

APPROVED
JUN 18 2008

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

NO. 08-167

DATE June 18, 2008

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

C.D. 1

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

SUBJECT: MACARTHUR PARK IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT - CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA (W.O. #E170207F) AND LIGHTING (W.O. #E170473F) - CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND REVIEW OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

R. Adams	_____	J. Kolb	_____
H. Fujita	_____	F. Mok	_____
S. Huntley	_____	K. Regan	_____
V. Israel	_____	*M. Shull	<u>Am for MS</u>

[Signature]
General Manager

Approved [Signature]

Disapproved _____

Withdrawn _____

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board:

1. Review, consider and certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed MacArthur Park Improvements Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007121152 and City Document No. EIR-RP-003-08);
2. Certify that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State and City CEQA Guidelines; that it reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis; that the information contained in the Final EIR was reviewed and considered prior to approving the project; and the documents constituting the record of proceedings in this matter are located in the files of the Department of Recreation and Parks' Planning and Development Division;
3. In accordance with Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, adopt the statement of Environmental Findings of Fact set forth in Exhibit A which provides one or more written findings for each of the significant environmental effects identified for the project;

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

PG. 2 NO. 08-167

4. In accordance with Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines, adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan set forth in Section 5 of the Final EIR, which specifies the mitigation measures to be implemented to mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects of the project;
5. Direct Environmental Management staff to file a Notice of Determination with the Los Angeles City Clerk and County Clerk within 5 business days of the certification of the Final EIR;
6. Find Park West Landscape, Inc., with a base bid of \$1,031,365, to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the MacArthur Park Improvements - Children's Play Area (W.O. #E170207F) and Lighting (W.O. #E170473F) project;
7. Exercise Additive Alternate No. 1 in the amount of \$91,100, for a total contract amount of \$1,122,465;
8. Authorize the Chief Accounting Employee to encumber funds in the amount of \$1,122,465 from the following fund and account numbers; and,

<u>FUND SOURCE</u>	<u>FUND NO./DEPARTMENT NO./ACCOUNT NO.</u>	<u>ENCUMBERANCE AMOUNT</u>
MacArthur Park Improvements - Children's Play Area (W.O. #E170207F)		
Proposition K 9 (2005/06)	43K/10/Y579	\$ 127,500
Proposition K YR 10 (2006/07)	43K/10/A579	\$ 183,750
Proposition K YR 11 (2007/08)	43K/10/C579	<u>\$ 611,215</u>
Subtotal		\$ 922,465
MacArthur Park - Lighting (W.O. #E170473F)		
Proposition K YR 11 (2007/08)	43K/10/C302	<u>\$ 200,000</u>
Subtotal		\$ 200,000
 TOTAL		 \$ 1,122,465

9. Request staff to prepare a contract and authorize the Board President and Secretary to execute the contract, subject to approval as to form by the City Attorney.

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

PG. 3 NO. 08-167

SUMMARY:

On May 7, 2008 (Board Report No. 08-111), the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners approved final plans and call for bids for the MacArthur Park Improvements - Children's Play Area (W.O. #E170207F) and Lighting (W.O. #E170473F) project, located at 2230 W. 6th Street, Los Angeles, California, 90057. Plans provide for improvements to the park using Proposition K Specified and Competitive funds. The scope of work for the Specified project calls for the construction of a children's play area that includes a synthetic turf meadow and equipment. The scope of work for the Competitive project calls for the installation of new security lighting.

On June 3, 2008, eight (8) bids were received for this project. The bid documents state that lowest responsible bidder shall be the responsible bidder who submits the lowest bid, and that the lowest bid shall be the lowest base bid amount which includes the work specified for all deductive alternates, and does not include the work specified for the additive alternate. The description and the bid amounts received are as follows:

<u>Bidders</u>	<u>Base Bid</u>	<u>Ded. Alt #1</u> <u>Trash</u> <u>Receptacles</u> <u>and Exercise</u> <u>Equipment</u>	<u>Ded. Alt #2</u> <u>Stabilized</u> <u>Natural</u> <u>paving</u>	<u>Add. Alt #1</u> <u>Ecofill or</u> <u>approved</u> <u>equal</u>
Park West Landscape, Inc.	\$1,031,365.00	\$19,909.00	\$27,428.00	\$91,100.00
C.S. Legacy Construction, Inc.	\$1,104,889.00	\$26,741.00	\$19,874.00	\$107,799.00
Environmental Construction, Inc.	\$1,136,520.00	\$21,500.00	\$15,730.00	\$82,000.00
C & J Engineering and Construction, Inc.	\$1,457,786.68	\$21,701.38	\$30,000.00	\$73,800.00
Simgel Co., Inc.	\$1,472,026.00	\$19,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$232,000.00
Malibu Pacific Tennis Courts, Inc.	\$1,594,800.00	\$40,000.00	\$29,000.00	\$95,000.00
Los Angeles Engineering, Inc.	\$1,876,146.44	\$30,800.00	\$57,000.00	\$100,000.00
Masters Contracting Corporation	\$1,947,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$29,000.00	\$120,000.00

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

PG. 4 NO. 08-167

The project is subject to the Minority Business Enterprise, and Other Business Enterprise (MBE/WBE/OBE) Subcontractor Outreach Program. In order to comply with the Good Faith Effort (GFE) requirements of the Subcontractor Outreach Program, bidders must submit GFE documentation in a timely manner sufficient to achieve a minimum of 75 out of 100 GFE evaluation points as outlined in the Board's Outreach Program.

Park West Landscape, Inc., submitted the apparent lowest base bid as indicated above. Staff has reviewed the documentation provided by Park West Landscape, Inc., regarding its outreach effort, and based on the documents submitted, has determined that Park West Landscape, Inc., satisfied the subcontractor outreach requirement. Park West Landscape, Inc., achieved a score of 81 of the 100-point requirements outlined by the Boards outreach program thereby satisfying the 75-point minimum requirement and obtained an MBE/WBE participation of 12 percent. The outreach document is on file in the Board Office and a synopsis of said package is attached.

Because sufficient funds exist, it is recommended that this project be awarded with Additive Alternate No. 1 being exercised. As a result, the recommended award amount is \$1,122,465.

The City Attorney and staff have reviewed the bids submitted by Park West Landscape, Inc., and found them to be in order. Park West Landscape, Inc., is the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

In accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the proposed project. The Draft EIR was circulated for public and government agency review for 45 days, from February 28 to April 14, 2008, and written comments were received from two agencies: the Los Angeles Police Department and the Native American Heritage Commission (a state agency). Both these letters and staff responses to comments have been incorporated into the Final EIR, which is on file along with all other documents and material that constitute the administrative record at the offices of Department of Recreation and Parks' Planning and Development Division located at 1200 West 7th Street, Los Angeles.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, Department staff has determined that the project as proposed will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects by design and through the implementation of specific mitigation measures. A statement of Environmental Findings of Fact for each environmental effect based substantial evidence in the EIR and other documentation in the record has been prepared for certification, along with a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for adoption as part of the approval of the project.

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

PG. 5 NO. 08-167

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT:

There is no fiscal impact to the Department's General Fund at this time, as the project is fully funded by Proposition K funds. Assessments of the future operations and maintenance cost have yet to be determined.

This report was prepared by Marcelo Martinez, Project Manager, Bureau of Engineering, Recreational and Cultural Facilities Program. Reviewed by Neil Drucker, Program Manager, Bureau of Engineering, Recreational and Cultural Facilities Program; Deborah Weintraub, Chief Deputy City Engineer, Bureau of Engineering; and Michael A. Shull, Superintendent, Planning and Development Division, Department of Recreation and Parks.

GOOD FAITH EFFORT CHECKLIST- EVALUATION RESULTS

Bidder: Park West Landscaping, Inc.

