

SECTION 4.0
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This section of the Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration includes a completed environmental checklist form consistent with Appendix I of the CEQA Guidelines. The environmental checklist was prepared based on the information compiled for the Los Angeles River Master Plan and supplement with archival and field research. In addition to the environmental checklist required pursuant to CEQA, Section 4.17, Assessment of Public Benefits pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act describes the public benefits that will be evaluated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during consideration of the *Los Angeles River Master Plan*.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
LAND USE and PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
GEOLOGICAL ISSUES. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
) Fault rupture?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Seismic ground shaking?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
) Landslides or mudflows?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Subsidence of the land?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
) Expansive soils?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
Unique geologic or physical features?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	---	---	<u>X</u>	---
) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
) Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>
) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	---	---	---	<u>X</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
5 AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
d) Create objectionable odors?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
6 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increase vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative Transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>
d) Wetlands habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>

ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>
b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>
c) Result in the loss of availability of known mineral resource that would be a future value to the region and the residents of the State?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>

HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	___	___	___	<u> X </u>

NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increases in existing noise levels?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	___	___	<u> X </u>	___

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1 PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

) Fire protection?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
) Police protection?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Schools?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Other governmental services?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>

2 UTILITIES and SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

) Power or natural gas?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Communications systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Sewer or septic tanks?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Storm water drainage?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
Solid waste disposal?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Local or regional water supplies?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—

3 AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
) Create light or glare?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—

4 CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

) Disturb paleontological resources?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
) Disturb archaeological resources?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Affect historical resources?	—	—	X	—
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	—	—	—	X
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	—	—	—	X

5 RECREATION. Would the proposal:

i) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	—	—	—	X
j) Affect existing recreational opportunities?	—	—	X	—

6 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

k) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	—	—	—	X
l) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	—	—	—	X
m) 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.)	—	—	—	X
n) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	—	—	—	X

7 ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC BENEFITS PURSUANT TO THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.

The site-specific projects recommended by the proposed *Los Angeles River Master Plan* provide public benefits related to land use and planning, biological resources, aesthetics, and recreation. The proposed *Los Angeles River Master Plan* achieves planning guidelines established in the *Federal Water Project Recreation Act* by: identifying opportunities for outdoor recreation and habitat enhancement that could be developed in association with the Los Angeles River, a federal flood protection project; integration of proposed improvements with other federal, state and local projects; and encouragement of non-federal cooperation in the administration of the proposed projects. The *Los Angeles*

River Master Plan with SCAG's *Regional Comprehensive Plan* goal of emphasizing and enhancing existing open-space resources to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation. The proposed *Los Angeles River Master Plan* is consistent with land use designations contained in the *County of Los Angeles General Plan* (County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, 1993 and 1980) and the thirteen local jurisdictions through which it passes.

The proposed *Los Angeles Master Plan* provides three distinct benefits for biological resources: (1) planting of a nearly continuous greenway adjacent to the 51-mile reach of the Los Angeles River and the 9-mile reach of Tujunga Wash; (2) habitat restoration and enhancement, particularly in association with the proposed Dominguez Gap Demonstration Project; and (3) protection of existing areas that provide suitable habitat for native species.

The proposed *Los Angeles River Master Plan* includes four types of aesthetic enhancement projects to remediate existing visually degraded sections of the Los Angeles River: (1) Mapping and Sign System; (2) Tree Plantings and Aesthetic Enhancement Programs; (3) River Art; and 4) Graffiti Abatement Programs.

Site-specific recommendations for recreation improvements contained in the proposed *Los Angeles River Master Plan* provide numerous opportunities to expand the accessibility and quality of outdoor recreation facilities to meet the diversified needs of County residents. Specifically, the proposed plan includes: Regional Trail System Improvements to provide a regional bike trail with connections to other public facilities located near the Los Angeles River and Tujunga Wash; the development of interpretive sites that facilitate use of the River as an outdoor classroom; Vista Points at Bridges to enhance existing pedestrian crossings of the River; the development of parks to serve neighborhoods and communities adjoining the River; and Demonstration Projects that provide aesthetic and recreation enhancements.