COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Findings

San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan

June 2006

SCH No. 2003041187

Table of Contents

Section **Page Number**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Having received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final Program EIR for the San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan, the Board of Supervisors hereby makes findings in accordance with Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code as follows. Except as otherwise noted, these findings incorporate the facts and discussions of environmental impacts that are found in the Final Program EIR as if fully set forth herein.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA," Public Resources Code §§ 21000-21178.1) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs., §§ 15000-15387), the County of Los Angeles (County) is the lead agency for the San Gabriel River Corridor Master Plan (Master Plan or Project). The County prepared a Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) for the Master Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2003041187), to consider the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives of the Master Plan on a program level. As projects identified in the Master Plan are proposed for implementation in the future, their sponsors will examine each project in light of the program EIR to determine what additional project-level environmental document must be prepared. The data on existing conditions and the programmatic analyses and mitigation measures presented in the program EIR will then serve as a source of background information and model to guide further project-level CEQA review.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The San Gabriel River extends from the Angeles National Forest through the San Gabriel Valley and the Los Angeles Coastal Plain to the Pacific Ocean. Engineered modifications currently present along the River provide flood protection for surrounding urban development. These modifications have also allowed development almost to the River's edge, decreasing open space and altering natural habitats. In order to address conditions along the River, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors passed a resolution in 1999 instructing the Department of Public Works (LADPW) to prepare a San Gabriel River Master Plan for Board approval, with the assistance of the Department of Regional Planning, Department of Parks and Recreation, and the National Park Service (NPS) (Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program). To develop the Master Plan, LADPW established the San Gabriel River Master Plan Steering Committee (Steering Committee) composed of a broad range of stakeholders, including: cities along the river; water and regulatory agencies; interested community, business, and environmental groups; and other interested individuals. The Steering Committee is open to the public, and members have met more than 40 times over the past 4 years. In addition to the Steering Committee, a Planning Committee consisting of Los Angeles County, San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC), and NPS staff meets monthly.

The Steering Committee and LADPW developed a vision statement and a set of broad goals. As defined by the Steering Committee, the vision for the project is:

> *The San Gabriel River will be the corridor of an integrated watershed system while providing protection, benefit and enjoyment to the public.*

The following goals of the Master Plan support the vision for the San Gabriel River and serve as the project objectives for the Master Plan in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b):

1. Habitat: Preserve and enhance habitat systems through public education, connectivity, and balance with other uses.
2. Recreation: Encourage and enhance safe and diverse recreation systems, while providing for expansion, equitable and sufficient access, balance, and multi-purpose uses.
3. Open Space: Enhance and protect open space systems through conservation, aesthetics, connectivity, stewardship, and multi-purpose uses.
4. Flood Protection: Maintain flood protection and existing water and other rights while enhancing flood management activities through the integration with recreation, open space, and habitat systems.
5. Water Supply and Water Quality: Maintain existing water and other rights while enhancing water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, and water conservation through the integration with recreation, open space, and habitat systems.
6. Economic Development: Pursue economic development opportunities derived from and compatible with the natural aesthetic and environmental qualities of the river.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Master Plan is an overall conceptual plan that focuses primarily on developing the San Gabriel River corridor as an integrated watershed system that enhances habitat, provides recreational benefits, and protects open space, while maintaining and enhancing flood protection and water resources. During the course of the Master Plan development process, over 130 independently sponsored enhancement projects were identified by the member agencies and organizations of the Steering Committee. Each of these projects incorporate one or more of the Master Plan goals of enhancing habitat, recreation and open space, while maintaining and enhancing flood protection, water supply and water quality. The Master Plan provides guidelines to help coordinate these independent projects and to facilitate the achievement of the shared vision and goals for the San Gabriel River corridor.

The Master Plan includes:

1. **Master Plan Vision, Goals, Objectives and Performance Criteria –** For each Master Plan goal (habitat, recreation, open space, flood protection, water supply and water quality, and economic development), the Steering Committee and LADPW defined multiple objectives that support the Master Plan vision and the goal. Performance criteria were then developed to measure progress toward those objectives.

2. **River Enhancement Project Concepts –** The following eight categories of project concepts were developed from a collective review of proposed projects along the San Gabriel River. The eight project concepts illustrate the types of projects that can be implemented along the river corridor to help achieve the vision and goals of the Master Plan.

- □ Trail Enhancements
- □ Educational Centers
- □ Bridges, Gateways and Connections
- □ Parks and Open Space
- □ Redevelopment and Reclamation
- □ Habitat Enhancement
- □ Water Quality and Supply
- □ Studies

3. **River Corridor Projects, Policies, and Programs**, **and Design Guidelines –** River corridor-wide efforts, policies, and guidelines intended to connect site-specific projects or address issues common to most Master Plan projects. The aesthetic design guidelines identify the types of materials, colors, and forms that can be incorporated into the design of project facilities (e.g., fences, gates, and walls) and landscaped areas to create an identity for the River.

4. **Stakeholder Projects –** Summary descriptions of over 130 projects suggested or proposed by Steering Committee members. Five of these projects are highlighted in the Master Plan as Concept Design Studies (see below).

5. **Concept Design Studies –** Five of the stakeholder projects are highlighted in the Master Plan as Concept Design Studies. The Concept Design Studies were defined to illustrate the types of multi-purpose projects to be fostered by the Master Plan. The conceptual project descriptions detailed in the Master Plan are the result of a Steering Committee exercise to help provide tangible examples of how the Master Plan multi-objective approach might apply to projects in the San Gabriel River corridor. These studies are intended for illustration purposes only and do not necessarily reflect the intent of the project sponsors. Environmental analysis in the Program EIR is based on the conceptual project descriptions in the Master Plan.

   - □ **San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds** – Proposed by LADPW and the City of Azusa, this project will provide aesthetic improvements and recreational amenities for the area between the River and the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds. Potential project elements include improvements to the fencing around the spreading basins, landscaping, habitat restoration/enhancements, trail enhancement, and interpretive signage.
   - □ **Woodland Duck Farm** – Proposed by the Watershed Conservation Authority (WCA), this project will modify an abandoned duck farm site into an open space area with passive recreation and native habitat enhancements. Potential project elements include trails, habitat, improved site access and parking, an educational center, and constructed wetlands.
   - □ **San Gabriel River Discovery Center at Whittier Narrows** – Proposed by the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District, County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, and RMC, this project will include replacement of the existing Whittier Narrows Nature Center building with a new San Gabriel

River Discovery Center, habitat restoration/enhancements, improvements to the existing trail system, and development of constructed wetlands.

- **Lario Creek** – Proposed by LADPW and North East Trees, this project will enhance water conservation by increasing the capacity of Lario Creek, a man-made conveyance structure operated by LADPW to divert water from the San Gabriel River to the Rio Hondo through the Whittier Narrows Flood Control Basin. The project also proposes improvements to the surrounding Whittier Narrows Nature Area (e.g., trails, signage, constructed wetlands, and habitat restoration/enhancements).
- **El Dorado Regional Park** – Proposed by the City of Long Beach, this project includes improvements to the City's El Dorado Regional Park. Potential project elements include: development of constructed wetlands, replacement of the existing water supply for the man-made lakes in the park with a non-potable source, and habitat restoration/enhancements.

4.0 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Notice of Preparation and Public Scoping Meeting. LADPW, as the division of the County responsible for preparing the Program EIR, prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Program EIR for the Master Plan. The 30-day review period for the NOP extended from April 29, 2003 to May 28, 2003. During the review period, comments were solicited from state and local government agencies that would affect or be affected by the Project, as well as private organizations and individuals that might have an interest in the Project. The NOP is included in Appendix B of the Final Program EIR.

The County received 21 comment letters on the NOP. CEQA related comments were also received during the CEQA scoping meeting held at LADPW offices in Alhambra on May 12, 2003. The written comments submitted on the NOP and comments provided at the CEQA scoping meeting assisted LADPW in focusing the environmental analysis in the Draft Program EIR, and are presented in Appendix B of the Final Program EIR.

Draft Program EIR Circulation. A Draft Program EIR for the Master Plan was completed and released for public review on March 7, 2005, and LADPW initiated a 60-day public comment period by filing a Notice of Completion (NOC) and a Notice of Availability (NOA) with the State Office of Planning and Research. The public review period ended on May 5, 2005. LADPW also provided the NOA to all organizations and individuals who had previously requested such notice. The NOA and the Draft Program EIR were mailed to a total of 72 agencies (including all responsible and trustee agencies), organizations, and interested individuals. The NOA was published in 4 newspapers of general circulation in the project area (*San Gabriel Valley Tribune, Whittier Daily News, Long Beach Press Telegram, and Seal Beach Sun* on March 11 and April 1, 2005). In addition, the NOA was sent to over 200 individuals by e-mail. The NOA was filed with the County Clerks of Los Angeles County and Orange County for public posting. Copies of the Draft Program EIR were made available for public review at the LADPW office in Alhambra, 19 local and area libraries, and on the Master Plan website.

LADPW received written comments on the Draft Program EIR from 24 agencies, organizations and individuals, all of which LADPW responded to in the Final Program EIR. Agency and public comments received on the Draft Program EIR, as well as responses to these comments, are presented in Appendix F of the Final Program EIR.

Final Program EIR. LADPW prepared the Final Program EIR, and provided copies of the Final Program EIR to all commenting agencies.

The following documents are part of the record of proceedings upon which the Board of Supervisors based its decision on the Project:

- The NOP for the Project
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the NOP
- Public notices issued in conjunction with the Project
- The Draft Program EIR
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft Program EIR
- The Final Program EIR for the Project
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the County in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps and other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, the County's consultants, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the Project
- All documents submitted to the County by agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project
- Matters of common knowledge to the County, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local laws and regulations

The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Board of Supervisors' decision is based in this matter is the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Watershed Management Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Assistant Deputy Director for the Watershed Management Division, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITHOUT MITIGATION

The Final Program EIR identifies environmental effects of the Project that were determined to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required to address these effects. Nevertheless, for some of the impacts, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the less-than-significant impacts.

5.1 Air Quality

5.1.1 Master Plan Impacts

Operational impacts on air quality due to increased vehicle trips for maintenance activities and visions to recreational facilities were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-A2 Evaluations of air quality impacts during project operation will be conducted as follows during site-specific environmental review of each future Master Plan project:

1. Based on the site-specific project description, the number of vehicle trips that would be generated by operation of proposed facilities (e.g., ongoing maintenance activities and/or visitors to recreational or educational facilities) will be estimated, and air emissions associated with those vehicle trips will be determined. If project operation involves use of electricity (e.g., lighting for parks, education center or park buildings, pumps, etc.), air emissions associated with electricity consumption will be estimated.
2. Based on the above information, and using the latest version of the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, operational emissions will be compared to the thresholds of significance (**Section 4.12**).
3. One or more of the following measures will be implemented as applicable to reduce air emissions:
    - Implement dust control if dry conditions and substantial area is disturbed for operations and maintenance activities that involve ground disturbance.
    - Select energy efficient lighting features or other building design considerations for proposed facilities (e.g., park buildings or interpretive centers) to minimize emissions associated with power generation.
    - Select low-emissions equipment and vehicles for operations and maintenance to reduce tailpipe emissions.
    - Implement an employee ride-share plan to reduce vehicle trips to the facility and associated tailpipe emissions.

5.1.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

PM10 emissions during construction (earth-moving activities) (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-A1 Clean dirt from construction vehicle tires and undercarriages when leaving the construction site and before entering local roadways.

CD-A2 During earth-moving activities, water the construction area as necessary, but at least twice per day.

CD-A3 Water temporary open storage piles once per hour or install temporary covers.

CD-A4 Water unpaved roadways three times per day or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers. (Note: CD-A5 Use of soil stabilizers near wetlands, streams, or other water features may be limited by regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game.)

CD-A5 Limit construction vehicle speed on the project site to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.

CD-A6 Cover dirt in trucks during on-road hauling.

CD-A7 Cease earth-moving activities on days when wind gusts exceed 25 mph or apply water to soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving such soil.

CD-A8 Sweep streets near the construction area at the end of the day if visible soil material is present.

CD-A9 For applicable construction areas, establish a vegetative groundcover as soon as feasible after active operations have ceased. Groundcover shall be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting.

CD-A10 Per SCAQMD Rule 403(e), large construction operations (greater than 50 acres of disturbed area or daily earth-moving or throughput volume of 5,000 cubic yards three times during the most recent 365-day period) shall implement applicable dust suppression measures specified in Table 2 of Rule 403 at all times. When the applicable performance standards cannot be met through use of Table 2 measures, the applicable contingency control measures specified in Table 3 of Rule 403 shall be implemented.

Tailpipe emissions during construction (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-A11 Prohibit all vehicles from idling in excess of 10 minutes, both on and off-site.

CD-A12 Maintain construction equipment in proper tune.

CD-A13 Encourage contractors to establish trip reduction plans. The goal of these plans will be to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR) for construction employees.

To further reduce tailpipe emissions from construction equipment, implementation of optional Mitigation Measure CD-A14 shall be considered at the time of construction of individual projects.

CD-A14 Select construction equipment with low pollutant emissions and high energy efficiency. Factors to consider include model year and alternative fuels (e.g., compressed natural gas, biodiesel, emulsified diesel, methanol, propane, butane, and low sulfur diesel).

Impacts related to odor were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Operational impacts on air quality due to increased vehicle trips for maintenance activities and visitors to recreational facilities (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-A15 Implement dust control if dry conditions and substantial area is disturbed for operations and maintenance activities that involve ground disturbance

CD-A16 Select energy efficient lighting features or other building design considerations for proposed facilities (e.g., park buildings or interpretive centers) to minimize emissions associated with power generation.

5.2 Biological Resources

5.2.1 Master Plan Impacts

Impacts related to invasive plant species were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-B2 Landscaping of vegetation will not include any invasive plant species as listed on the California Invasive Plant Council Pest Plant List.