Bid Date: 06/03/08

PROJECT: MACARTHUR PARK IMPROVEMENTS – CHILDREN’S PLAY AREA AND LIGHTING (W.O. #E170207F & E170473F)

Indicator	Required Documentation	Description of Submitted or Missing Documentation	Points	
1	The bidder’s or proposer’s efforts to obtain participation by MBEs, WBEs and other business enterprises could reasonably be expected by the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners (the “Board”) to produce a level of participation by interested sub-contractors, including 15% MBE and 2% WBE.		0	0
2 Pre-Bid Meeting	a) Attend pre-bid meeting and be listed on the attendance sheet; or b) Submit a letter prior to the pre-bid meeting either by fax to (213) 847-0703, or by mail to the Bureau of Engineering, Project Award and Control Division, 1149 S. Broadway, 1 st Floor, Los Angeles, Ca. 90015.	Did not attend Pre-bid Mtg. & letter of excuse for previous attendance w/in last 6 mos. is invalid.	10	0
3 Work Areas	Proof of this must be demonstrated in either Indicator 4 or 5.		13	13
4 Ad	A copy of the advertisement or a proof of publication statement or other verification which confirms the date the advertisement was published. The advertisement must be specific to the project, not generic, and may not be a planholder advertisement provided by the publication. It should include the City of Los Angeles project name, name of bidder, areas of work available for subcontracting, and a contact person’s name and telephone number, information on the availability of plans and specifications and the bidder’s policy concerning assistance to subcontractors in obtaining bonds, lines of credit and/or insurance. Consideration will be given to the wording of the advertisement to ensure that it did not exclude or seriously limit the number of potential respondents.	Did not submit proof of	9	0
5 Letters to Potential Subs	A copy of each letter sent to available MBEs, WBEs and OBEs for each item of work to be performed. If there is only one master notification, then a copy of the letter along with a listing of all recipients will suffice. Faxed copies must include the fax transmittal confirmation slip showing the date and time of transmission. Mailed letters must include copies of the metered envelope or certified mail receipts. Letters must contain areas of work to be subcontracted, City of Los Angeles project name, name of the bidder, and contact person’s name, address, and telephone number.		10	10
6 Follow-up to Letters	A copy of telephone logs. These logs must include the name of the company called, telephone number, contact person, who did the calling, time, date, and the result of the conversation. Bidder must follow-up with all subcontractors to whom they sent letters.		10	10
7 Plans	Include in Indicator 4 or 5, information detailing how, where and when the bidder will make the required information available to interested subcontractors.		5	5
8 Outreach Letters	A copy of each letter sent to outreach agencies requesting assistance in recruiting MBEs, WBEs and OBEs. Faxed copies must include the fax transmittal confirmation slip showing the date and time of transmission. Mailed letters must include copies of the metered envelopes or certified mail receipts. Letters must contain areas of work to be subcontracted, City of Los Angeles project name, name of the bidder, and contact person’s name, address, and telephone number.		10	10
9 Negotiate in Good Faith	a) Copies of all MBE/WBE/OBE bids or quotes received; and b) Summary sheet organized by work area, listing bids received and the subcontractor selected for that work area. If the bidder elects to perform a listed work area with its own forces, they must include a bid that shows their own costs for the work.		26	26
10 Bonds	Include in Indicator 4 or 5, information about the bidder’s efforts to assist with bonds, lines of credit and insurance.		7	7
TOTAL POINTS ACHIEVED			81	
MBE/WBE % ACHIEVED:			12%	

MBE= 12% WBE= 0% OBE= 31% PRIME= 57%

RESPONSIVE

EXHIBIT A

**Environmental Findings of Fact
on the
Environmental Impact Report for the
MacArthur Park Improvements Project**



City of Los Angeles
Department of Recreation and Parks
1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.928.9137

June 18, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Introduction 3
1.1 - Project Description 3
1.2 - Background and Project History 6
1.3 - Statutory and Regulatory Requirements 8
1.4 - Summary of Environmental Findings 9

Section 2: Finding Regarding Impacts that are Less Than Significant and, Therefore, do not Require Mitigation 11
2.1 - Noise 11
2.2 - Public Services and Recreation 12
2.3 - Cumulative Impacts 13
2.4 - Summary 17

Section 3: Finding Regarding Potentially Significant Effects that have been Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance with the Adoption of Mitigation Measures 18
3.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare 18
3.2 - Air Quality 19
3.3 - Biological Resources 21
3.4 - Cultural Resources 22
3.5 - Geology and Soils 22
3.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials 23
3.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality 24
3.8 - Transportation and Circulation 26
3.9 - Cumulative Impacts 27

Section 4: Finding Regarding Impacts not Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance 31

Section 5: Finding Regarding Growth Inducing, Unavoidable Adverse, and Irreversible Impacts 32
5.1 - Growth Inducing Impacts 32
5.2 - Unavoidable Adverse Impacts 33
5.3 - Irreversible Impacts 33

Section 6: Findings Regarding Alternatives to the Proposed Project 34
6.1 - No project – No Development Alternative 35
6.2 - Modified Soccer Field Improvements 36
6.3 - No Boathouse Improvements 36
6.4 - Environmentally Superior Alternative 37

Section 7: Statement of Overriding Considerations 39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Proposed Land Use for MacArthur Park Improvements Project 4
Table 2: Summary of Impacts of Alternatives (Compared to Proposed Project) 38

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This document contains the findings required under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code, § 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), specifically CEQA Guidelines § 15091, supporting the certification of the MacArthur Park Improvements Project and approval of the project by the City of Los Angeles (City), through the Recreation and Park Commissioners (Board).

1.1 - Project Description

The property is approximately 40 acres located in southern Los Angeles. The park site is within a highly urbanized area of central Los Angeles. MacArthur Park is located within the City's Westlake Community Plan Area and is bounded by West 6th Street on the north, South Alvarado Street on the east, West 7th Street on the south, and South Park View Street on the west. Wilshire Boulevard passes through the center of the park in an east-west direction, and the Metropolitan Transit Authority's Red Line runs beneath the park roughly paralleling Wilshire Boulevard.

The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks proposes to construct several improvements to existing facilities within MacArthur Park to improve public safety and to enhance the usability and durability of recreational features. The proposed project consists of the demolition of a maximum of 2,100 square feet of buildings or structures (i.e., boathouse), rehabilitation or reconstruction of 14,500 square feet of interior building space, approximately 500 cubic yards of grading, and construction of approximately 37,320 square feet of new turf area (maximum 1 acre) plus subsurface drainage improvements. The proposed land use for the MacArthur Park Improvements Project is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Proposed Land Use for MacArthur Park Improvements Project

Component	Size/Area	General Comments
Reconstruct Soccer Field	Approx. 37,320 SF	Install artificial turf for year-round use, longevity, and reduced maintenance costs.
Install New Field and Security Lighting	NA	Install state-of-the-art lighting for extended use and improve safety at dusk and nighttime – soccer field to have six new poles with a maximum height of 40 feet and the security lighting will have eight new poles with a maximum height of 30 feet.
Reconstruct Landscaping and Hardscape Areas	Approx. 20,000 SF	Relocate existing and/or install new landscaping, walkways, etc. to support reconstruction of the soccer field and improve security
Reconstruct existing and construct new Children's Play Areas	Approx. 2,710 SF	Reconstruct existing and construct new children's play areas, install equipment, and support facilities for children and parents (e.g., benches, etc.), including new exercise area near soccer field.
Renovate Signal Building	Approx. 14,500 SF	Make needed safety improvements while maintaining historical design elements
Replace Boat House	Approx. 2,100 SF	Make needed safety and user improvements while maintaining existing design elements
Install historical monument	NA	Install new historical monument to honor Oscar Romero, an El Salvadorian catholic priest
SF = square feet Source: Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2007.		

Soccer Field. One of the main improvements planned is the reconstruction of an existing soccer field to install artificial turf. The existing field is located northeast of Wilshire Boulevard between Wilshire and 6th Street. The field is currently a mixture of dirt and ragged turf which becomes unsafe and/or unplayable during and after rainstorms. City staff discussed at length whether this field should have natural or artificial turf. The City ultimately decided to install artificial turf to allow for year-round use, especially after periods of rain, improved longevity of the playing surface and surrounding areas, prevent erosion, and minimize long-term maintenance costs. The City may also use this installation to determine if other City fields could or should be reconstructed with artificial turf in the future.

Field Maintenance. The City will install fencing and lock the field to prohibit unauthorized use when the park is closed. The City will also prohibit pets, food, or drinks other than water on the synthetic turf. The City will install hose couplers around the field so it can be sprayed during times when temperatures are high to reduce the on-field temperature. The couplers will also allow the field to be washed if drinks other than water or bio-wastes (i.e., blood, vomit) are accidentally deposited on the field. To minimize these problems, the City will prohibit the consumption of beverages other than water on the field to minimize the need for regular washing or grooming. Spraying or washing the field will flush any potential waste materials into the subsurface drainage system or adjacent turf

areas. On occasion, the field will also have to be “groomed” to maintain the surface and artificial “turf” character of the field.

