYBE THEY
WILL FIND A NEWFOUND, YOU KNOW, FRIENDSHIP AT STARBUCKS
DURING THE BREAK OR SOMETHING.

BUT PLEASE, LET'S GET THROUGH THIS. LET'S GET
OUR PARK GOING. LET'S DO THE LESSONS LEARNED. LET'S
TRY TO DO THINGS BETTER. AND LET'S BE RESPECTFUL OF THE
PEOPLE THAT CAME BEFORE US.

SO THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING DOWN HERE. IT'S
QUITE A FEW OF YOU. AND WE WILL REMAIN EVER VIGILANT
WATCHING. BUT SO FAR IT LOOKS PRETTY GOOD. AND I
EXPECT THE TRIBAL SITUATION WILL BE RECTIFIED AND WE
WILL GET MORE INFORMATION ON THE SCARIFICATION BECAUSE I
WANT PEOPLE FROM THE COMMUNITY TO REST ASSURED THAT THEY
CAN GO TAKE THEIR SHOES OFF. IF PEOPLE ARE PREGNANT,
COME OUT THERE AND BRING THEIR KIDS. AND THAT'S WHY
IT'S TAKING US 17 YEARS TO GET THIS PARK. THANK YOU.
AMEN.

MS. MEDINA: AMEN.

MR. MCPHAUL: OKAY. DID YOU -- YOU SAID YOU
HAD ADDITIONAL COMMENTS -- DOES ANYONE ELSE HAVE
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, ANYTHING THEY WANT TO ADD?
QUESTION? YOU SAID YOU WANTED -- I THINK YOU WANTED TO
READ THE DOCUMENT. THAT'S CORRECT, OKAY.

ATTENDEE: YEAH.

MR. MCPHAUL: SO WITH THAT, GOING ONCE, GOING
TWICE.

OKAY. WITH THAT, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND
ADJOURN.

PLEASE BEFORE YOU STOP, BEFORE YOU LEAVE,
PLEASE STOP AND GET WATER AND A RICE KRISPY TREAT BEFORE
YOU LEAVE, OKAY? THERE'S COOKIES, COFFEE. PLEASE TAKE
ADVANTAGE. AND WE WILL BE AROUND HERE FOR A FEW
MINUTES.

THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING. WE REALLY
APPRECIATE YOU AS A COMMUNITY, AS STAFF. THANK YOU FOR
COMING OUT.

(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 7:17 P.M.)
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<td>PRECEDENT</td>
<td>37:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>14:19</td>
</tr>
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<td>19:10</td>
</tr>
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<td>10:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK</td>
<td>35:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANTED</td>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>9:10,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>35:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARM</td>
<td>41:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNED</td>
<td>42:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>7:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE</td>
<td>10:23</td>
<td>11:2,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36:10,12,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTES</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATCHING</td>
<td>42:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>24:24</td>
<td>38:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERING</td>
<td>23:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
<td>18:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBSITES</td>
<td>26:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK</td>
<td>35:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKS</td>
<td>18:2,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>8:7 14:14,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLY-NILLY</td>
<td>38:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDOW</td>
<td>33:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDOM</td>
<td>5:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISHING</td>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:11 20:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WONDERFUL</td>
<td>4:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WONDERING</td>
<td>34:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORDS</td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>5:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:14 8:16</td>
<td>9:5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:6,20</td>
<td>12:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:5,17,22</td>
<td>14:8,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:10,14,21,23</td>
<td>19:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS</td>
<td>16:9  24:15 36:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING</td>
<td>2:17,18 10:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35:14 40:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKS</td>
<td>39:24</td>
<td>41:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td>36:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORRY</td>
<td>13:24</td>
<td>40:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOW</td>
<td>5:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>26:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>26:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITTEN</td>
<td>26:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAY</td>
<td>4:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>15:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS</td>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>5:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:8 11:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19:11 28:7</td>
<td>43:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>37:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOM</td>
<td>4:12 7:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:12 29:8,10,12,15,17,19,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30:6,11,14,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31:5,8,11,13,20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>23:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUTH</td>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZACK</td>
<td>5:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Supplemental Geotechnical Report