Lighting impacts on nocturnal and crepuscular wildlife were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-B3 For projects that involve use of night lighting in public areas (e.g., parks) for health and/or safety reasons, lighting will be designed to minimize effects on the behavior patterns of nocturnal and crepuscular (active at dawn and dusk) wildlife (e.g., small ground-dwelling animals that use the darkness to hide from predators, and on owls that are specialized night foragers). To reduce light impacts on nocturnal and crepuscular

wildlife, night lighting will be low intensity directional lighting focused away from open space areas.

5.2.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Construction impacts on special status habitat types for (San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Construction impacts on respiratory function of plants (dust accumulation on leaf surfaces) (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts related to invasive plant species (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

> **CD-B5** Invasive Plant Species – Landscaping of surrounding vegetation shall not include any invasive plant species as listed on the California Invasive Plant Council Pest Plant List.

Lighting impacts on nocturnal and crepuscular wildlife (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

> **CD-B6** Night Lighting – Night lighting is expected to be used in public areas for health and safety reasons. Lighting would inadvertently affect the behavior patterns of nocturnal and crepuscular (active at dawn and dusk) wildlife at these areas. Of greatest concern is the effect on small ground-dwelling animals that use the darkness to hide from predators, and on owls that are specialized night foragers. To reduce light impacts on nocturnal and crepuscular wildlife, night lighting shall be low intensity directional lighting focused away from open space areas.

Operational impacts on special status plant and wildlife species, special status habitat types, and native plant species from habitat restoration/enhancement projects (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.3 Cultural Resources

5.3.1 Concept Design Study Impacts

Construction impacts on palentological resources (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.4 Geology and Soils

5.4.1 Master Plan Impacts

Impacts related to seismic ground shaking and surface rupture were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts on habitable structures related to geologic hazards were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, for future projects that include construction of habitable structures (e.g., recreation or interpretive centers), the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-G3 The site plan and building footprint will be reviewed by a registered professional to ensure that project siting and design provides adequate protection from geologic hazards such as fault rupture (including Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones), expansive soils, liquefaction, and unstable slopes. If a project site is located in known high risk areas with respect to geological hazards, a site-specific geotechnical study will be performed during facility design to identify potential concerns and recommended measures to reduce hazards. Recommendations in the geotechnical study will be incorporated into the final design.

5.4.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Impacts related to seismic ground shaking, surface rupture and subsidence (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

5.5.1 Master Plan Impacts

Impacts related to handling of hazardous materials (disposal of potentially contaminated sediments during maintenance of stormwater facilities) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts related to potential increase in bird/wildlife air strike hazard at nearby airports were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-H2 For projects located within 5 miles of El Monte Airport or Long Beach Airport, the potential for the proposed facilities to attract waterfowl and other birds will be evaluated. If the evaluation indicates that the project would attract birds, the FAA Western Pacific Regional Office, Long Beach Airport, El Monte Airport and Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base will be notified of the proposed land use change to recognize potentially significant hazards early in the planning process and avoid or minimize the hazards.

5.5.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Impacts related to handling of hazardous materials (sodium hypochlorite for stormwater disinfection and disposal of potentially contaminated sediments during maintenance of stormwater facilities) (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts related to potential increase in bird/wildlife air strike hazard at nearby airports (Woodland Duck Farm and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-H2 During the detailed design phase, FAA Western Pacific Regional Office and El Monte Airport (for Woodland Duck Farm) and Long Beach Airport (for El Dorado Regional Park) shall be notified of the proposed land use change to recognize potentially significant hazards early in the planning process and avoid or minimize the hazards.

Public health impacts of recycled water and stormwater reuse (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

5.6.1 Master Plan Impacts

Impacts related to increase in impervious surfaces or change in drainage patterns were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.6.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Impacts related to increase in impervious surfaces or change in drainage patterns (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds, Woodland Duck Farm, and San Gabriel River Discovery Center) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts on channel flood capacity (El Dorado Regional Park, Lario Creek, and Woodland Duck Farm) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Operational impacts on water quality related to channel modifications (El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts related to water supply and water rights (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impacts related to dam safety (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.7 Land Use / Mineral Resources

5.7.1 Master Plan Impacts

Impacts on land use were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.7.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Impacts on land use and mineral resources (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.8 Noise

5.8.1 Concept Design Study Impacts

Operational noise impacts (operation of pumps, use of vehicles for facility maintenance and increased traffic to parks) (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impact of siting new parks in areas with high ambient noise levels (Woodland Duck Farm) was determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.9 Public Services and Utilities

5.9.1 Master Plan Impacts

Operational impacts on police and fire protection services were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Operational impacts related to sewer and wastewater treatment systems, water supply systems, electricity consumption, and solid waste were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impact on landfill capacity from generation of solid waste during construction were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

> **MP-P5** State in the plans and specifications for the proposed project that the construction contractor is required to identify and implement programs for minimizing solid waste generated during construction. These programs could include recycling of asphalt and concrete paving materials, reuse and composting of green waste materials on site where appropriate (e.g., where there is limited potential for inadvertent spreading of invasive plants), and balance of graded soil on site to the maximum extent feasible.

Impact on solid waste collection routes from temporary lane and/or road closures during construction of storm drains, etc. were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

MP-P6 Prior to construction, notify the relevant municipality of the construction schedule and planned lane or road closures. The municipality or agency may then modify the solid waste collection routes and access in the area.

5.9.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

Operational impacts on police and fire protection services (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Construction impact on school access and student safety (San Gabriel River Discovery Center and Lario Creek). However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-P4 Prior to project construction, contact school administrators to provide sufficient notice to forewarn school bus operators, children, and parents when existing pedestrian and vehicular routes to school will be affected. As necessary to protect the safety of children, parents and employees accessing the school, one or more of the following measures shall be implemented in coordination with the school administrators:

- Develop temporary alternative pedestrian and vehicular routes to the school that avoid construction areas
- Install appropriate temporary traffic controls (signs, crossing guards, and/or signals) as needed to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety
- Minimize use of haul routes past the school when school is in session
- Prohibit parking or staging of construction or worker vehicles on streets adjacent to the school.

CD-P5 Secure all construction areas adjacent to the school, including trench areas, operating equipment areas and equipment staging and stockpile areas, through fencing or other barriers to prevent trespassing and reduce hazards to children and other pedestrians.

Operational impacts related to sewer and wastewater treatment systems, water supply systems, electricity consumption, and solid waste (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

Impact on landfill capacity from generation of solid waste during construction (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-P8 State in the plans and specifications for the proposed project that the construction contractor is required to identify and implement one or more

of the following applicable programs for minimizing solid waste generated during construction:

- Recycling of asphalt and concrete paving materials
- Reuse and composting of green waste materials where there is limited potential for inadvertent spreading of invasive plants
- Balance graded soil on site to the maximum extent feasible

Impact on solid waste collection routes from temporary lane and/or road closures during construction of storm drains, etc. (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-P9 Prior to construction, notify the relevant municipality of the construction schedule and planned lane or road closures. The municipality or agency may then modify the solid waste collection routes and access in the area.

5.10 Recreation

5.10.1 Concept Design Study Impacts

Construction impacts on existing parks (San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.11 Transportation and Traffic

5.11.1 Concept Design Study Impacts

Temporary impacts on traffic in the project area from construction vehicles and equipment and/or from construction activities in the street rights-of-way (e.g., storm drains) (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation. However, the following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts.

CD-T1 A construction traffic management plan shall be developed for each project site that shall include but not be limited to such measures as designated haul routes for construction-related traffic (e.g., construction equipment, pickup and dump trucks, and other material delivery trucks), travel time restrictions for construction-related traffic to avoid weekday peak periods on selected roadways, designated site access locations, driveway turning restrictions, temporary traffic controls and/or flaggers, and designated parking/staging locations for workers and equipment.

CD-T2 A construction area traffic control plan and/or detour plan shall be prepared for any location where construction activities would encroach into the right-of-way of a public roadway. The plan would include, but not be limited to such features as warning signs, lights, barricades, cones, lane closures, and restricted hours during which lane closures would not be allowed (e.g., 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 6:00 p.m., or as directed by the affected public agency).

CD-T3 Provide advance notification to affected property owners, businesses, residents, etc. of possible driveway blockages or other access obstructions and implement alternate access and parking provisions where necessary.

CD-T4 Provide alternative pedestrian and bicycle access/circulation routes if existing facilities such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes would be obstructed to ensure safe pedestrian/bicycle travel.

CD-T5 Coordinate with emergency service providers (police, fire, and ambulance/paramedic agencies) prior to construction to provide information regarding lane closures, construction schedules, driveway blockages, etc., if any, and develop a plan to maintain or accommodate essential emergency access routes (e.g., plating over excavations and use of detours).

CD-T6 Coordinate with public transit agencies (e.g., MTA) to provide information regarding lane closures, bus stop disruptions, etc. so that MTA or relevant agency can designate alternate pick-up/drop-off locations, if appropriate, and provide for uninterrupted service.

CD-T7 As necessary, obtain a transportation permit from Caltrans for transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways.

Operational impacts on traffic from increased visitors to proposed recreational facilities (all Concept Design Study projects) were determined to be less than significant before mitigation.

5.12 Growth Inducing Impacts

The Proposed Project does not involve construction of new homes or businesses and does not include construction of new, potentially growth-inducing, infrastructure such as roads or potable water or wastewater systems. Minor improvements to existing roadways may be proposed to improve site-specific access and circulation. The Master Plan would encourage projects that include infiltration of stormwater which could increase the volume of available groundwater. Since no new potable water treatment or distribution systems are proposed, this is not considered growth inducing. The Proposed Project would provide recreation and open space benefits to areas that have already been developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Therefore, it would not result in the elimination of obstacles to growth. No growth inducing impacts would occur.

6.0 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final Program EIR identifies environmental effects produced by the Project that are considered potentially significant prior to the application of mitigation measures. All of the impacts, including cumulative impacts, determined in the Program EIR to be significant or potentially significant can be mitigated to less than significant levels through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. This section presents in greater detail each of the significant or potentially significant environmental effects of the Project and the mitigation measures that are

proposed. It also summarizes the evidence relied upon by the Board of Supervisors in making these findings. This evidence is drawn from the Final Program EIR, including the comments and responses to comments on the Draft Program EIR, comments received on the NOP, other evidence presented to the County, and all other information in the administrative record.

6.1 Air Quality

6.1.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.1.1.1 Significant Effect – Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction of Future Master Plan Projects

Construction of these projects could result in potentially significant impacts on air quality from use of construction equipment and vehicles (tailpipe emissions) and earth moving activities (fugitive dust emissions). The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce emissions.

Mitigation Measure MP-A1: Evaluations of air quality impacts during project construction will be conducted as follows during site-specific environmental review of each future Master Plan project:

1. Based on the site-specific project description, the following should be determined:
    - Acreage of site disturbance that would occur during excavation, grading, and/or filling
    - List of necessary construction equipment (number, type, hours of operation per day, and number of days in operation for each phase of construction)
    - Length of construction period
    - Number of construction workers and vehicles
2. Based on the above information, and using the latest version of the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, construction emissions will then be estimated and compared to the thresholds of significance.
3. If the estimated construction emissions exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for fugitive dust, then one or more of the following dust control measures will be implemented as applicable:
    - Clean dirt from construction vehicle tires and undercarriages when leaving the construction site and before entering local roadways.
    - During earth-moving activities, water the construction area as necessary, but at least twice per day.
    - Water temporary open storage piles once per hour or install temporary covers.
    - Water unpaved roadways three times per day or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers. (Note: Use of soil stabilizers near wetlands, streams, or other water features may be limited by regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game.)
    - Limit construction vehicle speed on the project site to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.

- Cover dirt in trucks during on-road hauling.
- Cease earth-moving activities on days when wind gusts exceed 25 mph or apply water to soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving such soil.
- Sweep streets near the construction area at the end of the day if visible soil material is present.
- For applicable construction areas, establish a vegetative groundcover as soon as feasible after active operations have ceased. Groundcover will be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting.
- Per SCAQMD Rule 403(e), large construction operations (greater than 50 acres of disturbed area or daily earth-moving or throughput volume of 5,000 cubic yards three times during the most recent 365-day period) will implement applicable dust suppression measures specified in Table 2 of Rule 403 at all times. When the applicable performance standards cannot be met through use of Table 2 measures, the applicable contingency control measures specified in Table 3 of Rule 403 will be implemented.

4. If the estimated construction emissions exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for CO, ROC, NO_x, SO_x, then one or more of the following measures will be implemented:
   - Prohibit all vehicles from idling in excess of 10 minutes, both on and off-site.
   - Maintain construction equipment in proper tune.
   - Encourage contractors to establish trip reduction plans. The goal of these plans will be to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership (AVR) for construction employees.

   To further reduce tailpipe emissions from construction equipment, implementation of the following optional measure will be considered at the time of construction of individual projects. Aside from fugitive dust, the majority of construction emissions, particularly for NO_x, are generally associated with tailpipe emissions from diesel-fueled construction equipment. Using construction equipment with alternative fuel(s) can achieve high reduction efficiency for tailpipe emissions. The approximate NO_x emissions reduction rates of various alternative fuels are: 60 percent for compressed natural gas (CNG), 10 percent for emulsified diesel fuel, and 2 to 10 percent for biodiesel fuel (EPA, 2003c). However, use of construction equipment with alternative fuel(s), while effective, may not be applicable to all projects (i.e., limited equipment availability and high costs may make it infeasible to use a large fleet of construction equipment with alternative fuel(s)).

   - Select construction equipment with low pollutant emissions and high energy efficiency. Factors to consider include model year and alternative fuels (e.g., compressed natural gas, biodiesel, emulsified diesel, methanol, propane, butane, and low sulfur diesel).