Field and Security Lighting. To effectively light the renovated soccer field, the City proposes to install up to six (6) light poles with a maximum height of 40 feet. The lighting will provide extended use and improve safety at dusk and nighttime, but would be installed and maintained to minimize glare and light spillover outside of the park. These light standards would be approximately the same height as many of the older palm trees in the park. To improve nighttime security and use, the City will also install up to eight (8) new security lighting fixtures on poles up to 30 feet in height at various locations in the park. The sports field and security lighting will be state of the art and tunable to reduce glare and spillover of light offsite.

Landscaping and Hardscape Areas. MacArthur Park is a horticultural park designated by the City in 1972 as Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monument #100. Some of the existing landscaping may need to be relocated or removed to allow for reconstruction of the soccer field area. These improvements may include the installation of new landscaping depending on the size and health of the various planting materials that currently surround the field. This work also includes reconstructing 450 linear square feet of cracked or damaged walkways and installing 690 lineal feet and 400 lineal feet of new walkways, curbs, fencing, lighting, posts, edge treatments, etc., to support reconstruction of the soccer field and improve overall security for the park.

Children’s Play Area. The project involves the construction of new and reconstruction of existing children’s play areas located northwest of the soccer field. These areas would include equipment and related improvements on 2,710 square feet planned for children of ages 4 to 12 years. These improvements will provide an additional safe and entertaining area for children to play as well as an adult exercise area near the soccer field. Related improvements include construction of new or improved walkways for pedestrian and stroller access, plus the addition of benches adjacent to the play area for parents to sit and enjoy watching their children play.

Signal Building. This historic building was constructed in 1924 and is in need of physical, mechanical, and electrical upgrades due to age and wear of the building over the years. It is the oldest structure in the park. The improvements will be planned and installed to eliminate or minimize exterior or visual changes to the architectural and/or historical aspects of the building (e.g., Mediterranean style roof, walls, etc.). These improvements will involve approximately 14,500 square feet of interior space and be consistent with the Department of Interior’s guidelines for renovation of historic structures.

Boathouse. The boathouse is on the east side of the lake just south of Wilshire Boulevard. The current facility was constructed in 1973 and currently has extensive physical, mechanical, and electrical dilapidation. The boathouse is not considered an historic structure per se (i.e., it is only

34 years old), so the City eventually replace the boathouse with a structure of similar size (approximately 2,100 square feet) and appearance, although no plans have been developed as yet.

Historic Monument. The City will install a new historic monument to honor Oscar Romero, a Catholic priest killed in 1980. The size and location of the monument has not yet been finalized.

NOTE: The planned improvements to the park under this proposed project **do not include the Band Shell Building**. Proposed improvements to the band shell were already examined in a Negative Declaration that was approved by the City in January 2007. However, this EIR will examine the cumulative impacts of those planned improvements as well.

1.2 - Background and Project History

1.2.1 - Background

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15051, the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks is lead agency for the MacArthur Park Improvements Project, as the public agency with primary land use authority over the proposed project. The City determined that the project may have significant impacts on the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared. The City issued a *Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report* on August 9, 2007, inviting comments from responsible agencies, other regulatory agencies, organizations and individuals pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15082. In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the City received written comments which assisted the City in identifying the issues and alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR. The City also held a scoping meeting at MacArthur Park Community Center on August 27, 2007 to inform the public and interested agencies about the project and to solicit public comments on the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2007121152) to analyze the project's potential adverse environmental impacts. Upon completion of the Draft EIR dated February 28, 2007, the City initiated a 45-day public comment period from February 28 to April 14, 2008, by filing a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Clearinghouse for the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and publishing a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) in a newspaper of general circulation within the City's jurisdiction (CEQA Guidelines § 15087).

Copies of the DEIR were distributed to state agencies through the State Clearinghouse. The NOA was sent to public agencies, organizations, and individuals and indicated where copies of the DEIR could be obtained, or where they were available for review. The City made copies of the DEIR available for local review at the MacArthur Park Community Center, 2230 West 6th Street, Los Angeles, California 90017; Filipe de Neve Branch Library, 2820 W. 6th Street, Los Angeles, California 90057; Pico Union Branch Library, 1030 S. Alvarado Street, Los Angeles, California 90006; and City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, at 1200 W. 7th Street,

Los Angeles, California 90017. The DEIR is also available for review on the internet at the following web address: <http://www.laparks.org/environmental/environmental.htm>.

The City provided written response to comments received from the commenting agencies/individuals pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21092.5. The response to comments includes the verbatim comments received on the DEIR, a list of those commenting, and the City's response to the significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process. The Final EIR (FEIR) for the project consists of the DEIR (incorporated by reference), the response to comments, mitigation monitoring report program (MMRP), and changes to the DEIR which clarify, supplement, or update the information provided in the EIR. None of the changes or supplemental information in the FEIR constitute significant new information as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15508.5. Therefore, CEQA does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

The FEIR includes the DEIR, Response to Comments (RTC), and MMRP.

1.2.2 - Project History

The proposed improvements will take place entirely within MacArthur Park, a large urban public park constructed and enhanced over a period of time beginning in the 1880s. Prior to creation of the park, this site was swampland that was interspersed with alkali hummock, and filled with debris. The park was originally named Westlake Park, and consisted of a lake, a boathouse, and a surrounding carriageway. A band shell was added in 1896, and the park entertained a steady stream of visitors via two streetcar lines that terminated at the park. The Sunday Afternoon Concert Series became quite famous and helped turn the park into a cultural and historic landmark. The park area itself was surrounded by fashionable residential areas. Wilshire Boulevard was extended through the park in the 1930s, which induced urban growth to go westward in the City, and this contributed to the decline of the Park. The park was renamed in 1942, in honor of General Douglas MacArthur, commander of U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific during World War II.

The park and the lake have been used for recreational activities for over a century. Over the years, a wide variety of recreational facilities have been developed in the park, including the boathouse (replaced in 1973), children's playground facilities, ball fields, a band shell (replaced in 1957), a monument to Cardinal Jozsef Mindszenty, trees, benches, grassy areas, and other amenities.

The original band shell built in 1896 was eventually removed and the present structure was built in 1957. The building is a stucco finished frame structure with a vaulted roof performance area. The front of the band shell features a laminated wooden parabolic arch, which is the structure's principal design feature. Benches are arranged in front of the stage area, and concrete walkways access the audience area. The lawn areas extending outward from the front of the band shell slope upward, creating an amphitheater-like effect to the area. Proposed improvements to the band shell have already been examined in a previous Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/MND) dated January 2007.

Construction of a temporary boathouse was completed in 1890, but was replaced with a new structure in 1915. This boathouse fell into disrepair and was demolished in 1969 and replaced with the present structure in 1973.

In 1924, the Fire Alarm Signal Station Building (the Signal Building) was erected in the Park along 6th Street. This stately Mediterranean style building is the oldest existing structure in the park and has considerable historic value. This building housed fire department communications equipment that received signals from fire alarm boxes located throughout the community, and dispatchers directed the closest fire companies to respond to fires. The Signal Building was also used for fire department training and housed fire-fighting vehicles on the ground floor. During World War II, this building was used by the military as an aerial observation post and air raid warning station.

Over the years, the surrounding neighborhoods have changed significantly, and the park has seen numerous alterations. Efforts at rejuvenating the park have been implemented over the years, including the installation of significant public art in the 1980s (i.e., murals on the band shell, etc).

1.3 - Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

These Findings are based upon the information in the record of proceedings, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR, staff reports, project applicant's materials, MMRP, and the testimony presented at public hearings.

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines precludes the City from approving or carrying out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies any significant environmental effects unless the City makes one or more of the following written finding(s) for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact as identified in the EIR; or
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of a public agency other than the City, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or
3. Specific economic, social, legal, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

Sections 15092 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines require that if the project will cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts, the City must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to approving the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that any significant adverse project effects are acceptable if expected project benefits outweigh unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

1.4 - Summary of Environmental Findings

As set forth in more detail below, the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners (“the Board”) has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision to approve the proposed project. All of the findings made by the Board are based upon its consideration of the FEIR and the substantial evidence within the record as a whole.

Each of these environmental issues is described in Section 2 of this document. Environmental impacts identified in the EIR which the Board finds are less than significant and do not require mitigation are as follows:

- Noise;
- Public Services and Recreation; and
- Cumulative Impacts

Each of these environmental issues is described in Section 3 of this document. Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as potentially significant, but which the Board finds can be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions identified in the EIR and set forth herein are as follows:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- Air Quality;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality; and
- Transportation and Circulation.