A supplemental geotechnical report was prepared by Converse Consultants for the proposed project due to design alterations for the project utilizing two feet of clean fill as opposed to one foot of clean fill. This supplement does not change any of the findings in the IS/MND and has been included in this section for full documentation of the recommendations made by Converse for the Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project.
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January 23, 2017

Mr. Oscar Johnson  
Sr. Project Manager  
MIG, Inc.  
109 West Union Avenue  
Fullerton, California 92832

Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS LETTER  
Proposed Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project  
1000 204th Street  
Torrance, California  
Converse Project No. 15-32-125-01

Dear Mr. Johnson:

In accordance with your request and approval, Converse Consultants (Converse) has prepared this supplemental geotechnical recommendations letter for the subject project. To prepare this letter, we have reviewed the following:

- Loading Information from Design Team for Prefabricated Restroom and Maintenance Buildings through email dated January 9, 2017.
- Typical loading information for shade structures through email dated January 11, 2017.

It is our understanding that, due to environmental concerns at the site, the alternative grading plan is proposed for the site improvement. Based on our review of the latest grading plan, we understand that approximately 2 feet of granular import fill will be placed throughout the site. In building areas, this fill thickness will be more than 2 feet.

We understand that the prefabricated restroom and maintenance buildings will be supported on 8-inch thick concrete slab with 28-day compressive strength of 8,000 psi with a double rebar mat inside. We further understand the restroom building will be 90,000 pounds total and the maintenance building will be 70,000 pound total.

We also understand that the shade structures are going to be lightly loaded and supported on shallow foundations.
**Preparation of Fill Areas and Placement and Compaction of Fill**

After proper processing of construction area (free of vegetation, shrubs, roots and debris), we recommend the surface area should be scarified at least 12 inches, moisture conditioned as needed to near-optimum moisture content, and compacted to 90 percent relative compaction.

If soft, yielding soil conditions are encountered at the bottom, the following options can be considered:

a. Over-excavate until reach firm bottom.

b. Over-excavate additional 18 inches deep, and then place at least 18-inch-thick compacted base material (CAB or equivalent) to bridge the soft bottom. Base should be compacted to 95% relative compaction.

c. Over-excavate additional 18 inches deep, then place a layer of geofabric (i.e. Marifi HP570, X600 or equivalent), and place 18-inch-thick compacted base material (CAB or equivalent) to bridge the soft bottom. Base should be compacted to 95% relative compaction. An additional layer of geofabric may be needed on top of base depending on the actual site conditions.

Any proposed import fill should be evaluated and approved by the geotechnical engineer of record prior to import to the site and should satisfy the criteria presented below.

Fill soils shall be evenly spread in approximately 8-inch lifts. Prior to compaction, fill materials should be thoroughly mixed and moisture conditioned within two (2) percent of the optimum moisture content. All import fill should be compacted to at least 95 percent of the laboratory dry density in accordance with the ASTM Standard D1557 test method for the building areas and hardscape areas and 90 percent for all other areas.

Based on the review of the available plans, we understand footings for shade structures, restroom building and maintenance building will have minimum 2-foot of engineered fill support. We should review the final plans before the construction to confirm this condition. All other geotechnical recommendations presented in our referenced geotechnical report are still valid.

**Import Fill**

Import fill should be predominantly granular and meet the following criteria:

- Soils used as compacted import fill shall have the following characteristics:
  a. Structural area such as Pre-Fabricated Buildings, Shade Structures, and Hardscape Area: Expansion Index should be less than 20
b. Open/mounded turf and ball field area: Expansion Index less than 60
- Free of all deleterious materials
- Contain no particles larger than 3 inches in the largest dimension
- Contain at least 15 percent fines (passing #200 sieve)

Any import fill should be tested and approved by the geotechnical engineer/representative prior to delivery to the site.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of continued service to Del Amo Neighborhood Park Project. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call the undersigned at (626) 930-1275.