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: It is anticipated that future projects developed in a manner consistent with the Master Plan would involve the construction of facilities similar to those proposed for the Concept Design Studies (e.g., stormwater retention basins or constructed wetlands, trails, signage, etc.). As described in Section 4.1.4 of the Program EIR, each of the Concept Design Studies has a less than significant impact on air quality. Therefore, it is anticipated that implementation of most future projects developed in a manner consistent with the Master Plan would result in less-than-significant air emissions, similar to the Concept Design Studies. If significant air quality impacts are identified during second-tier CEQA analysis for each project undertaken pursuant to the Master Plan, site-specific mitigation measures will be defined and implemented by the specific lead agencies for each future project in the Master Plan study area. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-A1, construction impacts on air quality would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.1.3.

6.1.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

No significant air quality impacts have been identified for the Concept Design Studies.

6.2 Biological Resources

6.2.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.2.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Special Status Species and Habitat Types

Construction of these projects on an undeveloped site would result in ground disturbance, which could have an adverse impact on existing special status species and/or high-value vegetation types, if any are present at those locations. The following mitigation measure has been identified to avoid, reduce or mitigate the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-B1: Site-specific evaluations for biological resources will be conducted prior to completion of detailed design plans for each of the future projects to determine the presence of high-value vegetation types and the potential for special status plant and wildlife species to occur. The following tasks will be completed by these evaluations:

1. Identify and determine the extent of site disturbance proposed by the project. For sites where biological resources have any potential to be sensitive, continue evaluation as outlined below.

2. General plant and wildlife surveys will be performed by a qualified biologist to determine if any focused surveys for special status species are necessary. If the general surveys indicate that there is potential for sensitive plant or wildlife species to occur on the project site, focused surveys will be conducted for those species in accordance with relevant protocols at the appropriate time of the year.

3. If any special status species or high-value vegetation types are identified, the proposed facilities will be designed and/or sited to avoid disturbance and loss of the sensitive resources. If nesting habitat of special status bird species will be impacted, project construction will be scheduled outside of the breeding season if feasible. If scheduling construction outside of the breeding season is not feasible, then a pre-construction survey will be conducted to identify nests and to establish a buffer zone between the construction area and the nests to avoid construction impacts.

4. In some instances, depending on the location of sensitive resources and/or construction schedule requirements, project redesign and/or construction phasing that avoids biological resources while still meeting the project objective may be infeasible. Therefore, if avoidance is not feasible, the following measures will be detailed and disclosed in second tier CEQA documentation and implemented under the direction of a qualified biologist:

    - Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment; and/or

- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the project; and/or
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

5. If avoidance of impacts to listed species is not feasible, then consultation with the USFWS shall be required for federally-listed species, and consultation with the CDFG shall be required for state-listed species. If special status plants are identified, a mitigation program shall be developed following focused surveys and submitted to the appropriate agencies for review.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above outlines an approach to evaluation of biological resources prior to completion of detailed design plans and implementation of measures to reduce impacts by avoiding sensitive species nesting periods during construction, avoiding high value vegetation types or special status species, and/or rehabilitating habitat where avoidance is not

feasible. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-B1, construction impacts on special status species or high-value habitat types would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.5.

6.2.1.2 Significant Effect – Disturbance of Wildlife Behavior and Habitat Associated with Human Activity

Future Master Plan projects that involve operation of facilities for active recreation could result in increased visitors and human activities, which could result in adverse impacts to adjacent or onsite habitat areas (e.g., trampling of vegetation), if any. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce this impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-B4: For projects that involve recreational uses near habitat areas, a management plan to reduce impacts from human uses (e.g., riding, hiking, biking) on native habitats will be incorporated into detailed design plans. As relevant, the management plan will include access points including parking and restrooms, signage for trails and restricted uses, appropriate fencing, and restrictions on domestic animals. This plan will be written by a qualified biologist and approved by the sponsoring agency prior to initiation of site development.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-B4 above requires preparation of a management plan to reduce impacts from human uses through proper design of recreational and other facilities in coordination with a qualified biologist. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-B4, operational impacts on biological resources associated with recreational activities would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.5.

6.2.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.2.2.1 Significant Effect – Impacts on Special Status Species and Habitat Types during Construction (All Concept Design Studies)

Construction of facilities for the Concept Design Study projects would result in ground disturbance, which could have an adverse impact on existing special status species. The following mitigation measures have been identified to avoid, reduce or mitigate the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-B1: Prior to completion of detailed design plans for each of the five Concept Design Study sites, a qualified biologist shall conduct general plant and wildlife surveys to determine if any focused surveys for special status species are necessary. If the surveys confirm the potential for one or more special status species to occur, focused surveys for those species shall be conducted as described in Mitigation Measure CD-B2.

Mitigation Measure CD-B2: If the general biological survey (Mitigation Measure CD-B1) indicates that there is potential for sensitive plant species to occur on the project site, a spring survey shall be conducted prior to finalizing the project designs. The special status plant species surveys shall follow guidelines developed by the CNPS (CNPS, 2001). These surveys, as outlined in the guidelines, shall be conducted during the appropriate time of year for each species as determined by a qualified botanist. Collection of special status plant species, if any, shall follow the guidelines of CDFG and USFWS collection permits. If any special status plant species are located, their rarity and abundance shall be evaluated. If the general biological survey indicates that there is potential for special status wildlife species to occur on the project site, protocol surveys for those species shall be conducted in accordance with appropriate survey protocols at the appropriate time of the year. The results of these investigations and the appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant environmental impacts to a level that is less than significant shall be disclosed in second tier CEQA documentation.

If any special status wildlife species are identified, the proposed facilities shall be designed and/or sited to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts to the species during construction to levels that are less than significant. If nesting habitat of special status bird species will be impacted, project construction shall be scheduled outside of the breeding season, or a pre-

construction survey shall be conducted to identify nests and to establish a buffer zone between the construction area and identified nests to avoid construction impacts.

However, depending on the location of sensitive resources and/or construction schedule requirements, project redesign and/or construction phasing that avoids biological resources while still meeting the project objective may be infeasible. Therefore, if avoidance is not feasible, the following measures shall be detailed and disclosed in second tier CEQA document and implemented under the direction of a qualified biologist:

- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment; or
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the project; or
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

If avoidance of impacts to listed species is not feasible, then consultation with the USFWS shall be required for federally-listed species and consultation with the CDFG shall be required for state-listed species. As relevant, a special status plant mitigation program shall be developed following focused surveys and submitted to the appropriate agencies for review.

Rationale: The mitigation measures described above outline an approach to evaluation of biological resources prior to completion of detailed design plans and implementation of measures to reduce impacts by avoiding sensitive species nesting periods during construction, avoiding special status species, and/or rehabilitating habitat where avoidance is not feasible. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-B1 and CD-B2, construction impacts on special status species would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.6.

6.2.2.2 Significant Effect – Impacts on Least Bell's Vireo during Construction of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek and El Dorado Regional Park Concept Design Studies

The least Bell's vireo, an Endangered species, is known to occur in the vicinity of the Concept Design Study sites for San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park. Construction of facilities at these sites may disturb nests or nesting behavior of least Bell's vireo. The following mitigation measure has been identified to avoid the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-B4: Since least Bell's vireos are known to occur in the vicinity of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce impacts on this Endangered species:

To the extent feasible, no construction shall occur within the project site during the nesting season for least Bell's vireo (March 15 to September 1). However, if construction work is necessary between March 15 and September 1, a qualified biologist shall survey suitable habitat within the impact area, plus 1,000 feet (300 meters) on either side of the impact area, to identify the presence of any least Bell's vireo. No construction activities shall occur within 1,000 feet of a least Bell's vireo territory until the end of the nesting season (September 1) or when the least Bell's vireo departs the area, as determined by the biologist and with confirmation from the USFWS. The biological monitor shall use their discretion to increase the distance from vireo territory that construction can occur (in excess of 1,000 feet) or to limit use of the noisiest equipment to outside the nesting season if deemed necessary based on the type of construction equipment to be used.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel River Discovery Center and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above would avoid potential impacts on nests or nesting behavior of least Bell's vireo by scheduling construction to avoid the nesting season or by establishing a setback from the least Bell's vireo territory to the construction area. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-B4, construction impacts on least Bell's vireo nests or nesting behavior would be avoided.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.6.

6.2.2.3 Significant Effect – Impacts on Nesting Raptors and Other Birds during Construction of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek and El Dorado Regional Park Concept Design Studies

Nests of raptors and other birds may be present in the vicinity of the Concept Design Study sites for San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park. Construction of facilities at these sites may disturb nests or nesting behavior of raptors and other birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code. The following mitigation measure has been identified to avoid the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-B5: The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to avoid raptor impacts: One week prior to construction and clearing activities that would occur during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically February through August), a survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if

active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present within 300 feet (within 500 feet for raptors) of the construction zone. Construction can proceed if no active avian nests are located during this survey. If an active nest is found during the survey, a 500-foot (this distance may vary depending on the bird species and construction activity, as determined by the biologist) fence barrier shall be erected around the nest site. Clearing and construction within the fenced area shall be postponed or halted, at the discretion of the biologist, until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities may occur near active nests to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. Results of the raptor survey and any subsequent monitoring shall be provided to the CDFG and any other appropriate agency.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel River Discovery Center and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above would avoid potential impacts on nests or nesting behavior of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish

and Game Code by scheduling construction to avoid the nesting season or by establishing a setback from the vicinity of active nests to the construction area. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-B5, construction impacts on nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code would be avoided.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.6.

6.2.2.4 Significant Effect – Disturbance of Wildlife Behavior and Habitat Associated with Human Activity at Concept Design Study Sites (All Concept Design Studies)

Operation of facilities for active recreation could result in increased visitors and human activities, which could result in adverse impacts to adjacent or onsite habitat areas (e.g., trampling of vegetation), if any. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce this impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-B7: An appropriate plan for the management of native habitats shall accompany each Concept Design Study site to reduce impacts from human uses (e.g., riding, hiking, biking) on habitat areas. The management plan shall include access points including parking and restrooms, signage for trails and restricted uses, appropriate fencing, and restrictions on domestic animals. This plan shall be written by a qualified biologist and approved by the sponsoring agency prior to initiation of site development.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure CD-B7 above requires preparation of a management plan to reduce impacts from human uses through proper design of recreational and other facilities in coordination with a qualified biologist. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-B7, operational impacts on biological resources associated with recreational activities would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.2.6.

6.3 Cultural Resources

6.3.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.3.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains

Construction of these projects could result in ground disturbance or demolition/modification of existing structures, which could have an adverse impact on significant archaeological or historic resources, if any are present at those locations. The following mitigation measure has been identified to avoid, reduce or mitigate the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-C1: Site-specific evaluations for cultural resources will be conducted as follows prior to completion of detailed design plans for each future Master Plan project:

1. Identify and determine the extent of site disturbance and/or structural modifications proposed by the project. For sites where ground will be newly disturbed (i.e., not fill soils or previously completely disturbed sites) and/or for sites with potentially historic structures present, continue evaluation as outlined below.
2. Conduct background research to identify previous cultural resources investigations and known cultural resources relevant to the project site (review records at the South Central Coastal Information Center, contact local historical societies, the Native American Heritage Commission, etc.).
3. Conduct field reconnaissance if the project site has not been surveyed for cultural resources in the last five years.
4. If potential resources are identified in the field reconnaissance, determine if avoidance is feasible (e.g., design project to locate the proposed structures or site disturbance away from or around the area of the potential resource; a buffer of 100 meters is recommended in most cases). If feasible, the resource shall be avoided.

5. If avoidance is not feasible, evaluate the significance of the potential resource. The evaluation process may include excavation, additional review of records and literatures, interviews, field examination by a an architectural historian, and/or laboratory analysis. Based on the results of the evaluation, the significance of the potential resource should be determined using the criteria listed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the Final Program EIR.
6. If the resource is found to be significant, determine significance of project impacts on the resource. (Significant change to a resource includes demolition, replacement, substantial alteration, or relocation (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15064.5)).
7. If project impacts are determined to be significant, the following measures (in order of preference) will be implemented to reduce impacts to below a level of significance:
   - Incorporating the resource into the project design (e.g., for projects involving park development or interpretive centers); or
   - Remove and relocate the resource to an appropriate location (e.g., museum, public library, or school)

   The results of site-specific evaluations and detailed mitigation measures, if any, will be disclosed in subsequent CEQA documentation.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above outlines an approach to evaluation of cultural resources prior to completion of detailed design plans and implementation of measures to reduce potential impacts, if any. Impacts on known resources would be avoided or reduced by incorporating known resources into project design or removing and relocating the known resource. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-C1, construction impacts on cultural resources would be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.3.

6.3.1.2 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains

Construction of these projects could result in ground disturbance, which could have an adverse impact on buried archaeological resources or human remains, if any are present at those locations. The following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-C2: If previously unknown cultural resources are discovered in the course of excavation for project construction, the construction inspector shall have the authority and responsibility to halt construction until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance and distribution of the materials, and identify future activities needed. If the cultural material discovered is determined to be of potential archaeological significance, the investigation and future activities shall be conducted in consultation with a culturally affiliated Native American or other parties, as necessary.

Mitigation Measure MP-C3: If human remains are discovered in the course of excavation for project construction, the County Coroner shall be contacted and provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be followed.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources or human remains would be reduced by halting construction activities if any cultural resources/human remains are encountered and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of potential cultural resources. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures MP-C2 and MP-C3, construction impacts on buried cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.3.