Section 4 of this document described each environmental impacts identified in the FEIR as potentially significant but which the Board finds cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level despite the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures. However, each of the potentially significant impacts related to the MacArthur Park Improvements Project are mitigated down to a less than significant impact level.

Environmental impacts identified in the FEIR as growth-inducing, unavoidable adverse, and irreversible are described in Section 5 of this document.

Alternatives to the proposed project that might eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts are described in Section 6 of this document.

Public Resources Code § 21081.6 requires the City to prepare and adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for any project for which mitigation measures have been imposed to assure compliance with the adopted mitigation measures. Prior to taking action to approve the project, the Board was presented with, heard, reviewed, and considered all of the information and data in the

administrative record, including, but not limited to, the FEIR and all oral and written testimony presented to it during meetings and hearings. The EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the project and its related actions. No comments made in the public hearings conducted by the Board or any additional information submitted to the City have produced any substantial new information requiring recirculation or additional environmental review of the EIR under CEQA because no new significant environmental impacts were identified, no substantial increase in the severity of any environmental impacts would occur and no feasible mitigation measures, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, were rejected.

SECTION 2: FINDING REGARDING IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AND, THEREFORE, DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION

The Board finds that the following environmental impacts identified in the EIR are less than significant, and as a result, mitigation is not required under CEQA.

2.1 - Noise

Maximum construction noise levels are estimated to be approximately 62 dB at the nearest residences (i.e., north of W. Sixth Street, west of S. Park View Street, and south of W. 7th Street “behind” the commercial uses fronting on the perimeter streets around the park. Actual maximum noise levels are expected to be lower than this because construction activities will be located on other portions of the site much of the time, and actual construction noise would be attenuated by existing walls, buildings, elevation differences, and the distance to the actual construction area on the Project site. Grading and site preparation of the soccer field are expected to take approximately 2-4 weeks, followed immediately by installation of the artificial turf and associated improvements. The soccer field is actually located more than a quarter mile from neighboring residential uses, so the evaluation of noise impacts from this activity will constitute “worst-case” conditions for this Project since it has the greatest potential for using loud equipment (e.g., bulldozers, etc.) out of doors. Impacts in this case are expected to be less than significant.

Extensive earthwork is not proposed for this project, and no blasting or large ripping activities are required. Based on construction and operation of similar projects, vibration is not expected to even approach a 0.3-peak particle velocity (PPV) threshold during construction and 0.5-PPV threshold during operations. Therefore, construction-related vibration from the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

The Boathouse Building would occasionally require the use of delivery trucks that may create vibration. For the purposes of evaluating operational vibration, a threshold of 0.02 inch per second or 86 VdB (dB re: 1 micro-inch per second) was used as the significance level for ongoing, operation-related impacts—the suggested threshold provided in the *Caltans Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual*.

The nearest offsite sensitive receptor to the Proposed Project would be residential neighborhoods to the north, west, and south of the Project site. These residences are approximately 1,320 feet from the site at their closest points. A large bulldozer, which would be comparable to a tractor-trailer, generates 87 VdB at 25 feet. Since the closest residences would be over 40 times that distance from the nearest truck path, operational vibration from truck movements on the project site would not be expected to be felt by area residents. Therefore, no offsite vibration impacts are anticipated.

2.2 - Public Services and Recreation

Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Station 11 is located two blocks from MacArthur Park and would have an estimated response time well under the 5-minute standard established by the LAFD as outlined in the City of Los Angeles General Plan. In addition, there is at least one other LAFD station that would have a response time of under 5 minutes to the park site. Development of the Proposed Project would result in an incremental increased demand for fire protection services for additional park facilities, resulting in the need for additional fire protection facilities and personnel to cover the Proposed Project improvements. Therefore, all buildings/structures on the park site will be constructed in accordance with the City's development standards and requirements outlined in Chapter 15.11, Building Safety Enhancement Area Building Standards, of the Los Angeles Development Code. Additionally, Mitigation Measure HAZ-7 will assure that there will be adequate water for fire-fighting purposes for the planned improvements on the park site. No additional measures are needed.

The proposed project would result in an incremental increase in demand for police protection through increased calls for service and patrols. However, it is not possible at this time to estimate the specific amount of increased use the park will receive as a result of these improvements. Renovation of the Boathouse and Signal buildings will not substantially increase their capacity or ability to house new programs or services that would increase patronage of the park. Likewise, renovation of the soccer field will only provide a more usable and lower maintenance playing surface, although the lighting will extend the hours the field can be used, especially during the winter months.

The park and park users have experienced vandalism, graffiti, theft, violent crimes, and homeless people over the years, although recent efforts by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) have substantially reduced these incidents. One of the objectives of this project is to improve visibility and safety within the park, especially at night, which would help reduce the potential for these incidents in the future.

There are no records available of criminal or related activities involving the soccer field, so it is unknown what if any the addition of artificial turf and lighting will have in this regard. However, one of the objectives of the project is to improve visibility and safety within the park, especially at night, so it is possible the planned improvements could reduce such incidents to the extent they now occur in this portion of the park. In addition, it is also speculative as to the impact of the proposed improvements on homeless people using the park. The planned building renovations will not alter the overall appearance or design of the Signal building, so the project will not have a significant effect in this regard.

Based on current staffing and service levels, it is not likely the Proposed Project will result in a substantial increase in the calls for service or the need for additional sworn officers. The proposed

project would not substantially increase the demand for police protection or the need for additional police facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any significant public service impacts.

The Proposed Project is intended to improve the usability of the park, to provide additional recreational opportunities, and flexibility in building space. It will also improve security and visibility in the park, especially at night. Renovation will extend the use of the soccer field, especially with the addition of lights.

The analysis of park impacts includes the evaluation of synthetic versus natural turf for the planned soccer field renovation. City Park staff decided on an artificial surface with lighting to provide for the most practical extended use while minimizing long-term maintenance costs. This installation will also provide the City with valuable data on the applicability or desirability of artificial surfaces for City parks in the future. Park users and the public may have varying points of view regarding its desirability, but the analyses provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.10 of the DEIR demonstrate that installation of an artificial surface on this soccer field will not create significant environmental impacts. The project will not displace any existing recreational facilities and will not generate greater use or expansion of existing parks. The impacts to recreation would be less than significant.

2.3 - Cumulative Impacts

2.3.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources includes views of the Los Angeles Basin and the San Gabriel Mountains to the north on clear days. The park offers pleasant views of open space (grass, fields, the lake) in an otherwise highly urbanized setting. The Westlake area of the City is largely built out with developed multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses. Therefore, the planned park improvements will not contribute to cumulative aesthetic impacts relative to views or glare. The project will incrementally contribute to increased lighting at night by installing light standards for the renovated soccer field. These will slightly increase nighttime lighting levels, but light levels along this portion of the Wilshire Corridor are already moderate to high due to its urban setting. The design of the planned lighting, plus implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, will make it so the Proposed Project does not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable lighting impacts.

2.3.2 - Agricultural and Mineral Resources

The site does not contain significant agricultural or mineral resources, so construction of the planned park improvements will not make significant contributions to any cumulatively considerable impacts regarding long-term loss of these resources from the Los Angeles Basin.

2.3.3 - Air Quality

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to air quality includes the South Coast Air Basin, which is identical to the boundaries of the South Coast Air Quality Management District

(SCAQMD). The air basin covers the counties of Orange, Los Angeles, Imperial, and Ventura, Riverside, and Los Angeles, which includes the City of Los Angeles. Due to the poor air quality and level of planned growth, the City's General Plan EIR found that buildout of the City would have cumulatively considerable air quality impacts. The analysis of air quality impacts in Section 4.2 of this DEIR concluded that the project would not make significant contributions to this cumulative impact either over the short term (i.e., during construction) or over the long term (i.e., during use of the renovated park improvements). Air quality impacts were considered to be less than significant on a project level, and will not make significant contributions to cumulatively considerable air quality impacts over the long term.