CONVERSE CONSULTANTS

Siva K. Sivathasan, PhD, PE, GE, DGE, QSD, F. ASCE
Senior Vice President / Principal Engineer

Dist: 2/Addresssee
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Section 8: Responses to Comments on the Draft Final RAW
Responses to Community Comments on the Draft Final RAW
Del Amo Neighborhood Park

Comment E1:
I live in Ponderosa West, the condo community right next to the site. I just wanted to say thank you very much for your work. I fully support the proposed workplan. It is a wonderful community project!

Response to Comment E1:
Thank you for your comment. Comment noted.

Comment F1:
Where will vapor barriers be installed?

Response to Comment F1:
Thank you for your comment. Vapor barriers will be installed below any building constructed onsite pursuant to the Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances, Title 26 Building Code, Chapter 1, Section 110 and DTSC letter, Approval of Draft Final Removal Action Workplan (Draft Final RAW), Del Amo Neighborhood Park, Los Angeles, California dated March 20, 2017 (see page 18 of the Draft Final RAW). Vapor barriers prevent potential hazardous vapors from accumulating in unventilated buildings by diverting the vapor to the open sky where there is no human health risk. In the current plan, the vapor barriers will be installed under the restroom/office and maintenance building.

Comment F2:
We do not want graph tape we want something solid. Can that be done?

Response to Comment F2:
Thank you for your comment. Visual barriers, such as the grid or graph tape, are routinely and effectively used to alert a person of a potential hazard. In support of your comment, and other community member’s similar comments, DTSC will require an orange demarcation netting with a ¾-inch mesh opening throughout the site, as the visual barrier, to delineate the current soil prior to importing and placing clean soils. This netting is long-lasting and is also routinely used on sites with impacted soils. In addition to being a highly visual barrier, the other advantage of the netting is that it allows geotechnical stability of the imported clean soil adhering to the native soil. This allows the structures within the park a greater degree of stability.

In addition to this precautionary measure, the remedy for the site is the placement of 2-foot of soil and includes institutional controls that have been established for the park to be protective of human health and the environment. These institutional controls include: 1) a land use covenant limiting the use of the property and how future activities are to be conducted; 2) a soil management plan that outlines how to implement any excavation of impacted soils; and, 3) a health and safety plan to protect workers during the remedial field activities.

Legend:
Comment E1: emailed to S. Sayed by Kanji Kitamura
Comments F1-F2: written comment form by Karen Cruz
Comments F3, F4: written comment form by Cynthia Babich
Comment F6: written comment form by Cristal Martinez
Comments G5-G8: oral comment by Attendee
Comments G9-G17: oral comments by Cynthia Babich
Responses to Community Comments on the Draft Final RAW
Del Amo Neighborhood Park

Comment F3:
This 2-foot bar needs to be used for all future urban parks. How can this become a policy?

Response to Comment F3:
Thank you for your comment. DTSC welcomes the opportunity for dialogue with the Del Amo Action Committee and other interested parties to identify the most protective measures for parks constructed over previously contaminated properties in California. Subsequently to the public meeting, DTSC met with Ms. Cynthia Babich of the Del Amo Action Committee on May 11, 2017 to discuss soil cover requirements for park sites.

Comment F4:
2-feet of soil vs. 12 inches - This is a precautionary measure - How could DTSC not support this - DTSC needs to raise its bar on this - I am very upset that DTSC has not supported our community needs and it seems as though it just doing the samo ole’ thing - Need to take the communities lead - If the LANLT did not support and stand firm on 2’ of soil cap this park would not happen.

Response to Comment F4:
Thank you for your comment. With support from the project proponent and input from the community, it was determined that the best remedy for the site was to place a two-foot layer of clean soil.

Comment F6:
I do not want tape around the barrier. I want a solid plate in the whole park. I want it covered all!

Response to Comment F6:
Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response to comment F2 above.