6.3.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.3.2.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources at the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds

No cultural resources were identified at the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds. Site disturbance associated during project construction would be limited to installation of fencing, landscaping, installation of irrigation lines, and other minor activities. However, since the examination of the project area was limited to surface observations, there is potential for encountering and inadvertently disturbing significant buried resources during project construction at this site. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-C1: On the first day of subsurface work at the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds, a professional monitor qualified in historical archaeology shall be present to assess whether further monitoring might be warranted. Further monitoring may be required if subsurface cultural material was uncovered on the first day of earthwork and/or if the monitor determined that there was a high probability of additional subsurface cultural materials being encountered.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources would be reduced by monitoring and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of cultural resources during construction activities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C1 above and CD-C8 and CD-C9 (see Section 6.3.2.8), construction impacts on buried cultural resources present at the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds site, if any, would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.2 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources at the San Gabriel River Discovery Center

Since there are known cultural resources in the vicinity of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center project site (see Section 4.3.1.4 of the Program EIR) and the examination of the project area was limited to surface observations, there is potential for encountering and inadvertently disturbing significant buried resources during project construction. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-C2: A professional monitor qualified in historical archaeology shall be present at the San Gabriel River Discovery Center for subsurface work between the surface and 5 feet (or more as determined by the monitor based on soil conditions) in depth. If potentially important cultural deposits are encountered in the course of construction, work shall be temporarily diverted from the vicinity of the discovery until the monitoring archaeologist can identify and evaluate the importance of the find and conduct any appropriate assessment and activities, as necessary.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (San Gabriel River Discovery Center):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources would be reduced by monitoring and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of cultural resources during construction activities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C2 above and CD-C8 and CD-C9 (see Section 6.3.2.8), construction impacts on buried cultural resources present at the San Gabriel River Discovery Center site, if any, would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.3 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources at Lario Creek

There are known cultural resources at the Lario Creek project site (see Section 4.3.1.4 of the Program EIR) and the examination of the project area was limited to surface observations. Therefore, there is potential for encountering buried resources during project construction and inadvertently disturbing significant resources. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-C5: A professional monitor qualified in historical archaeology shall be present at the Lario Creek project site for subsurface work between the surface and 5 feet (or more as determined by the monitor based on soil conditions) in depth. If potentially important cultural deposits are encountered in the course of construction, work shall be temporarily diverted from the vicinity of the discovery until the monitoring archaeologist can identify and evaluate the importance of the find and conduct any appropriate assessment and activities, as necessary.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources would be reduced by monitoring and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of cultural resources during construction activities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C5 above and CD-C8 and CD-C9 (see Section 6.3.2.8), construction impacts on buried cultural resources present at the Lario Creek site, if any, would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.4 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources at El Dorado Regional Park

The Master Plan Concept Design for the El Dorado Regional Park does not propose any activities that would disturb the area where the potential archaeological resource (shell beads; see Section 4.3.1.4 of the Program EIR) were found. However, as with the other Concept Design Study sites, there is potential for encountering and inadvertently disturbing significant buried resources during project construction, which would include earthwork for construction of wetlands. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-C6: On the first day of subsurface work at El Dorado Regional Park, a professional monitor qualified in historical archaeology shall be present to assess whether further monitoring might be warranted.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources would be reduced by monitoring and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of cultural resources during construction activities. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C6 above and CD-C8 and CD-C9 (see Section 6.3.2.8), construction impacts on buried cultural resources present at the El Dorado Regional Park site, if any, would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.5 Significant Effect – Replacement of the Nature Center Building (San Gabriel River Discovery Center)

The Master Plan Concept Design for the San Gabriel River Discovery Center proposes to replace the existing Nature Center building with a new Discovery Center building. During the design phase of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center, the project proponent or the CEQA lead agency will conduct additional research and on-site surface inventory to determine the historical significance of the Nature Center building. If it is determined to be a significant historical resource, project impacts would be significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CD-C3: During the design phase of the San Gabriel River Discovery Center, the project proponent shall evaluate whether the Nature Center building is a significant historical resource using the criteria described in Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines. If it is determined to be a significant historical resource, the lead agency shall:

- Remove and relocate the building or historically significant portion of the building to an appropriate location, or
- Incorporate the historically significant elements of the existing building into the new Discovery Center.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (San Gabriel River Discovery Center):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above outlines an approach to evaluation of historical significance of the Nature Center building and implementation of measures to reduce impacts by removing and relocating the building or historically significant portion of the building or incorporating the historically significant elements of the existing building into the new Discovery Center. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C3, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.6 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Potential Cultural Resources at Lario Creek Identified During the Records Search and Field Reconnaissance

Potential cultural resources were identified during records search and field reconnaissance of the Lario Creek Concept Design Study project site. Disturbance of these resources, if found to be significant, would be a significant impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CD-C4: During the design phase of Lario Creek, LADPW shall evaluate if the project can be designed to avoid the structures identified in Section 4.3.1.4 of the Final Program EIR (locate the proposed structures or site disturbance at least 100 meters away from or around the structures).

If avoidance is not feasible for one or more of the structures, the structure's significance shall be evaluated, using the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a]. Results of this evaluation would be disclosed in second-tier environmental documentation.

If the resource is found to be significant, the significance of project impacts on the resource shall be determined. (Significant change to a resource includes demolition, replacement, substantial alteration, or relocation (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15064.5)). If feasible, the significant resource(s) shall be avoided.

If project impacts are determined to be significant, LADPW shall:

- Incorporate the resource into the project design, or
- Remove and relocate the resource to an appropriate location (e.g., museum, public library, or school)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above outlines an approach to ensuring that significant cultural resources are avoided or preserved. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C4, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.7 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Historical Resources at Woodland Duck Farm

The Original Ranch House and any adjacent structure located on the Woodland Duck Farm site that is 45 years and older have the potential to be a historically significant structure. Modification of these structures would be a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure CD-C7: During the design phase of Woodland Duck Farm, the Watershed Conservation Authority (WCA) shall evaluate if any onsite structures that are 45 years and older may be affected by the project.

For each structure that is 45 years and older and shall be affected by the project, the structure's significance shall be evaluated by a professional architectural historian, using the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a]. Results of this evaluation would be disclosed in second-tier environmental documentation.

If the resource is found to be significant, the significance of project impacts on the resource shall be determined. (Significant change to a resource includes demolition, replacement, substantial alteration, or relocation (CCR Section 15064.5)).

If project impacts are determined to be significant, the relevant resources shall be:

- Incorporated into the project design, or
- Removed and relocated to an appropriate location (e.g., museum, public library, or school)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Project (Woodland Duck Farm):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: The mitigation measure described above outlines an approach to evaluation of historical significance of existing structures that would be affected by the project and implementation of measures to avoid or reduce impacts by incorporating the resource into the project design or removing and relocating the resource to an appropriate location. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C7, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.3.2.8 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Buried Cultural Resources and/or Human Remains (All Concept Design Studies)

Construction of the Concept Design Study projects would result in ground disturbance, which could have an adverse impact on unknown buried archaeological resources or human remains, if any are present at those locations. The following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-C8: If previously unknown cultural resources are discovered in the course of excavation for project construction, the construction inspector shall have the authority and responsibility to halt construction until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance and distribution of the materials, and identify future activities needed. If the cultural material discovered is determined to be of potential archaeological significance, the investigation and future activities shall be conducted in consultation with a culturally affiliated Native American or other parties, as necessary.

Mitigation Measure CD-C9: If human remains are discovered in the course of excavation for project construction, the County Coroner shall be contacted and provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be followed.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for Non-County Sponsored Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Impacts on unknown buried cultural resources or human remains would be reduced by halting construction activities if any resources are encountered and reporting to limit the potential for inadvertent destruction of potential cultural resources. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-C8 and CD-C9, construction impacts on buried cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.3.4.

6.4 Geology and Soils

6.4.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.4.1.1 Significant Effect – Impacts Related to Liquefaction Potential from Proposed Stormwater Infiltration

Due to the presence of loose alluvium materials deposited by the San Gabriel River, most of the Master Plan study area falls within the liquefaction hazard zone (see Section 4.4.1.5 of the Program EIR). Future Master Plan projects may include groundwater recharge of stormwater (e.g., at former gravel pits). If project-related stormwater infiltration caused groundwater levels to rise within 30 feet of the surface, the project could result in an increased risk of liquefaction. In addition to the long-term effects of stormwater infiltration on groundwater levels, large volumes of stormwater infiltrated over a short period of time could have a temporary "mounding" effect, causing a localized increase in the groundwater level beneath the infiltration basins. If stormwater infiltration at project sites resulted in a substantial increase in groundwater levels and consequently increased liquefaction risk for onsite or adjacent habitable or other structures, the impact would be significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure G-1: During facility design, a site-specific geotechnical analysis will be conducted to determine soil types and groundwater levels. Based on the results of the

geotechnical analysis, the potential increase in liquefaction potential from the proposed infiltration will be evaluated. Factors that will be considered include the capacity of the infiltration facility and the associated amount of water proposed for infiltration, infiltration rate, proximity and types of nearby structures (including pipelines) that could be damaged from liquefaction, and infiltration at adjacent spreading grounds, if any.

If the project is determined to have the potential to cause groundwater levels to rise within 30 feet of the surface, new monitoring wells and/or existing wells in the project area will be used to detect any substantial increase in groundwater levels. If monitoring indicates a substantial rise in groundwater levels that could impact adjacent structures, stormwater would not be infiltrated and would be diverted into storm drains or onto street surfaces or routed to other stormwater management facilities as applicable.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-G1 outlines an approach to evaluating and monitoring the potential for increase in liquefaction risk due to rising groundwater levels. Infiltration would be ceased if necessary to prevent groundwater levels from increasing to within 30 feet of the surface. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-G1, impacts related to liquefaction risk would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.4.3.

6.4.1.2 Significant Effect – Impacts Related to Slope Instability

Adoption of the Master Plan could encourage reclamation of gravel mines. Sideslopes of gravel mines are potentially susceptible to landslides in the event of an earthquake or heavy precipitation. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure G-2: Site-specific evaluation of slope stability will be conducted as a part of the geotechnical analyses during design of each future Master Plan project that involves modification of a gravel mine. The recommendations of the geotechnical study will include optimum slope design for stability and safety, soil compaction or recompaction requirements, surface cover, and potentially other slope stabilizing measures. The recommendations of the geotechnical analysis will be incorporated into the detailed design of the project. The results of site-specific evaluations and detailed mitigation measures, if any, will be disclosed in subsequent CEQA documentation.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: As outlined in Mitigation Measure MP-G2 above, an evaluation of slope stability would be conducted as part of the geotechnical analyses during design of gravel mine reclamation projects to ensure that proposed modification does not result in unstable slope conditions. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-G2, impacts related to landslide/slope instability would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.4.3.

6.4.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.4.2.1 Significant Effect – Impacts Related to Liquefaction Potential from Proposed Stormwater Infiltration (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park)

The project area is considered by the California Geological Survey to be susceptible to liquefaction based on historical occurrence of liquefaction or local geological and groundwater conditions. The Master Plan Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park include constructed wetlands, which may be unlined and designed to allow infiltration to the groundwater. If project-related stormwater infiltration caused groundwater levels to rise within 30 feet of the surface, the project could result in an increased risk of liquefaction. In addition to the long-term effects of stormwater infiltration on groundwater levels, large volumes of stormwater infiltrated over a short period of time could have a temporary "mounding" effect, causing a localized increase in the groundwater level beneath the infiltration basins. If stormwater infiltration at project sites resulted in a substantial increase in groundwater levels and consequently increased liquefaction risk for onsite or adjacent habitable or other structures, the impact would be significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-G1: Prior to construction, conduct a geotechnical investigation to define site-specific subsurface conditions, including determination of site-specific groundwater levels and soil conditions to evaluate the potential for liquefaction onsite or at adjacent properties. Based on the results of the geotechnical analysis, the potential increase in liquefaction potential from the proposed infiltration shall be evaluated. Factors that should be considered include the capacity of the infiltration facility and the associated amount of water proposed for infiltration, infiltration rate, proximity and types of nearby structures that could be damaged from liquefaction, and infiltration at adjacent spreading grounds, if any.

If the project is determined to have the potential to cause groundwater levels to rise within 30 feet of the surface, new monitoring wells and/or existing wells in the project area shall be used to detect any substantial increase in groundwater levels. If monitoring indicates a substantial rise in groundwater levels that could impact adjacent structures, stormwater would not be infiltrated and would be diverted into storm drains or onto street surfaces with sufficient capacity. Re-diversion of storm flows will be in compliance with the applicable provisions of the relevant NPDES municipal stormwater permits.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-G1 outlines an approach to evaluating and monitoring the potential for increase in liquefaction risk due to rising groundwater levels. Infiltration would be ceased if necessary to prevent groundwater levels from increasing to within 30 feet of the surface. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-G1, impacts related to liquefaction risk would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.4.4.

6.4.2.2 Significant Effect – Impacts on Habitable Structures related to Expansive Soils (San Gabriel River Discovery Center)

The Concept Design Study for the San Gabriel River Discovery Center includes construction of a habitable structure (the Discovery Center building). If habitable structures were constructed on expansive soils, the potential damage to these structures would be considered a significant impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-G2: During facility design, evaluate site soils to determine the area and thickness of expansive soils. If expansive soils are found, one or more of the following measures shall be specified in the construction plans to minimize potential hazards associated with expansive soils:

- Replacement of expansive soils with granular non-expansive soils, or
- Treatment of expansive soils with lime to reduce expansivity, or
- Other appropriate geotechnical practices.

These measures that mitigate for expansive soils shall be incorporated into the construction documents.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel River Discovery Center):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-G2 would require site-specific review of soil conditions and, if necessary, replacement or treatment of expansive soils to minimize risk of structural damage. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-G2, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.4.4.

