

INITIAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Integrated Resources Plan

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
Wastewater Engineering Services (WESD)
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA, 90065

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Dr. Ara J. Kasparian (213) 847-8815

4. **Project Location:**

Citywide

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation
2714 Media Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Department of Water and Power
Water Resources
111 N. Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

6. **General Plan Designation:**

The proposed project could be constructed and operated on land designated by the General Plan for residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, community, public rights-of-way, and/or recreational uses. Additionally, the proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan and the policies advocated in that plan.

7. **Zoning:**

Zoning designations include the R (residential), C (commercial), and M (industrial) series, as well as other designated zones such as public facilities and open space.

8. **Background Information:**

The City of Los Angeles owns and operates an extensive infrastructure system related to wastewater collection, wastewater treatment, recycled water use, and stormwater and urban runoff collection and treatment.

The wastewater collection system is comprised of over 6,500 miles of sewers that collect wastewater from City residents, commercial and industrial facilities, as well as various other jurisdictions that contract with the City to manage their wastewater. Wastewater is conveyed to and treated at various treatment plants, which include the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant (Tillman) in the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin in Van Nuys, the Los Angeles – Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAG) in northeast Los Angeles (across the Golden State Freeway from Griffith Park), the Hyperion Treatment Plant (Hyperion) in Playa del Rey, and the Terminal Island Treatment Plant (Terminal Island) in the Los Angeles Harbor area. Both Tillman and LAG are currently undergoing construction of nitrification-

denitrification process units required to meet new Los Angeles River discharge limits. When complete, the treatment capacity at Tillman may be reduced from 80 million gallons per day (mgd) to 64 mgd. The treatment capacity at LAG may be reduced from 20 mgd to 15 mgd. Hyperion has a treatment capacity of 450 mgd. Lastly, Terminal Island has a treatment capacity of 30 mgd.

Some of the treated or recycled water from Tillman is beneficially reused at Lake Balboa and the Wildlife Lake in the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin, and the Japanese Gardens. The unused portion of the recycled water is discharged directly into the Los Angeles River below the Sepulveda Dam.

A portion of the recycled water from LAG is distributed for irrigation and industrial purposes, with the balance of the effluent discharged to the Los Angeles River.

The majority of the effluent from Hyperion is discharged to the Santa Monica Bay through an ocean outfall, but a portion is conveyed to the West Basin Municipal Water District for further treatment and reuse for landscape irrigation, cooling towers, refineries, and the sea water intrusion barrier in the South Bay area. Hyperion provides biosolids handling and treatment for Tillman, LAG and Hyperion. Biosolids currently generated at Hyperion (approximately 680 wet tons per day) are hauled to Kern County for land application or composted at the Griffith Park Composting Facility.

Terminal Island currently accepts and treats wastewater generated in the San Pedro area, Wilmington, and Port of Los Angeles. Some of the reclaimed water from Terminal Island will soon be distributed to various industrial end users and for use as a seawater intrusion barrier, with the balance discharged to the Los Angeles Harbor. Biosolids currently generated at Terminal Island (approximately 50 wet tons per day) are hauled to Kern County for land application.

Los Angeles, with the cooperation of City, County, State and Federal agencies, has an extensive drainage system to protect its residents from flood hazards. The system includes open channels, flood control basins, storm drains, catch basins, culverts, low-flow diversions to direct runoff to the sanitary sewer system, pumping plants, debris basins, detention basins and spreading grounds. In the City, approximately 1,900 miles of open channel, storm drain pipe, and culverts collect runoff from streets, parking lots, and lawns within the watershed and conveys the untreated runoff to various rivers, creeks, and the ocean. Of the 1,900 miles of storm collection facilities, about 1,300 miles are City-owned and 600 miles are County-owned. The urban runoff carries pollutants from the watershed, which contributes to temporary beach closures. In the Santa Monica Bay watershed, some of the dry weather urban runoff is diverted to the wastewater collection system for treatment at Hyperion or to the Santa Monica Urban Runoff Recycling Plant (SMURRF). The SMURRF treats runoff from the Pico Kenter storm drain and the Santa Monica Pier drain to remove pollutants and pathogens.