Oral Comment G5:
They will be using the shortest route, the same route?

Response to Oral Comment G5:
Thank you for your comment. A preliminary Traffic Control Plan has been prepared (see Figure 9.0, Section 6.5.6 Traffic Control page 19 and 8.2 Site Traffic Control page 20 of the Draft Final RAW) that takes into consideration length of trip, location of residents and ease of ingress and egress for purposes of achieving a safe transportation plan. The Traffic Control Plan will be provided to the County of Los Angeles to obtain a permit. Upon obtaining approval by the County of Los Angeles, this (or a similar) traffic plan will be the route taken by all vehicle ingress and egress from the Site. The final route will be viewable by the public upon request to the contractor.

Oral Comment G6:
Legend:
Comment E1: emailed to S. Sayed by Kanji Kitamua
Comments F1-F2: written comment form by Karen Cruz
Comments F3, F4: written comment form by Cynthia Babich
Comment F6: written comment form by Cristal Martinez
Comments G5-G8: oral comment by Attendee
Comments G9-G17: oral comments by Cynthia Babich
Mine is a question, and it may be considered too technical for here, but I figured I would just put it on the record. I noticed from the RAW, the mitigation -- one of the mitigation techniques for the damaging -- the health impacts on users to the park was a layer of two feet of topsoil over the area. I know in one of the documents, it may have the original DTSC recommendation, they originally recommended one foot of soil. I was wondering if anybody here knows why it was changed from one foot of soil to two feet of soil?

Response to Oral Comment G6:
Thank you for your comment. Based on its review of the scientific literature related to the protection of sensitive human receptors to the concentrations of lead found in soil at the site, DTSC determined that one foot of soil would provide adequate protection of human health and the environment. With support from the project proponent and input from the community, it was further determined that the best feasible remedy for the site was to place a two-foot soil cover out of an abundance of precaution.

Oral Comment G7:
I don’t have the background to know where this sort of mitigation has been done in the past. I assume it’s been done successfully elsewhere. I just want -- I am a dog lover. I know dogs like to dig holes in the same places. If somebody takes their dog for a walk to the park and it starts digging a hole and starts working on it week after week, two feet of soil doesn’t really seem like that much to get through. I just wanted to know -- I assume this has been used successfully in other areas?

Response to Oral Comment G7:
Thank you for your comment. As previously conveyed to the community during the meeting on April 12, 2017, this type of remedy (placement of 2-foot of soil) has been successfully implemented in a park in the San Fernando Valley. Further, this property will be developed into a park, will be frequently maintained and soil will be placed over a plastic netting; therefore, two feet of soil has been determined to be an adequate buffer for these maintained conditions. Additionally, DTSC has placed institutional controls through a land use covenant that would require the use of a Soil Management Plan prior to any excavation below the two feet of soil. See response to Comment F2 above.

Oral Comment G8:
That plastic membrane you’re describing, is that going to be used in this park?

Response to Oral Comment G8:
Thank you for your comment. A netting will be used as a demarcation barrier. The plastic membrane, as mentioned at the April 12, 2017 public meeting, is only used when there are volatile substances like solvents. For this park, the remedy is the 2-foot of clean soil underlain by the plastic netting, and a vapor intrusion barrier under buildings. See response to Comment F2 above.
Responses to Community Comments on the Draft Final RAW
Del Amo Neighborhood Park

Oral Comment G9:
-- so, in general, I think that the document is good. I think that the document is good because of our partnership with the Land Trust and their commitment to the two foot of soil.

Response to Oral Comment G9:
Thank you for your comment. DTSC is committed to protection of human health and the environment and will continue to work with the community and the project proponent, DANP, and LA County throughout the project development.

Oral Comment G10:
And I really take to task on page 2 where it talks about the cover program and that this should not be considered a precedent for other remedial projects in the area. I think that two foot is the way that the agency should go... and so I think that should be removed on page 2. I find it offensive.

Response to Oral Comment G10:
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment F3 above.