6.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

6.5.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.5.1.1 Significant Effect – Public Health Impacts related to Potential Increase in Mosquito Habitat

Future Master Plan projects could include construction and operation of various types of stormwater retention/infiltration facilities. Some of the proposed facilities would temporarily contain stagnant water, which would create potential mosquito breeding conditions, a potentially significant public safety impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-H1: Project plans and designs will be submitted to the applicable vector control agency (see Section 4.5.1.4 of the Final Program EIR) for review and comment with respect to control of mosquitoes and other vectors. Upon consultation with the vector control agency, appropriate vector management measures will be incorporated into the project design. Potential management measures include the following:

- Design to minimize and/or provide periodic removal of vegetation on bank slopes and periphery of water bodies to minimize areas of stagnant water.
- Design and/or manage to optimize water depths and flow pattern. For mosquito control, maintain water depths and encourage/provide water circulation. For black fly control, minimize aeration of flowing water. If necessary, design water features to allow for periodical drying to desiccate vector larvae.
- Work with the vector control agency to stock ponds and other permanent water features with mosquito-eating fish as needed.
- Provide site access to vector control agency specifications (e.g., dikes with access roads or trails) to potential breeding areas for maintenance (e.g., vegetation removal) and treatment (e.g., application of Bti or other larvicides).
- Design stormwater retention facilities/devices to drain completely within 72 hours, or design with the capability to be dewatered rapidly if needed for vector control.
- Incorporate measures into project designs that serve to educate the public about wildlife safety and vector-borne disease issues, prevent wildlife-human interactions, and prevent wildlife access to trash and unnatural food and water sources that are likely to result in unnatural population levels.
- Design underground utility vaults, if needed for project implementation, to prevent retention of standing water thereby reducing vector breeding habitat.
- Regularly consult with the vector control agency to identify mosquito management problems, mosquito monitoring and abatement procedures, and opportunities to adjust water and vegetation management practices to reduce mosquito production.
- Incorporate funding for vector management activities into project funding or implement a secure and reliable funding source for vector management activities.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-H1 requires consulting with the relevant vector control agencies and incorporating into the project design and operations measures to minimize mosquito breeding potential. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-H1, impacts on public health due to mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.5.4.

6.5.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.5.2.1 Significant Effect – Public Health Impacts related to Potential Increase in Mosquito Habitat (All Concept Design Studies)

All Concept Design Studies projects could include construction and operation of various types of stormwater retention/infiltration facilities or other water features. Some of the proposed facilities would temporarily contain stagnant water, which would create potential mosquito breeding conditions, a potentially significant public safety impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-H1: Project plans and designs shall be submitted to the applicable vector control agency (SGVMVCD for San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Woodland Duck Farm and GLAVCD for San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park) for review and comment with respect to control of mosquito and other vectors. Upon consultation with the vector control agency, appropriate vector management measures shall be incorporated into the project design. Potential management measures include the following:

- Design to minimize and/or provide periodic removal of vegetation on bank slopes and periphery of water bodies to minimize areas of stagnant water.
- Design and/or manage to optimize water depths and flow pattern. For mosquito control, maintain water depths and encourage/provide water circulation. For black fly control, minimize aeration of flowing water. If necessary, design water features to allow for periodical drying to desiccate vector larvae.
- Work with the vector control agency to stock ponds and other permanent water features with mosquito-eating fish as needed.
- Provide site access to vector control agency specifications (e.g., dikes with access roads or trails) to potential breeding areas for maintenance (e.g., vegetation removal) and treatment (e.g., application of Bti or other larvicides).
- Design stormwater retention facilities/devices to drain completely within 72 hours, or design with the capability to be dewatered rapidly if needed for vector control.
- Incorporate measures into project designs that serve to educate the public about wildlife safety and vector-borne disease issues, prevent wildlife-human interactions, and prevent wildlife access to trash and unnatural food and water sources that are likely to result in unnatural population levels.
- Design underground utility vaults, if needed for project implementation, to prevent retention of standing water thereby reducing vector breeding habitat.
- Regularly consult with the vector control agency to identify mosquito management problems, mosquito monitoring and abatement procedures, and opportunities to adjust water and vegetation management practices to reduce mosquito production.
- Incorporate funding for vector management activities into project funding or implement a secure and reliable funding source for vector management activities.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for Non-County Sponsored Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-H1 requires consulting with the relevant vector control agencies and incorporating into the project design and operations measures to minimize mosquito breeding potential. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-H1, impacts on public health due to mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases would be reduced to less than significant levels:

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.5.5.

6.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

6.6.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.6.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Surface Water Quality related to Soil Erosion

Construction activities that involve soil disturbance (e.g., excavation, grading, and filling) would temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion. In addition, during the rainy season, construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies may come in contact with runoff. If appropriate measures are not taken to minimize the release of sediments and other materials from construction sites, this could result in a temporary impact on surface water quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W2: For future projects involving constructing, clearing, grading or excavation on areas over 1 acre in size, develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize the amount of runoff and associated pollutants (e.g.,

sediments) leaving the construction site by containing the runoff onsite, containing the sediments onsite, and/or minimizing the potential for stormwater to come in contact with pollutants. The following are possible measures to be incorporated into site-specific SWPPPs as applicable. Additional sample measures and guidelines for developing SWPPPs are available in California Stormwater Quality Association's Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook – Construction (CASQA, 2003). Measures to reduce fugitive dust generated during construction (see Section 4.1.5 – Air Quality) will also minimize the potential for soil erosion.

- Install perimeter silt fences or hay bales.
- Stabilize soils through hydroseeding with native plant species where possible and use of soil stabilizers.
- Install temporary sedimentation basins.
- Conduct earth moving activities during the dry season (April through October), as feasible.
- Designate storage areas for construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) to keep these materials out of the rain and minimize contact with stormwater.
- Conduct regular inspections to ensure compliance with the SWPPP.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: As required by the EPA and the Regional Board and as outlined in Mitigation Measure MP-W2 above, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed and implemented during construction of project components greater than 1 acre in area. Incorporation of stormwater best management practices in the SWPPP would reduce the potential for soil erosion and release of other pollutants during construction. These measures would minimize the amount of runoff and associated pollutants (e.g., sediments) leaving the construction site by containing the runoff onsite (e.g., sedimentation basins), containing the sediments onsite (e.g., silt fences and hay bales), or minimizing the potential for stormwater to come in contact with pollutants (e.g., conduct activities during the dry season, control pollutant releases (oils, grease, etc.) from construction equipment). With the incorporation of such control measures in the SWPPPs, construction impacts on surface water quality are expected to be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.2 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Water Quality during Channel Modifications

Master Plan projects that propose earth moving activities within the channel of the River or tributaries could result in a temporary increase in the potential for soil erosion and release of sediments. The resultant increase in turbidity (and potential release of pollutants in the soils underlying the concrete) in river flows could be a significant water quality impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W3: For future projects involving channel modifications, COE, Regional Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game will be consulted. All necessary federal and state approvals (including CWA Section 404 permits, CWA Section 401 water quality certifications or waivers, and California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements) will be obtained prior to the implementation of construction activities. Any conditions of agency approvals (e.g., measures to minimize the potential water quality impacts associated with the channel modification) will be incorporated into the project design. Water quality mitigation options for use during construction of in-channel improvements include diversion of flows around the construction site, installation of in-stream silt curtains, or use of off-channel sediment retention ponds or tanks.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Under Mitigation Measure MP-W3, COE, Regional Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game will be consulted for projects involving channel modifications. Any conditions of agency approvals (e.g., measures to minimize the potential water quality impacts associated with the channel modification) will be incorporated into the project design. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-W3, potential impacts on water quality during channel modifications would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.3 Significant Effect – Water Quality Impacts of Pesticide/Herbicide Use in Landscaped Areas or for Exotics Species Removal

Future Master Plan projects could include landscaping/habitat restoration and/or removal of exotic plant species as potential project elements. Water quality impacts associated with runoff containing chemical herbicides/pesticides would be potentially significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W4: For future projects involving landscaping, habitat restoration, and/or removal of exotic plant species, select biological or non-chemical means of controlling exotics and pests unless not feasible because biological or non-chemical controls are not readily available for the specific exotics to be controlled. If chemical pesticide or herbicide use is necessary, compounds that are less persistent in the environment will be selected, and application will be conducted in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and general standards of use, e.g., restricted application before and during rain storms.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: With incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-W4, use of chemical herbicides/pesticides will be minimized, use of chemicals will be limited to approved herbicides and pesticides, and application will be conducted in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and general standards of use, e.g., restricted application before and during rain storms. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-W4, water quality impacts from this type of chemical use would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.4 Significant Effect – Operational Impacts on Water Quality Related to Channel Modifications

Master Plan projects that propose removal of concrete from the channel of the River or tributaries could result in substantial erosion and downstream surface water quality impacts if measures to stabilize slopes and control scour are not incorporated into project design. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W5: For future projects involving channel modifications, detailed engineering studies (including sediment transport as applicable) will be conducted to assess the impact of the proposed changes on the channel's stability and erodability and will include recommendations to avoid or minimize the impact. Recommendations of the engineering studies will be incorporated into project design to minimize impacts on surface water quality associated with potential increase in erosion of channel banks from proposed modifications.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-W5 would require consideration and incorporation of measures to stabilize slopes and control scour for future Master Plan projects that involve removal of concrete from the channel. Incorporation of these measures would minimize soil erosion after channel modifications have been completed. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-W5, operational impacts on water quality associated with channel modifications would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.5 Significant Effect – Operational Impacts on Groundwater Quality from Stormwater Infiltration

Future Master Plan projects could include recharge of stormwater. The level of treatment needed prior to infiltration would vary depending on the drainage area land use. Stormwater treatment methods designed to remove suspended solids and floatables (e.g., oil and grease) are expected to remove many of the pollutants (e.g., heavy metals and organics) that are sorbed onto particulates. For projects that include industrial land uses in the drainage areas, additional treatment could be used to further improve water quality. If the adequacy of the treatment methods is not monitored and evaluated, stormwater infiltration could result in a significant impact on groundwater quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W6: For projects that involve stormwater infiltration, a comprehensive stormwater and groundwater quality monitoring program will be designed and implemented, or the results of existing monitoring programs will be considered. Monitoring results will be used to assess the ongoing effectiveness of the proposed stormwater treatment methods in protecting both surface and groundwater. If monitoring results indicate substantial water quality degradation associated with project infiltration, the following strategy will be followed:

- Provide additional treatment prior to infiltration, or
- Redesign project to reduce or eliminate infiltration (e.g., lining), or
- Identify an alternative water source (e.g., reclaimed water).

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-W6 requires monitoring of stormwater and groundwater quality to assess the ongoing effectiveness of the proposed stormwater treatment methods in protecting water quality, and outlines measures that would be taken if monitoring results indicate substantial water quality degradation associated with project infiltration. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-W6, water quality impacts associated with stormwater infiltration would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.6 Significant Effect – Groundwater Hydrology Impacts from Stormwater Infiltration

Master Plan projects that increase recharge of stormwater or recycled water would generally result in beneficial impacts on groundwater elevations of the underlying groundwater basins. However, projects that involve large amounts of groundwater recharge could have adverse effects on groundwater hydrology (groundwater elevations and flow directions). Potential adverse impacts include inundation of historical landfill materials or other contaminant sources and potential interference with ongoing remediation and cleanup efforts of existing groundwater contamination in the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin. The significance of impacts on groundwater hydrology would be site-specific, and depend on the volume and rate of water infiltrated and proximity to contamination plumes and landfills. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W7: For projects involving groundwater recharge, the project site's proximity to existing groundwater contamination plumes and landfills (or other known hazardous materials sites that could become a contamination source if inundated with groundwater) will be evaluated. If a project site is located within or adjacent to a plume or in the vicinity of a contamination source, the effect of the proposed recharge on groundwater hydrology (changes in flow direction and levels) will be evaluated. As applicable, groundwater modeling would be conducted to determine whether the rate and amount of recharge proposed by the project could result in substantial changes to the location or shape of existing contamination plumes, or in the inundation of landfills or other contamination sources. As part of the investigation, relevant agencies, including the Regional Board, Watermasters, and agencies involved in groundwater clean-up activities (e.g., EPA and WQA), will be consulted. As applicable, Mitigation Measure CD-W4 will be implemented to prevent interaction of infiltrated water with landfill materials or other contaminant sources.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-W7 includes a site-specific assessment to identify land uses with the potential for contaminants which would be incompatible with infiltration. If a project site is located within or adjacent to a plume or in the vicinity of a contamination source, the effect of the proposed recharge on groundwater hydrology (changes in flow direction and levels) will be evaluated. Based on the results of the evaluation, additional measures to protect groundwater quality (modifications to the location and design of infiltration facilities and/or monitoring) would be incorporated into the project (see Mitigation Measure CD-W4). Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-W7 and CD-W4, impacts on groundwater quality would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.1.7 Significant Effect – Groundwater Quality Impacts related to Potential Soil Contamination at Infiltration Sites