2.3.4 - Biological Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to biological resources includes the Westlake Community Plan area and this western portion of the City. The project area is highly urbanized with no natural drainage channels and no significant areas of vacant or undisturbed land. MacArthur Park represents the largest "open" land in the area, and it is a developed urban park. The park contains no significant biological resources (in terms of listed or sensitive species) although it does contain extensive turf and landscaped planter areas that do support some amount of wildlife tolerant of human activity (e.g., songbirds, waterfowl, small mammals). Planned growth in this area will, therefore, not have cumulatively considerable impacts on biological resources, and the improvements associated with the Proposed Project will not make any significant contribution to this impact.

2.3.5 - Cultural Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to cultural resources includes the entire City as outlined in the Los Angeles General Plan. The project vicinity represents an area with prehistoric settlement by several Native American groups prior to Spanish and Mexican settlement, and then American settlement during the mid-nineteenth century. The project area is highly urbanized and has been extensively disturbed to a considerable depth, both by creation of the park as well as by development of the surrounding private land. Planned growth in this area is not expected to impact archaeological or paleontological resources due to previous disturbance. MacArthur Park does contain a number of historic resources, as does the Westlake community in general (e.g., residence and business buildings in excess of 50 years in age). The planned improvements, with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, will not create significant impacts to historical resources. Similarly, development within the surrounding area must comply with the City's extensive procedures regarding documentation and development sensitive to historic resources. With implementation of these City procedures, future growth will not have cumulatively considerable impacts relative to cultural resources.

2.3.6 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity includes this portion of Los Angeles County due to the presence of numerous regional faults, including the well

known San Andreas Fault. Future growth will introduce additional residences, businesses, residents, and workers into this area and all of these will be subject to moderate to severe ground shaking in a major seismic event. This regional impact is considered cumulatively considerable due to its potential severity and the number of people and structures it could affect. However, this potential impact can be reduced to less than significant levels by the implementation of applicable building design and construction methods. The improvements of the Proposed Project that involve structures will comply with applicable seismic codes and building standards. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable impacts relative to geology, soils, and seismicity.

2.3.7 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan and the City as a whole. Future growth will incrementally increase the amount of hazardous materials utilized in this area (i.e., stored, transported, or handled). The area is highly urbanized and does not face major threats from flooding, aircraft accidents, wildfires, etc. As long as new development complies with applicable regulations regarding hazardous materials, there should be no cumulatively considerable impacts from growth in this regard. Similarly, construction of the planned park improvements will not make significant contributions to risks or hazards to the surrounding community, including hazardous materials, because of the type of improvements planned.

2.3.8 - Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan, as well as the City as a whole. MacArthur Park contains a man-made lake that is lined with concrete. The lake and the park have no natural drainage channels, inlets, or outlets. Additional development, both within the City and the community plan area, will result in additional excavation activities, new buildings, and further intensification of land use, which could potentially impact hydrology and water quality in the area. Construction of the planned park improvements according to the proposed mitigation measures will not make significant contributions to regional impacts related to flooding or water quality. With the design of the project and recommended mitigation measures, the water-related impacts will be less than significant and thus the project will not have a cumulatively considerable impact regarding hydrology and water quality.

2.3.9 - Land Use

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to land use includes the Westlake Community Plan area. The park is designated as Open Space, and the proposed improvements are consistent with that designation. The DEIR concluded that the Project would not have any adverse land use impacts. The Westlake area is largely built out and no substantial new development is planned, although growth projections show slow, steady growth, especially in average household sizes, through 2010.

However, since the Proposed Project has no land use impacts, it will not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable land use impacts.

2.3.10 - Noise

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative noise impacts encompasses the ambient noise environment around the park site, as well as surrounding roadways in the Westlake Community Plan area. The Proposed Project is not expected to create a significant increase in either short-term or long-term traffic volumes on surrounding streets or freeways. In addition, planned improvements of the Project will not generate significant additional noise over existing levels, since the areas planned for improvement are already being used (e.g., Signal Building, boathouse, soccer field). Park uses are relatively quiet, and the park is in a highly urbanized setting, so the planned improvements will not make a significant contribution to any cumulatively considerable noise impacts from future growth in the surrounding area.

2.3.11 - Population and Housing

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to population and housing encompasses the City of Los Angeles and Southern California within the jurisdiction of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Since the Proposed Project will not add any housing or businesses to the City, it will not cause any increases in population or housing. Therefore, the Project cannot make any significant contributions to cumulatively considerable impacts from regional growth relative to population or housing projections.

2.3.12 - Public Services

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to public services and recreation includes the entire City of Los Angeles. Construction of the proposed park improvements would incrementally increase the need for police and fire services, and would produce beneficial impacts on recreation by adding facilities and rehabilitating existing facilities at MacArthur Park. The park has a police sub-station and a City fire station is located two blocks east of the park. The site has good to excellent access for emergency vehicles due to the surrounding roadways, multiple access points, and many paths and maintenance roads on the site. For these reasons, the Proposed Project will not make a significant contribution to any cumulatively considerable impacts relative to public services.

2.3.13 - Traffic and Circulation

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to transportation includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan, and the City as a whole. The DEIR estimated the Project would only generate an incremental amount of traffic, on the order of 50 additional vehicle trips per day, and most additional users of the park would probably access it via public transportation, walking, or by bicycle. Since the Proposed Project would not generate significant amounts of traffic, it will not make a significant contribution to any cumulatively considerable impacts relative to traffic or circulation.

2.3.14 - Utility Systems

The Proposed Project will tie into existing City utility systems, and the planned improvements are not anticipated to consume significant amounts of water, electricity, or natural gas, or generate significant amounts of wastewater or solid waste. The City will follow its own guidelines regarding water and energy conservation when implementing this project. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not make significant contributions to cumulatively considerable impacts on utility systems that may occur with growth.

2.4 - Summary

Regional growth may eventually result in a number of cumulatively considerable impacts, including traffic, air quality, water consumption, water quality, and energy consumption. However, the Proposed Project will not make significant contribution to any of these cumulatively considerable impacts either during construction or from use of the planned improvements.

SECTION 3: FINDING REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITH THE ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The Board finds that the following environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR are potentially significant but can be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions identified in the Final EIR and summarized below.

3.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

3.1.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

The Proposed Project has the potential to create significant visual impacts if the improvements are incompatible with the appearance of historic structures or landscaping within the park site. In addition, the lighting to the soccer field, and other improvements to buildings on the site, has the potential to create significant impacts related to light and glare.

3.1.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures AES-1 through AES-7, the project's impacts to aesthetics, light, and glare are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- AES-1** Prior to construction of new facilities, City park staff shall coordinate the design of the improvements to the Signal Building with City Cultural Heritage Commission to comply with the Department of the Interior's guidelines for historic buildings, including any additional square footage, exterior improvements, etc.
- AES-2** Prior to construction of new facilities, City park staff shall coordinate the design of the improvements to the Boathouse Building with City Cultural Heritage Commission to be generally consistent with the Department of the Interior's guidelines for historic buildings, as appropriate, including any additional square footage, exterior improvements, etc.
- AES-3** Prior to removal of any mature landscaping (i.e., plants over 10 feet tall or more than 20 years of age), City park staff will identify specific plants or planted areas to be removed or reconstructed as part of this project. City park staff shall coordinate the

removal or relocation of mature landscaping with City Office of Historic Resources (OHR) staff prior to the start of construction. The goal of this measure is to minimize the removal of historic landscaping in the park, to relocate rather than replace, to the extent practical. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Parks Director in consultation with the City OHR Director and their staffs. Where practical, the historical landscaping preservation guidelines of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) shall be applied to this project.

AES-4 New field lighting poles and fixtures installed around the soccer field shall be painted forest green or equivalent to minimize visual intrusion of views toward the field.

AES-5 Prior to installation of the lighting system, City park staff will work with the selected lighting consultant to adjust the lighting “footprint” to minimize horizontal spillover of light off the park site, and prevent “hot spot” glare on surrounding properties. If hot spot areas are identified by the lighting plan, City park staff will plan the installation of additional trees to help shield or block this glare onto surrounding properties. The plan shall include detailed information regarding lighting levels by the use of photometrics to indicate the maximum, minimum, and average foot-candle lighting level proposed for this project. The plan shall also identify the number and type of light fixtures and pole heights. The lighting plan shall also demonstrate how the lighting system will comply with City lighting standards.

AES-6 City park staff shall develop a lighting plan with light fixtures that direct lighting downward lighting with minimal horizontal travel and minimum levels to provide sufficient safety at night. Use of soccer field lighting shall be limited to scheduled events and times and the schedules posted on the City parks website on a regular basis so the public can be aware of planned times of use.