Oral Comment G11:
On page 18, we just spoke about this, the visual barrier that’s supposed to be down over the property before the import soil comes in. It gives an example of five-foot grid tape. That’s not acceptable. We want a colorful -- either cloth that you would use in landscaping that the water can go through. But we do not want some willy-nilly grid tape and then you just have to hope that somebody hits the edge of the grid and finds the tape. That’s not what we’re looking for.

Response to Oral Comment G11:
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to F2 above.

Oral Comment G12:
Some of you may know from reading the RAW that this property was ready to go, in some people’s minds, in 2001, and it took all this time for the community to implement these precautionary measures. And we would really like to see that DTSC takes that to the next level. And so we would like to know how we can institute that into policy and work with DTSC to make sure that that happens.

Response to Oral Comment G12:
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to Comment F3 above.

Legend:
Comment E1: emailed to S. Sayed by Kanji Kitamura
Comments F1-F2: written comment form by Karen Cruz
Comments F3, F4: written comment form by Cynthia Babich
Comment F6: written comment form by Cristal Martinez
Comments G5-G8: oral comment by Attendee
Comments G9-G17: oral comments by Cynthia Babich
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good partnership with Mark and the L.A. Land Trust. And I will tell you right now, this park would not be going through without the two-foot cap.

Response to Oral Comment G13:
Thank you for your comment. Comment noted.

Oral Comment G14:
And I am also a little bit concerned, I’m not very familiar with the term on page 5, I believe it’s the second part of the volume two of the RAW. And it talks about scarification, up to 12 inches of scarification of the existing soil to make sure that the new soil and the old soil adheres. I’m not familiar with that. That sounds a little bit scary to me, and I would like to know a little bit more about how that process works. I know that with Mark in charge there will be plenty of moistures that goes on, but this is a hot spot area, and we think that the cover and the new soil is going to be a really great barrier.

Response to Oral Comment G14:
Thank you for your comment. Scarification is a process of loosening soil to provide an ample bond between the existing soil and the imported clean soil. This process avoids irregular settlement of the site’s soil, and thereby prevents structural and drainage problems, for example. It is important to note that scarification will only be done with the teeth of the excavator (6 inches ~ 12 inches), or an equivalent machinery with scarifier attachment, and will only interact with the immediate surface soil.

Oral Comment G15:
We have done some studies on the phosphorus because phosphorus will bind lead. And so we thought that would be another great measure. And I know in speaking to Mark that they can have their soil amendment that they will be bringing in, kind of -- they’re bringing in so much that they can add extra phosphorus if they want, and we appreciate that.

Response to Oral Comment G15:
Applying phosphorus based fertilizer to lead contaminated soil may decrease both the mobility and the bioavailability of lead, limiting its negative impact on human health. However, soil amendment with excess phosphorus may cause potential impact on soil pH due to the acidification. Based on the residual lead concentrations at the site, the application of normal phosphate based-fertilizer (which is already incorporated into the design specification) should aid in limiting the mobility of lead in this soil. It is not recommended to add excess fertilizer that may pose a potential impact to soil pH and plant viability on site. The project proponent is working with sub-consultants to find a happy medium.

Oral Comment G16:
But I would like to know more about the scarification because the likelihood of finding something is real.

Legend:
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Comments F1-F2: written comment form by Karen Cruz
Comments F3, F4: written comment form by Cynthia Babich
Comment F6: written comment form by Cristal Martinez
Comments G5-G8: oral comment by Attendee
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Response to Oral Comment G16:
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to oral comment G14 above.

Oral Comment G17:
And when I tell them somebody is going to bring in a foot of clean soil, 12 inches doesn’t feel warm and fuzzy. I don’t know why two foot feels better, but it does. And that is really important. If people are not comfortable with this park with all this work we have done and money it’s going to cost to bring that amount of soil, it’s really going to be for not. And I really want my community, at the end of this, to not have to keep living that nightmare. At least we need one piece of property in the community that’s safe to live on.

Response to Oral Comment G17:
Thank you for your comment. Comment noted.