Future Master Plan projects may include stormwater infiltration. If stormwater were infiltrated in large amounts through contaminants and caused pollutants to leach out into the underlying groundwater, this would be considered a significant impact on groundwater quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-W8: For projects involving substantial ground disturbance where prior land use is unknown and the potential for soil contamination or other constraints (e.g., oil or gas wells) from previous land uses exists, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) will be conducted to determine the site-specific potential for soil contamination or other constraints. The Phase I ESA will be conducted in accordance with the latest version of the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) 1527 "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Assessment Process." This document outlines the customary practice for performing ESA's in the United States. Phase I ESA will consist of a review of site-specific documents and historical maps to determine past uses of the site, a site visit to visually inspect the property for signs of potential environmental contamination, and investigation of state and federal environmental regulatory databases to identify recognized hazardous materials usage or spills, and include review of California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, & Geothermal Resources records of oil, gas, and geothermal wells. For project sites with infiltration, the boundary of the Phase I ESA will include parcels located within 500 feet of the project site boundary to identify active or abandoned landfills or other land uses with the potential for contaminated soils which would be incompatible with infiltration (to be cross-referenced with Mitigation Measure CD-W4). If the Phase I ESA concludes that there is no substantial potential for soil contamination or other constraints, no further action would be required. If the Phase I ESA indicates that there is potential for soil to be contaminated, additional investigation (Phase II ESA, including soil sampling and analysis) will be conducted to determine the presence and extent of the contamination. If the proposed project would involve disturbance of soil in the contaminated area, soil would be removed and disposed of in compliance with applicable regulations at approved disposal sites. If the proposed project site includes or is in the immediate vicinity of oil or gas wells or if any unrecorded wells are damaged or uncovered during excavation or grading, the project proponent shall submit the information outlined in the "Construction Project Site Review and Well Abandonment Procedure" to the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources. In order of preference, wells should be avoided, plugged or re-

plugged to current Division specifications, or an adequate gas venting system should be installed if construction over an abandoned well is unavoidable.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-W8 includes site-specific investigation of potential contaminants and proper disposal, if any. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-W8, groundwater quality impacts associated with potential contamination at infiltration sites would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Sections 4.6.3. and 4.6.4

6.6.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.6.2.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Surface Water Quality related to Soil Erosion (All Concept Design Studies)

Construction of facilities proposed for the Concept Design Studies would involve soil disturbance (e.g., excavation, grading, and filling), which would temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion. In addition, during the rainy season, construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies may come in contact with runoff. If appropriate measures are not taken to minimize the release of sediments and other materials from construction sites, this could result in a temporary impact on surface water quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W1: Develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for projects that involve constructing, clearing, grading or excavation on areas over 1 acre in size to minimize the amount of runoff and associated pollutants (e.g., sediments) leaving the construction site by containing the runoff onsite, containing the sediments onsite, and/or minimizing the potential for stormwater to come in contact with pollutants. The following are possible measures to be incorporated into site-specific SWPPPs. Additional sample measures and guidelines for developing SWPPPs are available in California Stormwater Quality Association's *Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbook – Construction* (CASQA, 2003). Measures to reduce fugitive dust generated during construction (see Section 4.1.5 – Air Quality) will also minimize the potential for soil erosion.

- Install perimeter silt fences or hay bales.
- Stabilize soils through hydroseeding with native plant species where possible and use of soil stabilizers.
- Install temporary sedimentation basins.
- Conduct earth moving activities during the dry season (April through October), as feasible.
- Designate storage areas for construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) to keep these materials out of the rain and minimize contact with stormwater.
- Conduct regular inspections to ensure compliance with the SWPPP.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for Non-County Sponsored Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: As required by the EPA and the Regional Board and as outlined in Mitigation Measure CD-W1 above, a SWPPP will be developed and implemented during construction of Concept Design Study projects. Incorporation of stormwater best management practices in the SWPPP would reduce the potential for soil erosion and release of other pollutants during construction. These measures would minimize the amount of runoff and associated pollutants (e.g., sediments) leaving the construction site by containing the runoff onsite (e.g., sedimentation basins), containing the sediments onsite (e.g., silt fences and hay bales), or minimizing the potential for stormwater to come in contact with pollutants (e.g., conduct activities during the dry season, control pollutant releases (oils, grease, etc.) from construction equipment). With the incorporation of such control measures in the SWPPPs, construction impacts on surface water quality are expected to be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.6.2.2 Significant Effect – Impacts on Water Quality During Channel Modifications (El Dorado Regional Park, Lario Creek, and Woodland Duck Farm)

The Master Plan Concept Design Studies for El Dorado Regional Park, Lario Creek, and potentially Woodland Duck Farm include channel modifications. Earth moving activities within the channel of the River or tributaries could result in a temporary increase in the potential for soil erosion and release of sediments. The resultant increase in turbidity (and potential release of pollutants in the soils underlying the concrete) in river flows could be a significant water quality impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W6: For projects involving channel modifications, COE, Regional Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted. All necessary federal and state approvals (including CWA Section 404 permits, CWA Section 401 water quality certifications or waivers, and California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreements) shall be obtained prior to the implementation of construction activities. Any conditions of agency approvals (e.g., measures to minimize the potential water quality impacts associated with the channel modification) shall be incorporated into the project design. Water quality mitigation options for use during construction of in-channel improvements include diversion of flows around the construction site, installation of in-stream silt curtains, or use of off-channel sediment retention ponds or tanks.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Under Mitigation Measure CD-W6, COE, Regional Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Game will be consulted for projects involving channel modifications. Any conditions of agency approvals (e.g., measures to minimize the

potential water quality impacts associated with the channel modification) will be incorporated into the project design. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-W6, potential impacts on water quality during channel modifications would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.6.2.3 Significant Effect – Water Quality Impacts of Pesticide/Herbicide Use in Landscaped Areas or for Exotics Species Removal (All Concept Design Studies)

All five Concept Design Studies could include landscaping/habitat restoration as potential project elements. In addition, the Concept Design Studies for San Gabriel River Discovery Center, Lario Creek, and El Dorado Regional Park propose removal of exotic plant species. Water quality impacts associated with runoff containing chemical herbicides/pesticides would be potentially significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W2: For projects involving landscaping, habitat restoration, and/or removal of exotic plant species, select biological or non-chemical means of controlling exotics and pests unless not feasible because biological or non-chemical controls are not readily available for the specific exotics to be controlled. If chemical pesticide or herbicide use is necessary, compounds that are less persistent in the environment shall be selected, and application shall be conducted in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and general standards of use, e.g., restricted application before and during rain storms.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

With incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-W2, use of chemical herbicides/pesticides will be minimized, use of chemicals will be limited to approved herbicides and pesticides, and application will be conducted in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and general standards of use, e.g., restricted application before and during rain storms. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-W2, water quality impacts from this type of chemical use would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.6.2.4 Significant Effect – Groundwater Quality Impacts related to Potential Soil Contamination at Infiltration Sites (El Dorado Regional Park, Lario Creek, and Woodland Duck Farm)

Future Master Plan projects may include stormwater infiltration. If stormwater were infiltrated in large amounts through contaminants and caused pollutants to leach out into the underlying groundwater, this would be considered a significant impact on groundwater quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W3: For projects involving substantial ground disturbance, conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to determine the site-specific potential for soil contamination. The Phase I ESA shall be conducted in accordance with the latest version of the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) 1527 "Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Assessment Process." This document outlines the customary practice for performing ESA's in the United States. Phase I ESA shall consist of a review of site-specific documents and historical maps to determine past uses of the site, a site visit to visually inspect the property for signs of potential environmental contamination, and investigation of state and federal environmental regulatory databases to identify recognized hazardous materials usage or spills. For project sites with infiltration, the boundary of the Phase I ESA shall include parcels located within 500 feet of the project site boundary to identify active or abandoned landfills or other land uses with the potential for contaminated soils which would be incompatible with infiltration (to be cross-referenced with Mitigation Measure CD-W4). If the Phase I ESA concludes that there is no substantial potential for soil contamination, no further action would be required. If the Phase I ESA indicates that there is potential for soil to be contaminated, additional investigation (Phase II ESA, including soil sampling and analysis) shall

be conducted to determine the presence and extent of the contamination. If the proposed project would involve disturbance of soil in the contaminated area, soil would be removed and disposed of in compliance with applicable regulations at approved disposal sites.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure CD-W3 includes site-specific investigation of soil contamination potential and proper disposal of contaminated soil, if any. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-W3, groundwater quality impacts associated with potential soil contamination at infiltration sites would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.6.2.5 Significant Effect – Operational Impacts on Groundwater Quality from Stormwater Infiltration (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park)

The Master Plan Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, the San Gabriel River Discovery Center at Whittier Narrows, and El Dorado Regional Park include constructed wetlands, which may be unlined and designed to allow infiltration of stormwater to the groundwater. The level of treatment needed prior to stormwater infiltration would vary depending on the drainage area land use. Stormwater treatment methods designed to remove suspended solids and floatables (e.g., oil and grease) are expected to remove many of the pollutants (e.g., heavy metals and organics) that are sorbed onto particulates. For projects that include industrial land uses in the drainage areas, additional treatment could be used to further improve water quality. If the adequacy of the treatment methods is not monitored and evaluated, stormwater infiltration could result in a significant impact on groundwater quality. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W5: For projects that involve stormwater infiltration, conduct vadose zone and groundwater quality monitoring. If monitoring results indicate substantial water quality degradation, pursue the following general strategy:

- Provide additional treatment prior to infiltration, or
- Redesign project to reduce or eliminate infiltration (e.g., lining), or
- Identify an alternative water source (e.g., reclaimed water).

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure CD-W5 requires monitoring of stormwater and groundwater quality to assess the ongoing effectiveness of the proposed stormwater treatment methods in protecting water quality, and outlines measures that would be taken if monitoring results indicate substantial water quality degradation associated with project infiltration. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-W5, water quality impacts associated with stormwater infiltration would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.6.2.6 Significant Effect – Groundwater Hydrology Impacts from Stormwater Infiltration (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park)

The Master Plan Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, the San Gabriel River Discovery Center at Whittier Narrows, and El Dorado Regional Park include constructed wetlands, which may be unlined and designed to allow infiltration of stormwater to the groundwater. Increase recharge of stormwater or recycled water would generally result in beneficial impacts on groundwater elevations of the underlying groundwater basins. However, projects that involve large amounts of groundwater recharge could have adverse effects on groundwater hydrology (groundwater elevations and flow directions). Potential adverse impacts include inundation of historical landfill materials or other contaminant sources and potential interference with ongoing remediation and cleanup efforts of existing groundwater contamination in the San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin. The significance of impacts on groundwater hydrology would be site-specific, and depend on the volume and rate of water infiltrated and proximity to contamination plumes and landfills. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-W4: If the site-specific Phase I ESA (Mitigation Measure CD-W3) indicates that an active or closed landfill (either municipal solid waste or inert construction waste) is located within 500 feet of the project site boundary, then a site-specific geotechnical study shall be conducted to: 1) characterize the extent and composition of landfill materials; 2) determine whether the landfill materials are releasing methane; 3) and estimate the potential mounding effect from the proposed stormwater infiltration. The results of the geotechnical study shall be incorporated into the project design to minimize the potential for project infiltration to

result in interaction between infiltrated stormwater and landfill materials or to impact landfill gas releases, if any. Potential design modifications include siting the infiltration facilities away from the landfill and/or partially lining the facilities to direct infiltration away from the landfill. For sites with stormwater infiltration within 500 feet of an active or closed landfill, a groundwater monitoring program shall be developed and implemented to ensure that infiltration does not result in interaction between infiltrated stormwater and landfilled materials or impact landfill gas releases. Infiltration would cease at any site where groundwater levels rose to within 10 feet of landfilled materials to prevent interaction of infiltrated water with landfill materials.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure CD-W3 includes a site-specific assessment to identify land uses with the potential for contaminated soils which would be incompatible with infiltration. If a project site is located within or adjacent to a plume or in the vicinity of a contamination source, the effect of the proposed recharge on groundwater hydrology (changes in flow direction and

levels) will be evaluated. Based on the results of the evaluation, additional measures to protect groundwater quality (modifications to the location and design of infiltration facilities and/or monitoring) would be incorporated into the project per Mitigation Measure CD-W4. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-W3 and CD-W4, impacts on groundwater quality would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.6.4.

6.7 Land Use / Mineral Resources

6.7.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.7.1.1 Significant Effect – Impacts on Availability of Mineral Resources

Adoption of the Master Plan could encourage redevelopment and reclamation, including development of gravel mines or abandoned lands for various purposes including active and passive recreation and habitat restoration. The Master Plan envisions that reclamation plans would be developed based on negotiation and partnership with the current owners and operators of these properties, including mining operations. Therefore, implementation of redevelopment and reclamation projects under the Master Plan are anticipated to take place after extraction of mineral resources have been completed. However, if a Master Plan project proposes development of facilities that would result in the restriction of future mineral extraction operations (e.g., reclamation of an existing gravel mine before gravel extraction activities have been completed or restriction of access for in-channel gravel removal activities approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), the impact on mineral resources would be potentially significant. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-L1: For future projects that propose development of facilities that would result in restriction of future mineral extraction operations (e.g., reclamation of an existing gravel mine before gravel extraction activities have been completed), site-specific evaluations described below will be conducted and the results will be disclosed in subsequent CEQA documentation:

1. Determine the site-specific availability of mineral resources by reviewing relevant publications from the California Geological Survey (e.g., Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) Mineral Land Classification, available at: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/mlc/index.htm) and/or mine reclamation plans (if the proposed project site is an existing mine).

2. Contact the relevant SMARA lead agency (see Section 4.7.1.1 of the Final Program EIR) to determine whether the proposed land use change could restrict or preclude the extraction of mineral resources designated as regionally significant (MRZ-2) or locally important (as designated in a local land use plan).

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: If a future Master Plan project proposes development of facilities that would result in the restriction of future mineral extraction, site-specific evaluations (including availability of mineral resources and consultation with SMARA) would be conducted under Mitigation Measure MP-L1. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-L1, impacts on mineral resources would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.7.3.

6.7.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

No significant land use or mineral resources impacts have been identified for the Concept Design Studies.

6.8 Noise

6.8.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.8.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Noise Impact on Sensitive Receptors

Construction of facilities proposed under future Master Plan projects could temporarily increase noise from construction equipment use and worker vehicle trips. Depending on the project-specific construction characteristics and distance to nearby noise receptors, noise generated during construction could exceed the applicable municipality's noise standards, a potentially significant impact. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-N1: Evaluations of construction noise generation will be conducted as follows during site-specific environmental review of each future Master Plan project:

1. Identify noise-sensitive land uses located in the vicinity of the project site (e.g., residences, hospitals, schools, guest lodging, libraries, convalescent and retirement facilities, houses of worship, auditoriums and concert halls, outdoor theaters, nature and wildlife preserves, and parks).