AES-7 Prior to construction of the planned improvements to the Signal and Boathouse buildings, City park staff will review the improvement plans to assure there are no metallic or reflective surfaces in exterior locations that could cause significant glare onto offsite properties.

3.2 - Air Quality

3.2.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact air quality and existing emissions of greenhouse gases. In addition the proposed project has the potential to adversely impact PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} levels, and may exceed SCAQMD localized daily thresholds. Other potentially significant impact can occur over the short-term duration of the proposed project (i.e., during construction).

3.2.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures AIR-1 through AIR-10, the project's impacts to air quality criteria polluting and green house gas emissions are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- AIR-1** During construction of the proposed improvements, the City shall utilize best management practices to control dust during construction, and shall include:
- Application of water on disturbed soils a minimum of two times per day;
 - Using track-out prevention devices at construction site access points;
 - Stabilizing construction area exit points (i.e., if vehicles travel offsite);
 - Reducing speed on unpaved roads to less than 15 miles per hour (mph);
 - A maximum of 5 acres per day shall be actively graded;
 - Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas;
 - Covering haul vehicles that travel offsite; and
 - Replanting disturbed areas as soon as practical and other measures, as deemed appropriate for the site, to control fugitive dust.
- AIR-2** If construction activities will limit traffic or access along adjacent streets, the City shall prepare a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP), which will be reviewed and approved by the City Transportation Department. The CTCP will describe in detail safe detours around Project construction sites and provide temporary traffic control (i.e., flag person) during construction-related, truck-hauling activities, if needed.
- AIR-3** During construction of the proposed improvements, construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location and includes proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and equipment design specification data sheets shall be kept onsite during construction.
- AIR-4** During construction of the proposed improvements, all contractors will be advised not to idle construction equipment on the site for more than 5 minutes.

- AIR-5** During construction of the proposed improvements, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators.
- AIR-6** The City shall install energy efficient lighting with electronic timing controls to limit unnecessary lighting. These controls may include keyed or remote control to allow the lights to be turned off when the soccer field is not being used.
- AIR-7** During construction, the City shall reuse or recycle construction waste where feasible and shall reuse or recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the waste.
- AIR-8** The City shall plant drought tolerant trees where practical to replace trees that are removed as part of the Project.
- AIR-9** The City shall install irrigation control devices to prevent watering of non-plant surfaces and to control the quantity of water used. The irrigation system shall be maintained and inspected at least once per year to make sure that system devices are working properly and watering appropriate areas.
- AIR-10** The City shall apply the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System for Existing Buildings: Operations & Maintenance Rating System requirements to the building(s) to be renovated as long as they do not conflict with the City's applicable historical preservation requirements.

3.3 - Biological Resources

3.3.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact nesting birds.

3.3.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1, the project's impacts to biological resources are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- BIO-1** If the removal or relocation of any trees or bushes over 8 feet in height is required during the breeding season for birds (February to August), City staff will verify the trees or bushes do not contain active nests prior to any work on the affected trees or

bushes. If any active nests are found, an ornithologist or equivalent professional will be retained to monitor the nest and work may commence after any juveniles have fledged.

3.4 - Cultural Resources

3.4.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact the loss of historic attributes.

3.4.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, the project's impacts to cultural resources are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.4.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- CUL-1** **Signal Building.** The long-span, open spandrel reinforced concrete arches visible on the ground and intermediate levels are important features of the building's design and shall remain exposed.
- CUL-2** **Signal Building.** Perimeter walls and ceilings of the ground and intermediate levels are generally painted concrete. This type of concrete work is typical of the Signal Building's period of construction shall remain exposed.
- CUL-3** **Signal Building.** The original paneled wooden doors with brass-finished locksets are located on various levels and in the maintenance yard shall be retained. All windows shall remain in their original condition or their appearance maintained throughout the structure.

3.5 - Geology and Soils

3.5.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Because the project is located in a seismically active region, the impacts in regard to geology and soil are considered potentially significant. California has stringent permitting and building design standards designed to minimize the adverse impacts in the event of an earthquake.

3.5.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1, the project's impacts to Geology and Soils are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.5.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

GEO-1 Prior to construction of new building foundations or reconstruction of existing foundations, the City shall have a detailed geotechnical foundation study prepared by qualified personnel that identify specific foundation designs based on expected onsite geotechnical constraints. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Building Department in consultation with the County Geologist or qualified geotechnical personnel retained by the City.

3.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

3.6.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Development of the MacArthur Park Improvements Project may involve a number of impacts associated with hazardous materials.

3.6.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, the project's impacts to hazards and hazardous materials are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.6.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the FEIR:

HAZ-1 Prior to the commencement of renovation activities at the Signal Building, City staff will verify that ongoing activities involving small amounts of hazardous materials generated by police activities, including any underground storage tanks, will not be adversely affected by planned renovations. Any work involving underground storage tanks will be planned and coordinated with appropriate local and state agencies. A letter report will be sent to the Board prior to the start of any work at this facility if it involves hazardous materials or an underground storage tank.

HAZ-2 Prior to the start of any demolition or reconstruction work within the Signal Building or Boathouse Building, the City shall conduct a detailed survey of existing walls,

ceilings, etc. to identify any specific areas or materials that have asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead based paint (LBP). Any ACMs or LBP identified in the areas to be reconstructed shall be removed by a licensed contractor and the materials disposed of in a licensed facility, consistent with state law and City practice. Any areas found to contain ACMs or LBP shall be isolated from existing uses or users to preclude any risks to public health, consistent with federal or state law and City practice.

- HAZ-3** Prior to completion of the soccer field reconstruction, the LAFD will verify that the existing number and location of hydrants are sufficient to protect the new structure. If this level of protection cannot be verified, City park personnel will extend an existing hydrant line and install an additional hydrant or hydrants near the soccer facility to assure it is adequately protected in the event of a fire in this portion of the park.

3.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality

3.7.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact water quality impacts. Mitigation is required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to offset any impacts to waters of the United States and to jurisdictional streambeds.

3.7.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures HYD-1 through HYD-2, the project's impacts to hydrology and water quality are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.7.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- HYD-1** Prior to the start of grading for the soccer field project, the City Parks staff shall determine if the affected area exceeds 1 acre. If the project area exceeds 1 acre, the City shall prepare and submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and grading plan to the RWQCB for review and comment prior to the start of grading. Even if a SWPPP is not required, the City will implement appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater runoff and associated pollution from construction sources. These BMPs shall identify a practical sequence for site

restoration, BMP implementation, contingency measures, responsible parties, and agency contacts. The City Parks staff shall include conditions in construction contracts requiring the plans to be implemented and shall have the ability to enforce the requirement through fines and other penalties. The plans shall incorporate control measures in the following categories:

- Soil stabilization practices;
- Dewatering practices (if necessary);
- Sediment and runoff control practices;
- Monitoring protocols; and
- Waste management and disposal control practices.

Once comments from the RWQCB have been reviewed by the City, the City's contractor(s) shall be responsible throughout the duration of the project for installing, constructing, inspecting, and maintaining the control measures included in the SWPPP, grading plan, and related improvement plans.

HYD-2

Whether or not the City is required to prepare a SWPPP for this project, it shall identify pollutant sources that could affect the quality of stormwater discharges from the construction site and implement appropriate BMPs. The BMPs shall effectively treat target pollutants in stormwater discharges anticipated from project construction sites. To protect receiving water quality, BMPs shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Temporary erosion control measures (such as fiber rolls, staked straw bales, detention basins, temporary inlet protection, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover) shall be employed for disturbed areas.
- No disturbed surfaces will be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.
- Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures, especially in those areas that might drain into the lake.
- The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.
- BMPs performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (i.e., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant

reduction or elimination, (inadvertent petroleum release) is required to determine adequacy of the measure.

- Native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance.

3.8 - Transportation and Circulation

3.8.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Staging operations of the proposed project may have the potential to obstruct onsite and possibly offsite roadways and parking lots.