Current and pending environmental laws and regulations require or will require improvements in the quality of wastewater effluent and stormwater discharges to water bodies such as the Los Angeles River and the Santa Monica Bay. This will necessitate process upgrades at existing upstream treatment plants and innovative runoff management approaches. In addition, the population within the City and outlying areas is expected to significantly increase in the future (based on population projections by the Southern

California Association of Governments for the year 2020 and beyond), which will pose challenges in meeting future water resource needs. Historically, facilities planning for the wastewater collection system, wastewater treatment system, recycled water system, and the stormwater system have occurred independent of each other. Recognizing that all of these systems are interrelated or have overlapping influences, the City is undertaking an integrated approach in managing its water resources.

9. Description of the Project:

The City of Los Angeles' Department of Public Works (Bureau of Sanitation) and Department of Water and Power, in partnership with various stakeholders and community representatives, have developed four alternatives for the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP). The IRP is an integrated facilities plan for the City's wastewater, stormwater, and recycled water programs for the year 2020 and beyond.

The guiding principles that form the basis of the IRP alternatives were developed by stakeholders in 2001 and include the following:

- Build/expand new wastewater facilities upstream in the system
- Produce and use as much recycled water as possible from existing and planned facilities
- Reduce the amount of rainfall-dependent inflow and infiltration
- Increase the level of water conservation beyond current plans
- Increase the amount of dry weather runoff that is diverted and treated or captured and beneficially used
- Increase the amount of wet weather runoff that is captured and beneficially used
- Beneficially reuse biosolids
- Focus on lower-cost solutions

The IRP alternatives are comprised of a suite of wastewater treatment, wastewater conveyance, urban runoff management, and potential water-recycling components. The four IRP Alternatives are generally described as follows:

Alternative 1: Hyperion expansion and moderate potential for water resources projects.

Alternative 2: Tillman and LAG water reclamation plants expansions/process upgrades and high potential for water resources projects.

Alternative 3: Tillman expansion/process upgrade and moderate potential for water resources projects.

Alternative 4: Tillman expansion/process upgrade and high potential for water resources projects.

The selected IRP alternative would be implemented over the next 20 years, with individual components implemented, as demand requires (need for wastewater treatment or conveyance capacity, compliance with laws, regulations, permits, and/or administrative orders, etc.).

The recycled water components identified in the IRP will be subject to further analysis by DWP to evaluate economic and operational feasibility. The rate of implementation of recycled water projects will ultimately depend on budgetary constraints, staff resources, and the availability of outside funding.

9.1 IRP Alternative 1

Under IRP Alternative 1, the treatment capacity of Hyperion will be expanded from 450 mgd to 500 mgd, which is an increase in capacity of 50 mgd. This expansion includes the addition of new secondary clarifiers and digesters. Biosolids management and handling would continue to occur at Hyperion. Alternative 1 also includes upgrading the treatment processes at Tillman to advanced treatment using membrane technology, which includes MicroFiltration-Reverse Osmosis (MFRO). Capacity expansion of Tillman would not occur under this alternative. Under this Alternative, LAG and possibly Tillman, would be improved to add operational storage. The operational storage at LAG would be approximately 10 million gallons (MG). The storage at Tillman would be approximately 60 MG and would be optional (see Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer discussion below). LAG would no longer discharge to the Los Angeles River, instead providing recycled water to users or discharging back into the sewer when recycled water demand is unavailable. Figure 1 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 1 within the service area.

This alternative would include three new sections of large diameter sewer (approximately 5 to 8 feet in finished diameter) that would extend from the Eagle Rock area north and west to Tillman. These sewer sections are the Northeast Interceptor Sewer II (NEIS II), the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS), and the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer (VSLIS). As an option, buried operational storage tanks could be constructed at Tillman in lieu of VSLIS. The sewer sections are as follows:

- NEIS II would extend from approximately San Fernando Road at Cazador Street northward to the vicinity of SR 134. NEIS II would also connect with LAG.
- GBIS would extend westward along the Los Angeles River from the northern terminus of NEIS II (vicinity of SR 134 and the Los Angeles River) to the Toluca Lake area.
- The VSLIS would extend from the western terminus of GBIS (Toluca Lake area) to Tillman, if wet weather storage at Tillman is not implemented.

The sewer projects are likely to cross beneath one or more freeways, railroads, storm drains, utilities, and the Los Angeles River. The three sewers would be constructed using tunneling and/or open-trench methods.