2. Determine the existing noise environment of the project area (e.g., rural vs. high density urban). Identify nearby existing noise sources that affect the project site (e.g., heavy industrial operations or major highways).

3. Review the relevant jurisdiction's noise regulations and policies (e.g., noise ordinances and general plan noise element) to identify construction noise standards and noise/land use compatibility guidelines.

4. Estimate the construction equipment needed and resultant noise generation (see Section 4.8.5.1 of the Final Program EIR). Compare the estimated construction noise levels that would be experienced by the nearest sensitive receptor to the relevant jurisdiction's construction noise standards. The impact evaluation will also take into consideration construction duration, whether the noise generated would be intermittent or continuous, and the existing noise environment of the project area.

5. If the estimated noise levels exceed the standards, one or more of the following applicable site-specific measures will be implemented to reduce noise levels to meet the relevant jurisdiction's noise standards:

    - Equip all mobile construction equipment with properly operating mufflers or other noise reduction devices
    - Install sound walls, sound curtains, or other temporary sound barriers
    - Select quieter construction procedures and/or equipment

6. For projects at school sites: schedule the noisier phases of construction on Saturdays, school vacation periods, and/or after regular class hours but before 9 p.m., as feasible; and maintain

ongoing communications with the schools' administrators to address any construction noise-related issues.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Mitigation Measure MP-N1 outlines an approach to evaluation of construction noise and implementation of measures to reduce noise (via installation of mufflers, notification to nearby receptors, limitation of construction hours, and development of site-specific noise mitigation plans (to potentially include sound barriers, etc.)). Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-N1, construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.8.4.

6.8.1.2 Significant Effect – Operational Noise Impact of New or Expanded Facilities for Active Recreation

Operation of recreational facilities proposed as part of future Master Plan projects would result in generation of noise associated with park users, which could have adverse impacts on adjacent noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential uses or habitat areas). The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-N2: Projects that involve new or expanded facilities for active recreation (e.g., athletic fields) will be designed to minimize impacts on nearby noise-sensitive land uses, if any, by siting facilities away from noise-sensitive land uses, limiting hours of operation, installation of sound barriers, and/or using other appropriate measures as necessary.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-N2 would require siting facilities away from noise sensitive land uses, limiting hours of operation, and installation of sound barriers, etc., thereby mitigating this impact to below a level of significance.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.8.4.

6.8.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.8.2.1 Significant Effect – Construction Noise Impact on Sensitive Receptors (All Concept Design Studies)

Since detailed construction plans have not been developed for the proposed Concept Design Studies, the types of construction equipment required for each project were estimated based on the concept designs of the proposed facilities. Typical construction noise levels for each project site were then assessed and compared to the construction noise standards established by the applicable municipality for each Concept Design Study site. Based on this evaluation, construction noise impacts on sensitive receptors would be potentially significant for all five Concept Design Studies. The following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-N1: Limit construction activities to the hours allowed by the applicable jurisdiction's noise ordinance (City of Azusa for San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds; County of Los Angeles for Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and Lario Creek; and City of Long Beach for El Dorado Regional Park).

Mitigation Measure CD-N2: Equip all mobile construction equipment with properly operating mufflers or other noise reduction devices.

Mitigation Measure CD-N3: Notify businesses and residences immediately adjacent to the construction site prior to the start of construction (e.g., via flyers). Include a telephone number for noise complaints in this notification.

Mitigation Measure CD-N4: Prior to the start of construction of the project, require the construction contractor to develop a site-specific noise mitigation plan based on an updated estimate of construction equipment and schedule. One or more of the following measures shall be implemented as applicable to reduce noise levels to meet the relevant jurisdiction's construction noise standards:

- Install temporary sound walls, sound curtains, or other temporary sound barriers
- Select quieter construction procedures and/or equipment

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-N1 through CD-N4 would reduce construction noise impacts to less than significant levels by limiting construction activities to daytime hours (thereby avoiding noise generation during nighttime when nearby receptors are most sensitive to noise), using noise reduction devices on construction equipment, and identifying site specific measures to reduce noise levels to meet construction noise standards established by the applicable municipality.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.8.5.

6.9 Public Services and Utilities

6.9.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.9.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impact on Police and Fire Protection Services from Temporary Lane and/or Road Closures

Future Master Plan projects could include stormwater management facilities, such as storm drains, catch basins, or other structures within street rights-of-way. Temporary road or lane closures associated with construction of these facilities may have a temporary significant impact on police and fire emergency response times and emergency vehicle access to streets, fire

hydrants or structures adjacent to the affected roadways. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-P1: For future projects with substantial construction periods, the following measures will be implemented as applicable to minimize construction impacts on emergency response requirements of relevant police and fire departments. (See also Section 4.11.6 regarding mitigation measures related to construction impacts on traffic and roadways).

- Prior to the start of construction, consult the fire station(s) serving the project area and review phasing, road/lane closure, and detour plans. The fire station(s) may then identify alternative fire and emergency medical response routes.

- Prior to the start of construction, consult the police station(s) serving the project area, as appropriate, of project-related lane and/or road closures and detour plans. The police station(s) may then identify alternative police emergency response routes.

- If determined to be necessary by the relevant police and/or fire service providers, implement one or more of the following applicable traffic control measures capable of reducing the temporary adverse effects to police and emergency vehicle travel during project construction:

  - Use flagmen to direct traffic
  - Post "No Parking" signs along the affected area
  - Install temporary signals or signs to direct traffic
  - Other equivalent traffic control measures

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-P1 would reduce impacts on emergency service provider response times to below a level of significance by requiring consultation with emergency service providers and implementation of traffic control measures to reduce temporary adverse effects to emergency vehicle response vehicles.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.3.

6.9.1.2 Significant Effect – Construction Impact on Schools

Construction activities at future Master Plan Project sites located near schools (e.g., construction traffic and parking of construction vehicles on the street adjacent to the school) could have temporary significant impacts on access to the school and on student safety. In addition, projects involving construction of structures within street rights-of-way as part of a stormwater management facility may have a significant adverse impact on school commuting routes. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-P2: For future projects located adjacent to a school, evaluate the impact on school access (vehicles and pedestrians) and student safety from operation and/or parking of construction vehicles and equipment near the school property. The school district or the school administrator will be contacted to identify any policies that the school or the school district has established regarding construction on or near school properties (e.g., noise and traffic control standards) and to provide sufficient notice to forewarn school bus operators, children, and parents if existing pedestrian and vehicular routes to school would be affected. As necessary to protect the safety of children, parents and employees accessing the school, one or more of the following measures will be implemented in coordination with the school administrators:

- Develop temporary alternative pedestrian and vehicular routes to the school that avoid construction areas
- Install appropriate temporary traffic controls (signs, crossing guards, and/or signals) as needed to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety
- Minimize use of haul routes past the school when school is in session
- Prohibit parking or staging of construction or worker vehicles on streets adjacent to the school.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Incorporation of Mitigation Measure MP-P2 would reduce construction impacts on school access and school commuting routes to less-than-significant levels through proper planning of construction activities and/or identification of alternative bus routes, as necessary.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.3.

6.9.1.3 Significant Effect – Potential Interference with Existing Utilities

Projects involving stormwater collection and treatment may include construction of storm drains, catch basins, or other structures within street rights-of-way as part of a stormwater management facility. Utilities that may be affected by construction of these facilities include water, sewer, electricity, gas, oil, telephone, and cable. If underground utilities are not identified prior to construction, significant damage and temporary disruption to those lines and associated services could occur. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-P3: For future projects that include construction of pipelines or other underground structures, identify the roadways or other rights-of-way that would be affected during construction. During facility design, contact the relevant utilities (e.g., water, sewage, electricity, natural gas, telephone, cable, and oil) to identify existing and proposed buried facilities in affected roadways. To the extent feasible, the alignment of new facilities will be designed to avoid the existing utilities. If avoidance is not feasible, one or more of the following measures will be implemented as applicable:

- If relocation is required, sequence construction activities to avoid or minimize interruptions in service.
- If utility service disruption is necessary, notify residents and businesses in the project area a minimum of 2 to 4 days prior to service disruption through local newspapers, direct mailings to affected parties, or public posting of notices.
- If project construction would occur near existing utilities, require the contractor to excavate around utilities, including hand excavation as necessary, to avoid damage and to minimize interference with safe operation and use. Hand tools must be used to expose the exact location of buried gas or electric utilities.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of MP-P3 would reduce potential impacts on utilities below a level of significance by requiring identification of buried facilities in affected roadways and relocation of facilities as necessary.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.3.

6.9.1.4 Significant Effect – Operational Impact on Power Line Towers from Stormwater Infiltration

Portions of the river corridor parallel power transmission lines. Operation of stormwater infiltration facilities near power line towers could result in saturation of soil surrounding the towers, which could affect the stability of the power line towers, a potentially significant impact on utilities. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-P4: For future projects that include stormwater infiltration in the vicinity of power line towers, a geotechnical investigation will be conducted during facility design to assess the characteristics and stability of the soil around the power line towers. If results of the investigation indicate that stormwater infiltration may saturate the soil and affect the stability of the towers, one or more of the following changes will be incorporated into the site design as applicable:

- Site the proposed retention basins to avoid the towers, if possible, or construct a series of drywells so that water would be infiltrated deeper into the ground to avoid saturation of surface soils.
- Install a liner along the sideslope of the basin closest to the power line towers to prevent infiltration. (The liner would cover only a small portion of the infiltration basin.)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-P4 would reduce impacts on utility tower stability to below a level of significance by requiring a geotechnical investigation and modifications to infiltration system design to minimize saturation of soils around power line towers.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.3.

6.9.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

6.9.2.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impact on Police and Fire Protection Services from Temporary Lane and/or Road Closures (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park)

The Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park include stormwater management facilities, such as storm drains, catch basins, or other structures within street rights-of-way. Temporary road or lane closures associated with construction of these facilities may have a temporary significant impact on police and fire emergency response times and emergency vehicle access to streets, fire hydrants or structures adjacent to the affected roadways. The following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-P1: Prior to the start of construction, consult the fire station(s) serving the project area and review phasing, road/lane closure, and detour plans. The fire station(s) may then identify alternative fire and emergency medical response routes.

Mitigation Measure CD-P2: Prior to the start of construction, consult the police station(s) serving the project area, as appropriate, of project-related lane and/or road closures and detour plans. The police station(s) may then identify alternative police emergency response routes.

Mitigation Measure CD-P3: If determined to be necessary by the relevant police and/or fire service providers, implement one or more of the following applicable traffic control measures capable of reducing the temporary adverse effects to police and emergency vehicle travel during project construction:

- Use flagmen to direct traffic
- Post "No Parking" signs along the affected area
- Install temporary signals or signs to direct traffic
- Other equivalent traffic control measures

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measures CD-P1 through CD-P3 would reduce impacts on emergency provider response times to below a level of significance by requiring consultation with emergency service providers and implementation of traffic control measures to reduce temporary adverse effects to emergency response vehicles.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.4.

6.9.2.2 Significant Effect – Construction Impact on School Commuting Routes from Temporary Lane and/or Road Closures (Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park)

The Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park include stormwater management facilities, such as storm drains, catch basins, or other structures within street rights-of-way. Temporary road or lane closures associated with construction of these facilities may have a temporary significant impact on school commuting routes. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-P6: Notify the applicable school district of the expected start and end dates for various portions of the project that may affect traffic in the area and any potential impact on existing school bus routes to facilitate identification of alternative routes and minimize unexpected delays in commuting to the school.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CD-P6 would reduce construction impacts on school access and school commuting routes to less-than-significant levels through proper planning of construction activities and/or identification of alternative bus routes, as necessary.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.4.

6.9.2.3 Significant Effect – Potential Interference with Existing Utilities (All Concept Design Studies)

The Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm, Lario Creek, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park include stormwater management facilities, such as storm drains, catch basins, or other structures within street rights-of-way. Utilities that may be affected by construction of these facilities include water, sewer, electricity, gas, oil, telephone, and cable. In addition, the Concept Design Study site for the San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds contains an underground water pipeline near the perimeter of the spreading grounds. This pipeline is owned and maintained by the City of Azusa for conveying water from its wells to its water treatment facility. If underground utilities are not identified prior to construction, significant damage and temporary disruption to those lines and associated services could occur. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-P7: During design of each project component, consult the applicable utility service provider(s) to identify existing and proposed buried facilities in affected roadways and to determine which utilities require relocation and which can be avoided. If results of the consultation indicate that project construction could affect buried facilities, one or more of the following measures shall be implemented as applicable:

- If relocation is required, sequence construction activities to avoid or minimize interruptions in service.
- If utility service disruption is necessary, notify residents and businesses in the project area a minimum of 2 to 4 days prior to service disruption through local newspapers, direct mailings to affected parties, or public posting of notices.
- If project construction would occur near existing utilities, require the contractor to excavate around utilities, including hand excavation as necessary, to avoid damage and to minimize interference with safe operation and use. Hand tools must be used to expose the exact location of buried gas or electric utilities.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (San Gabriel Canyon Spreading Grounds and Lario Creek):

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm, San Gabriel River Discovery Center, and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of CD-P7 would reduce potential impacts on utilities below a level of significance by requiring identification of buried facilities in affected roadways and relocation of facilities as necessary.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.4.