3.8.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1, the project's impacts to transportation and circulation are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.8.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

- TRANS-1** Prior to the commencement of construction of the soccer field, the City Park staff shall prepare a Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan to minimize impacts on surrounding streets and parking areas. All construction contracts shall include a clause requiring compliance with the Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan and the developer shall be able to enforce the provisions of the plan through penalties, up to and including, termination of the contract. The plan shall include the following provisions:
- Construction truck traffic shall be limited to designated routes and construction truck traffic shall be prohibited on all other roadways, unless compelling circumstances warrant such movements (e.g., a major traffic accident).
 - Signage shall be installed at construction truck ingress and egress points alerting motorists to such movements.
 - Soil, debris, or other loose materials shall be covered with tarps or other restraining material during haul movements on roadways
 - On-site and off-site construction staging and parking locations shall be identified, as well as any necessary shuttle service needed to transport workers

from off-site locations. For safety reasons, off-site staging or parking shall be arranged as close as practical to the park site if it cannot be arranged onsite.

- A pre-construction conference shall be held advising all construction contractors of the requirements of the Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan.

3.9 - Cumulative Impacts

3.9.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources includes views of the Los Angeles Basin and the San Gabriel Mountains to the north on clear days. The park offers pleasant views of open space (grass, fields, the lake) in an otherwise highly urbanized setting. The Westlake area of the City is largely built out with developed multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses. Therefore, the planned park improvements will not contribute to cumulative aesthetic impacts relative to views or glare. The project will incrementally contribute to increased lighting at night by installing light standards for the renovated soccer field. These will slightly increase nighttime lighting levels, but light levels along this portion of the Wilshire Corridor are already moderate to high due to its urban setting. The design of the planned lighting, plus implementation of the mitigation measures MM AES 2a-d and MM AES 4a-c, will make it so the Proposed Project does not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable lighting impacts.

Air Quality

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to air quality includes the South Coast Air Basin, which is identical to the boundaries of the SCAQMD. The air basin covers the counties of Orange, Los Angeles, Imperial, and Ventura, Riverside, and Los Angeles, which includes the City of Los Angeles. Due to the poor air quality and level of planned growth, the City's General Plan EIR found that buildout of the City would have cumulatively considerable air quality impacts. The analysis of air quality impacts in Section 4.2 of this DEIR concluded that the project would not make significant contributions to this cumulative impact either over the short-term (i.e., during construction) over the long-term (i.e., during use of the renovated park improvements). Air quality impacts were considered to be less than significant on a project level with mitigation measures MM AIR 1a-e and MM AIR 9a-e, and will not make significant contributions to cumulatively considerable air quality impacts over the long-term.

Biological Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to biological resources includes the Westlake Community Plan area and this western portion of the City. The project area is highly urbanized with no natural drainage channels and no significant areas of vacant or undisturbed land. MacArthur Park

represents the largest “open” land in the area, and it is a developed urban park. The park contains no significant biological resources (in terms of listed or sensitive species) although it does contain extensive turf and landscaped planter areas that do support some amount of wildlife tolerant of human activity (e.g., songbirds, waterfowl, small mammals). However, with mitigation measure MM BIO-1 and planned growth in this area will therefore not have cumulatively considerable impacts on biological resources, and the improvements associated with the Proposed Project will not make any significant contribution to this impact.

Cultural Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to cultural resources includes the entire City as outlined in the Los Angeles General Plan. The project vicinity represents an area with prehistoric settlement by several Native American groups prior to Spanish and Mexican settlement, and then American settlement during the mid-nineteenth century. The project area is highly urbanized and has been extensively disturbed to a considerable depth, both by creation of the park as well as by development of the surrounding private land. Planned growth in this area is not expected to impact archaeological or paleontological resources due to previous disturbance. MacArthur Park does contain a number of historic resources, as does the Westlake community in general (e.g., residence and business buildings in excess of 50 years in age). The planned improvements, with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, will not create significant impacts to historical resources. Similarly, development within the surrounding area must comply with the City’s extensive procedures regarding documentation and development sensitive to historic resources. With implementation of these City procedures and mitigation measures MM CUL 1a-d, future growth will not have cumulatively considerable impacts relative to cultural resources.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity includes this portion of Los Angeles County due to the presence of numerous regional faults, including the well known San Andreas Fault. Future growth will introduce additional residences, businesses, residents, and workers into this area and all of these will be subject to moderate to severe ground shaking in a major seismic event. This regional impact is considered cumulatively considerable due to its potential severity and the number of people and structures it could affect. However, this potential impact can be reduced to less than significant levels by the implementation of applicable building design and construction methods and mitigation measures MM HYD 1-a and MMHYD 1-b in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. The improvements of the Proposed Project that involve structures will comply with applicable seismic codes and building standards. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable impacts relative to geology, soils, and seismicity.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan and the City as a whole. Future growth will incrementally increase the amount of hazardous materials utilized in this area (i.e., stored, transported, or handled). The area is highly urbanized and does not face major threats from flooding, aircraft accidents, wildfires, etc. As long as new development complies with applicable regulations regarding hazardous materials in combination with mitigation measures MM HAZ-1, MM HAZ-2 and MM HAZ-7, there should be no cumulatively considerable impacts from growth in this regard. Similarly, construction of the planned park improvements will not make significant contributions to risks or hazards to the surrounding community, including hazardous materials, because of the type of improvements planned.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan, as well as the City as a whole. MacArthur Park contains a man-made lake that is lined with concrete. The lake and the park have no natural drainage channels, inlets, or outlets. Additional development, both within the City and the community plan area, will result in additional excavation activities, new buildings, and further intensification of land use, which could potentially impact hydrology and water quality in the area. Construction of the planned park improvements according to the proposed mitigation measures will not make significant contributions to regional impacts related to flooding or water quality. With the design of the project, combined with mitigation measures MMHYD-1a and MM HYD 1-b, the water-related impacts will be less than significant and thus the project will not have a cumulatively considerable impact regarding hydrology and water quality.

Traffic and Circulation

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to transportation includes the Westlake Community Plan area identified in the Los Angeles General Plan, and the City as a whole. The DEIR estimated the Project would only generate an incremental amount of traffic, on the order of 50 additional vehicle trips per day, and most additional users of the park would probably access it via public transportation, walking, or by bicycle. Since the Proposed Project would not generate significant amounts of traffic through mitigation measure MMTRANS-8a, it will not make a significant contribution to any project level or cumulatively considerable impacts relative to traffic or circulation.

3.9.2 - Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or mitigate cumulative environmental effects to a less than significant level after mitigation.

3.9.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

As explained above, the project's cumulative environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation mitigation measures related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and transportation and circulation specifically identified herein in the project level discussion regarding each of these issues. These project level measures effectively reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.

SECTION 4: FINDING REGARDING IMPACTS NOT MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a)(b) requires an EIR to identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project, including effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project were implemented.

This section describes significant impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of less than significant. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing a project alternative, their implications, and the reason why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, are described. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Project will not create any significant environmental impacts.

SECTION 5: FINDING REGARDING GROWTH INDUCING, UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE, AND IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

5.1 - Growth Inducing Impacts

5.1.1 - Description

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126(d), 12126.2(d)). This discussion must address: 1) ways the project could encourage economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment; and 2) project characteristics that may encourage or facilitate other activities that could individually or cumulatively significantly affect the environment.

5.1.2 - Finding

There are no project-specific significant growth-inducing effects requiring implementation of mitigation measures.

5.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

Direct growth-inducing impacts occur when the development of a project imposes new burdens on a community by directly inducing population growth, or by leading to the construction of additional development of residential, commercial, or industrial uses in the same area. Also included in this category are projects that remove physical obstacles to population growth such as a new road into an undeveloped area or a wastewater treatment plant with excess capacity that could allow additional development in the service area. Construction of these types of infrastructure projects cannot be considered isolated from the development they facilitate and serve. Projects that physically remove obstacles to growth or projects that indirectly induce growth may provide a catalyst for future unrelated development in an area, such as a new residential community, that requires additional commercial uses to support residents.

The Proposed Project would result in minor renovations and reconstruction of various facilities at MacArthur Park. The project would install new or relocate landscaping, install new walkways, build a new children's play area, expand use of the existing soccer field, and rehabilitate the interiors of several onsite buildings. The Project will not add new facilities or infrastructure such as pipelines that could accommodate new growth. The Proposed Project will not create a significant amount of new jobs or add to the City's population or housing stock. The Project will also not affect the regional population or housing growth projections by the SCAG. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not induce growth into the Westlake portion of the City of Los Angeles.

5.2 - Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

5.2.1 - Description

CEQA requires that a description of any significant environmental effects remaining after implementation of feasible mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.2(b)).

5.2.2 - Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project, which will lessen any potentially significant impacts on the environment to less than significant levels. Therefore, there are no unavoidable adverse impacts from the proposed project.