6.9.2.4 Significant Effect – Operational Impact on Power Line Towers from Stormwater Infiltration (Woodland Duck Farm and El Dorado Regional Park)

The Concept Design Studies for the Woodland Duck Farm and El Dorado Regional Park may involve construction of stormwater infiltration facilities near power line towers. If stormwater infiltration saturates the soil surrounding the towers and affects the stability of the power line

towers, it could result in a significant impact on electricity infrastructure. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure CD-P10: During design of the facility, conduct a geotechnical investigation to assess the characteristics and stability of the soil around the power line towers. If results of the investigation indicate that stormwater infiltration may saturate the soil and affect the stability of the towers, one or more of the following changes shall be incorporated into the site design as applicable:

- Site the proposed retention basins to avoid the towers, if possible, or construct a series of drywells so that water would be infiltrated deeper into the ground to avoid saturation of surface soils.
- Install a liner along the sideslope of the basin closest to the power line towers to prevent infiltration. (The liner would cover only a small portion of the infiltration basin.)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Concept Design Study Projects (Woodland Duck Farm and El Dorado Regional Park):

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure CD-P10 would reduce impacts on utility tower stability to below a level of significance by requiring a geotechnical investigation and modifications to infiltration system design to minimize saturation of soils around power line towers.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.9.4.

6.10 Recreation

6.10.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.10.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impact on Existing Recreational Facilities

Construction of new facilities in or near existing recreational facilities as part of future Master Plan projects could temporarily reduce public access to the facilities, a potentially significant impact on recreation. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Mitigation Measure MP-R1: For projects that include modifications of existing recreational facilities, the timing, duration and areal extent of disturbance that would occur during construction of the proposed facilities will be identified during facility design. If temporary closures of existing recreational facilities would be necessary, the potential increase in use of

other nearby recreational facilities will be evaluated. Factors to be considered in the evaluation include the duration of the closure, acreage and type of facility that would be unavailable due to the closure, and existing usage levels at the relevant recreational facilities.

If the impacts on nearby recreational facilities are determined to be potentially significant, one or more of the following measures will be implemented:

- Minimize construction period
- Modify construction phasing to limit disturbance of existing recreational facilities
- Avoid construction during peak use periods

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-R1 would reduce temporary potentially significant impacts on existing recreational facilities by modification of construction schedules to minimize the duration of closure and/or to avoid peak use periods.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.10.3.

6.10.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

No significant recreation impacts have been identified for the Concept Design Studies.

6.11 Transportation and Traffic

6.11.1 Master Plan Impacts

6.11.1.1 Significant Effect – Construction Impacts on Traffic

Construction of facilities proposed as part of future Master Plan projects could have potentially significant impacts on transportation/traffic from construction vehicle trips and/or construction within the right-of-way of public streets/bikeways. The following mitigation measure has been identified to reduce the impact.

Mitigation Measure MP-T1: A traffic impact study will be prepared for any Master Plan project that is projected to meet or exceed the site-generated traffic volume thresholds cited in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program "Guidelines for CMP Transportation Impact Analysis." The guidelines indicate that a study is required if a project would add 50 or more vehicle trips during either the a.m. or p.m. weekday peak hours to a CMP arterial monitoring intersection or freeway on- or off-ramp. An analysis will be conducted if the project would add 150 or more trips in either direction to a mainline freeway during either the a.m. or p.m. weekday peak hours. A traffic study will also be prepared if the project meets the criteria for the municipality in which the project site is located (i.e., an incorporated city, County of Los Angeles, or County of Orange). If the project would result in significant traffic impacts, one or more of the following measures will be implemented as applicable.

- A construction traffic management plan shall be developed for each project site that will include but not be limited to such measures as designated haul routes for construction-related traffic (e.g., construction equipment, pickup and dump trucks, and other material

delivery trucks), travel time restrictions for construction-related traffic to avoid weekday peak periods on selected roadways, designated site access locations, driveway turning restrictions, temporary traffic controls and/or flaggers, and designated parking/staging locations for workers and equipment.

- A construction area traffic control plan and/or detour plan shall be prepared for any location where construction activities would encroach into the right-of-way of a public roadway. The plan would include, but not be limited to such features as warning signs, lights, barricades, cones, lane closures, and restricted hours during which lane closures would not be allowed (e.g., 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 6:00 p.m., or as directed by the affected public agency).
- Provide advance notification to affected property owners, businesses, residents, etc. of possible driveway blockages or other access obstructions and implement alternate access and parking provisions where necessary.
- Provide alternative pedestrian and bicycle access/circulation routes if existing facilities such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes would be obstructed to ensure safe pedestrian/bicycle travel.
- Coordinate with emergency service providers (police, fire, and ambulance/paramedic agencies) prior to construction to provide information regarding lane closures, construction schedules, driveway blockages, etc., if any, and develop a plan to maintain or accommodate essential emergency access routes (e.g., plating over excavations and use of detours).
- Coordinate with public transit agencies (e.g., MTA) to provide information regarding lane closures, bus stop disruptions, etc. so that MTA or relevant agency can designate alternate pick-up/drop-off locations, if appropriate, and provide for uninterrupted service.
- As necessary, obtain a transportation permit from Caltrans for transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways.
- Other relevant traffic control measures.

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>County-Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[XX] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[ ] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Finding per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for <u>Non-County Sponsored</u> Master Plan Projects:

[ ] Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final Program EIR. (Subd. [a][1].)

[XX] Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. (Subd. [a][2].)

[ ] Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (Subd. [a][3].)

Rationale: Implementation of Mitigation Measure MP-T1 would reduce traffic impacts to below a level of significance by requiring the evaluation of construction traffic and implementation of traffic control measures such as installation of warning signs, lights, and barricades; restriction of lane closure hours; provision of alternative pedestrian and bicycle routes; and restriction of travel times during construction to avoid peak periods.

Reference: Final Program EIR Section 4.11.4.

6.11.2 Concept Design Study Impacts

No significant transportation and traffic impacts have been identified for the Concept Design Studies.

7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

7.1 Air Quality

The SCAB is a non-attainment area for ozone (extreme), PM10 (serious), and CO (serious). It can be reasonably assumed that construction of Master Plan projects would overlap with other construction in the South Coast Air Basin including construction of one or more of the related projects. However, each of the Master Plan projects is anticipated to be below the construction emission thresholds established by SCAQMD, and operational impacts on air quality of Master Plan projects would be negligible. In addition, each of the related projects would be required to mitigate its temporary construction impacts to the extent feasible. Therefore, cumulative effects are anticipated to be less than significant.

7.2 Cultural Resources

Significant impacts to archaeological materials are not predicted for the Master Plan since mitigation measures, including monitoring during subsurface disturbances, would be conduced as warranted. Since other related projects are located in disturbed urban areas with limited potential for cultural resources, and since these projects would also mitigate their individual impacts, if any, significant cumulative impacts on cultural resources are not anticipated.

7.3 Hydrology and Water Quality

The other related development projects could increase impervious surface area within the corridor and, therefore, result in generation of additional runoff over existing conditions. Increases in runoff which exceed the capacity of the receiving waterbody would be potentially significant without mitigation.

However, compliance with LADPW standards for stormwater discharges would be required at every construction site within the County. LADPW has determined the allowable discharge rate for parcels within their jurisdiction. Allowable discharge rates are calculated by multiplying the site acreage by the allowable flow rate per acre, which varies by the design capacity of the receiving drainage facility and is determined by LADPW. The objective of the allowable discharge rates is to maintain the design capacities of LADPW's existing storm drainage facilities in compliance with the agency's flood protection standards. Compliance with the LADPW standards would reduce cumulative impacts on drainage to a less than significant level for the related development projects. Together with the beneficial impacts on runoff from the Master Plan projects which would decrease stormwater runoff by provision of infiltration and detention facilities, the cumulative impact would be less than significant or beneficial.

With regard to stormwater runoff quality, development of Master Plan projects would not have an incremental effect that is cumulatively considerable. Instead, Master Plan impacts to water quality are net beneficial, and would be expected to partially offset water quality impacts from development of the related projects which would increase impervious surface area (homes, warehouses, restaurants, etc.). Each of the related projects would contribute non-point source pollutants to runoff that flows into surface waters tributary to the San Gabriel River. However, the cities along the corridor require implementation of BMPs in compliance with SUSMP. Overall, the cumulative effect with implementation of Master Plan is less than cumulatively considerable. Runoff quality from the watershed should improve over time as compared with existing conditions.

7.4 Land Use

Each of the proposed related projects and the Master Plan projects would require compliance with local zoning and land use regulations. Master Plan projects would be generally consistent with relevant land use policies. The cumulative impact on land use of all related projects is less than significant.

7.5 Noise

Cumulatively considerable noise impacts could occur in the event construction schedules overlapped for various projects in the same vicinity and the net effect was generation of noise in excess of local noise standards. However, the Master Plan and each of its Concept Design Studies, however, would not contribute to a significant noise impact. Further, since each project would be required to incorporate mitigation to reduce noise generation to the extent feasible, the cumulative effect would be less than significant. Operations related noise related to the Master Plan projects would be limited to infrequent maintenance and recreation use. Again, with compliance with local noise standards, cumulative impacts with the related projects would be less than significant.

7.6 Transportation and Traffic

Cumulatively considerable impacts could occur on traffic in the event construction schedules overlapped for various projects and the net effect was degradation of service to unacceptable volume/capacity ratios on specific roadway segments. The cumulative impact would then be considered significant, but temporary. It is anticipated that in this case, traffic mitigation would be required of each project to reduce LOS on the affected streets to "D." The cumulative impact would then be mitigated to a level of less than significant.

8.0 ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly obtain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.) The "No Project" alternative must be evaluated, and if it is the environmentally superior alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified among the other alternatives. (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e).)

There are no environmental impacts of the Master Plan that are significant and cannot be avoided through mitigation. In addition, The Master Plan document does not detail any alternatives. Therefore, for the purposes of Program EIR analysis, the County evaluated the environmental effects of the following alternatives to the Master Plan:

- No Project
- Maximum Habitat Alternative
- Maximum Recreation Alternative
- Maximum Master Plan
- Specific Alternatives for Individual Master Plan Elements

No Project Alternative

Under this alternative, there would not be any unifying planning process or Master Plan document to guide individual projects along the river corridor proposed by various municipalities, agencies and interest groups.

Under the No Project alternative, the environmental benefits that would result from the collaborative process and the multi-objective planning approach advocated by the Master Plan would be reduced as summarized below:

- Biological resources – reduced consistency of restoration projects, possible reduction in the use of native species and therefore reduced habitat values, no planned wildlife corridors or linkages would be established, reduced coordination for invasive species removal and therefore potentially reduced success of individual efforts
- Recreation – reduced integration of trails and reduced focus on underserved areas
- Open space – reduced integration of land acquisition, potentially reduced coordination of clean-up efforts
- Water resources – elimination of another coordination mechanism for TMDL and NPDES processes
- Aesthetics – reduced potential for common design elements for signs, fences, gates, etc.

Therefore, the No Project alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

Maximum Habitat Alternative

Under this alternative, each future Master Plan project would maximize the opportunities for habitat preservation and enhancement available at each site. The recreation component of each project would consist mostly of passive forms of recreation that are compatible with the habitat component of the project (e.g., bird watching, wildlife appreciation, etc.).

This alternative does not avoid any significant unmitigable impacts identified for the Proposed Project but would have greater beneficial impacts on biological resources than the proposed Master Plan by encouraging a greater number of projects to maximize habitat enhancement and preservation of open space. The Maximum Habitat Alternative would mostly avoid potentially adverse impacts associated with the Recreation, Flood Protection, Water Quality, and Economic Development Elements. For example, this alternative would largely avoid the traffic, noise, and air pollutant emissions related to an increase in recreational visitor trips associated with active recreation. For this reason, and since this alternative would maximize habitat restoration efforts within the river corridor resulting in greater beneficial impacts on biological resources, it can be considered the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative would not encourage projects that provide active recreation to the communities along the river.

Since it would fail to meet the goal of balancing habitat, recreation, and open space, as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution and as defined by the project objectives, it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

Maximum Recreation Alternative

Under this alternative, each future Master Plan project would maximize the opportunities for providing recreational facilities, particularly those for active forms of recreation. The habitat

component of each project would consist of landscaping, tree planting, and other forms of enhancements that are compatible with human activities.

This alternative does not avoid any significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project but would have greater beneficial impacts on recreation than the proposed Master Plan by encouraging a greater number of projects to maximize recreational opportunities. The Maximum Recreation Alternative would mostly avoid potentially adverse impacts associated with the Habitat, Open Space, Flood Protection, Water Quality, and Economic Development Elements. For example, this alternative would avoid impacts associated with development of stormwater retention facilities such as an increase in mosquito breeding habitat or potential liquefaction concerns. However, this alternative would have increased operational impacts on traffic, air quality, and noise associated with recreational visitors as compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would not encourage projects that provide habitat restoration and preservation of open space reducing beneficial impacts on biological resources.

Since it would fail to meet the goal of balancing habitat, recreation, and open space, as intended by the Board of Supervisors' resolution and as defined by the project objectives, this alternative is not identified as the environmentally superior alternative and it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

Maximum Master Plan Alternative

Under this alternative, the goal of the Master Plan would be to restore the river to more a natural state reminiscent of its condition prior to urban development (e.g., removal of dams, lined channels and other engineered features that provide flood control and water supply benefits).

Removal of concrete to re-naturalize the river would result in:

- Significant flooding impacts from decreased flood control capacity currently designed into the system, or
- Significant land use changes from expansion of the floodplain to accommodate flood flows, for example, the displacement of existing residential, commercial, and industrial land uses through building demolition and replacement with open space.

This alternative does not avoid any significant impact identified for the proposed project but could maximize beneficial impacts on biological resources, recreation, and open space. However, this alternative would have significant impacts on water supply, flooding, land use, population, and housing. This alternative is not identified as the environmentally superior alternative and it is rejected and not proposed for adoption by the Board and the other municipalities in the river corridor.

Specific Alternatives for Individual Master Plan Projects

For many of the future Master Plan projects, more than one project description will be considered. These alternatives may focus on balancing project objectives at specific sites. Overall, definition of component-specific alternatives will focus on balancing the multiple uses of the sites to accommodate various interests and maximize beneficial effects.