5.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The proposed project will not produce significant project specific and cumulative impacts. No other adverse environmental impacts are expected if the project and mitigation measures are implemented as proposed in the EIR

5.3 - Irreversible Impacts

5.3.1 - Description

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the extent to which a proposed project will commit nonrenewable resources to uses that future generations will probably be unable to reverse so that such current consumption may be justified.

5.3.2 - Finding

The DEIR has evaluated the project's commitment of irretrievable resources in the implementation of the project and has found that the use of such resources is justified by the long-term benefits of the project.

5.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project site will be used as a multiuse recreational park. The new uses will be utilized as a resource for the community over the long-term, and will be similar to other recreational park projects in the City.

SECTION 6: FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of the project, which: 1) are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse environmental impact associated with the project; and 2) may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6).

An EIR must only evaluate reasonable alternatives to a project which could feasibly attain most of the project objectives and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6; *Sierra Club v. County of Napa*, 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490 [2004]). In all cases, the consideration of alternatives is to be judged against a rule of reason (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6.). The lead agency is not required to select the environmentally superior alternative identified in the EIR if the alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the proposed project and: 1) through the imposition of mitigation measures the environmental effects of a project can be reduced to a less than significant level; or 2) there are social, economic, technological or other considerations which make the alternative infeasible.

The discussion of alternatives is required to include the “No project” alternative. CEQA further requires that the City identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the “No project” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6.).

CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 requires an EIR to evaluate an alternative site when an alternative location would avoid or substantially lessen significant effects. However, the DEIR does not identify any significant unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures; therefore, no alternatives will be developed to eliminate one or more significant project impacts as required by CEQA. However, the City will consider alternatives that may reduce anticipated (but less than significant) impacts, or will improve the acceptability or successful implementation of the planned park improvements. The objectives for the project as identified in the Draft EIR and considered by the Board are the following:

- Improve overall usability of the park for all segments of the City population;
- Improve security and accessibility of the park for park users;
- Maintain or enhance views into and out of the park for security;
- Minimize intrusion of park activities into surrounding neighborhoods;
- Reduce or minimize maintenance and security costs to the City; and
- Take advantage of available funding within allowed time limits.

6.1 - No project – No Development Alternative

6.1.1 - Description

CEQA requires the evaluation of the impacts of a specific No Project-No Development alternative compared to the proposed project. The No Project-No Development analysis essentially evaluates existing conditions on the site (i.e., no improvements). Under this alternative, none of the planned improvements to MacArthur Park would be completed and thus any short-term impacts from construction and long-term or contributions to cumulative impacts implementation of the planned park improvements (even though they were determined to be less than significant under CEQA) would be avoided.

6.1.2 - Finding

The No Project – No Development alternative would eliminate any potential impacts identified with construction or operation of the Proposed Project. However, many of the planned improvements would still need to be installed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these improvements. Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

6.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The No Project-No Development alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project because it would avoid the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. This alternative would eliminate the potential impacts of the proposed park improvements, including air pollutant emissions during demolition and construction as well as incremental contributions to cumulative air quality impacts. This alternative would also reduce any impacts associated with increased lighting for the soccer field or the use of a synthetic surface for the field. However, all of these potential project impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

This alternative would not allow for the most efficient use of the Signal or Boathouse buildings, as well as allow continued use of the dirt soccer field. Eventually, reconstruction or regrading of the soccer field would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions as a result of use and erosion. In addition, a number of safety improvements would be needed for the Boathouse and Signal buildings to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative would most likely only postpone the need for the planned improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines. Therefore, this alternative increases impacts related to erosion and hazards, but does reduce electrical and water consumption compared to the Proposed Project.

For the foregoing reasons, the Board finds that the No project-No Development alternative fails to meet project objectives and does not provide the benefits derived from the project. On this basis, the Board rejects the No project-No Development alternative.

6.2 - Modified Soccer Field Improvements

6.2.1 - Description

Under this alternative, the dirt soccer field would be improved with natural turf only, and would not have any field lighting installed, but the rest of the park improvements would be made as planned.

6.2.2 - Finding

The Modified Soccer Field Improvements may reduce local objection to synthetic field surfaces and night lighting of the soccer field. However, the soccer field would need continued maintenance to keep it in a playable condition, especially as wear and water erosion cause the surface to become more and more uneven (and unsafe). Some level of improvement would still be needed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these improvements. In addition, this alternative does not achieve the objectives of the project to nearly the same degree as the Proposed Project (in terms of year-round playability of the soccer field). Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

6.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

Although this alternative would eliminate potential controversy regarding use of a synthetic surface for the soccer field, as well as eliminate any concerns related to increased lighting related to the soccer field, the alternative would not allow for the most efficient use of the soccer field, and would not improve safety of field users. If natural turf is used, additional replanting with sod, seed, and possible regrading of the soccer field would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions. In addition, a number of safety improvements would be needed for the soccer field to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative may only postpone needed improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines.

6.3 - No Boathouse Improvements

6.3.1 - Description

Under is alternative, replacement of the boathouse would be eliminated, but the rest of the park improvements would be made as planned.

6.3.2 - Finding

The No Boathouse Improvements would eliminate air quality and other short-term impacts from demolition and reconstruction of a boathouse building. However, these impacts of the Proposed Project were determined to be less than significant, and the Boathouse would only be a portion of those impacts. If these improvements are not made, the Boathouse would still need continued maintenance to keep it in usable and safe condition. Some level of improvement would still be needed at some point for safety reasons, and there are timing limitations to the funding for these

improvements. In addition, this alternative does not achieve the objectives of the project to nearly the same degree as the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative is rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

6.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

Although this alternative would eliminate air pollutant emissions from demolition of the existing building and construction of a new boathouse building, it would not allow for the most efficient use of the boathouse, and would not improve safety for building users. Eventually, reconstruction or some form of rehabilitation would be necessary to maintain safe playing conditions. In addition, a number of improvements are needed for the Boathouse Building to continue to be used in a safe manner. Therefore, this alternative may only postpone needed improvements. In addition, funding for these improvements have certain time limits, which might preclude their implementation if they are delayed beyond the funding deadlines.

6.4 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

6.4.1 - Description

The environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the Proposed Project are summarized in Table 2. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an “environmentally superior alternative.” If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as it is in this case, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. The Proposed Project does not result in any significant impacts after implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Therefore, the identified alternatives may make the Project more acceptable to some members of the public, or assist in the implementation of the planned park improvements.

6.4.2 - Finding

The Proposed Project does not create any significant environmental impacts after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. However, all of the alternatives do reduce short-term construction-related impacts to some degree (i.e., make fewer improvements). The alternative, Modifying Soccer Field Improvements, would result in less consumption of electricity but increase water use (for turf irrigation). None of the alternatives achieve the objectives of the project to the same degree as the Proposed Project. Since none of the alternatives eliminates one or more significant impacts of the Project, and do not achieve the project objectives as well, none are considered environmentally superior to the Proposed Project and are therefore rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

6.4.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

None of the alternatives achieve the objectives of the project to the same degree as the Proposed Project. The environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the Proposed Project are summarized in the Table 2 below.

Table 2: Summary of Impacts of Alternatives (Compared to Proposed Project)

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project*	Alternative 1 No Project – No Improvements	Alternative 2 Modified Soccer Field Improvements	Alternative 3 No Boathouse Improvements
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Increased lighting but less than significant*	No Impact	Reduced but still less than significant	Reduced but still less than significant
Air Quality Construction	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Operation (including greenhouse gases)	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Biological Resources	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Cultural Resources (historical)	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less than significant*	Continued erosion	Less than significant	Less than significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant*	Continued unsafe conditions on soccer field	Less than significant	Less than significant
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant*	Continued erosion	Less than significant but increased water consumption	Less than significant
Noise	Less than significant	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Public Services (fire, police, parks)	Less than significant	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Utilities (water, energy, etc.)	Less than significant	No Impact	Less electrical use but increased water consumption	Less than significant
Transportation and Circulation	Less than significant*	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Meets Project Objectives?	Yes	No	Not to same degree	Not to same degree
* with mitigation				

SECTION 7: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 (a) states that:

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the FEIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the FEIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes a finding under Section 15091(a)(2) or 15091 (a)(3).

As identified above, the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks find that the project does not produce any significant and unmitigable impacts and, therefore, **does not require a Statement of Overriding Considerations.**