IRP Alternative 1 includes potential expansion of the recycled water distribution system to reuse up to 42,000 acre-feet per year of non-potable recycled water. The proposed recycled water distribution system expansion would connect with the existing recycled water distribution system and would occur in the Valley, Downtown, Westside, and Harbor areas. Specific locations of the recycled water facilities have not yet been identified.

**Placeholder for Figure 1: Hyperion Expansion
11x17 Black & White Insert**

2nd Side Placeholder for Figure 1: Hyperion Expansion

Dry weather runoff would be reduced through the implementation of smart irrigation devices on various city properties, schools, and residences. Dry weather runoff would also be managed through diversions of runoff into the wastewater collection system for treatment at existing plants. Only general locations of dry weather runoff facilities and urban runoff plants have been identified.

Wet weather runoff would be managed through a suite of measures that include onsite storage (in cisterns) for irrigation use; onsite percolation of runoff for new developments, schools, and governmental buildings, vacant lots, alleys, and parks; conveyance of runoff from the West Valley and percolation at existing spreading grounds in the East Valley; and wet weather runoff treatment at new urban runoff plants. Only general locations of wet weather runoff facilities have been identified.

Figure 1 shows the primary components of IRP Alternative 1.

9.2 IRP Alternative 2

IRP Alternative 2 would expand Tillman to 80 mgd (currently 64 mgd of capacity) and LAG to 30 mgd (from 15 mgd) of treatment capacity. The treatment processes at these plants would also be upgraded to advanced treatment such as MFRO, as conditions dictate, and to add operational storage. The operational storage at LAG would be approximately 10 MG. The storage at Tillman would be approximately 60 MG and would be optional (see Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer discussion below). Treated water from LAG that is not recycled would be discharged to the Los Angeles River. Biosolids management and handling would continue to occur at Hyperion, which would require additional digesters. Figure 2 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 2 within the service area.

This alternative would include three new sections of large diameter sewer (approximately 5 to 8 feet in finished diameter) that would extend from the Eagle Rock area north and west to Tillman. These sewer sections are NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS. As an option, buried operational storage tanks could be constructed at Tillman in lieu of VSLIS. The sewer sections are as follows:

- NEIS II would extend from approximately San Fernando Road at Cazador Street northward to the vicinity of SR 134. NEIS II would also connect with LAG.
- GBIS would extend westward along the Los Angeles River from the northern terminus of NEIS II (vicinity of SR 134 and the Los Angeles River) to the Toluca Lake area.
- The VSLIS would extend from the western terminus of GBIS (Toluca Lake area) to Tillman, if wet weather storage at Tillman is not implemented.

The sewer projects are likely to cross beneath one or more freeways, railroads, storm drains, utilities, and the Los Angeles River. The three sewers would be constructed using tunneling and/or open-trench methods.

IRP Alternative 2 includes potential expansion of the recycled water distribution system to reuse up to 53,000 acre-feet per year of non-potable recycled water. The proposed recycled water distribution system expansion would connect with the existing recycled water distribution system and would occur in the Valley, Downtown, Westside, and Harbor areas. Specific locations of the recycled water facilities have not yet been identified.

Dry weather runoff would be reduced through the implementation of smart irrigation devices on various city properties, schools, and residences. Dry weather runoff would also be managed through diversions of runoff into the wastewater collection system for treatment at existing plants, new urban runoff plants, or constructed treatment wetlands. Only general locations of dry weather runoff facilities and urban runoff plants have been identified.

Wet weather runoff would be managed through a suite of measures that include onsite storage (in cisterns) for irrigation use; onsite percolation of runoff for new developments, schools, and governmental buildings, vacant lots, alleys, and parks; conveyance of runoff from the West Valley and percolation at existing spreading grounds in the East Valley; and wet weather runoff treatment at new urban runoff plants. Only general locations of wet weather runoff facilities have been identified.

Figure 2 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 2.

**Placeholder for Figure 2: Tillman & LAG Expansion
11x17 Black & White Insert**

**2nd Page for Figure 2: Tillman & LAG Expansion
to maintain page numbering**

9.3 IRP Alternative 3

IRP Alternative 3 would expand Tillman to 100 mgd (currently 64 mgd of capacity). The treatment processes at Tillman would also be upgraded to advanced treatment with MFRO, as conditions dictate. Under Alternative 3, LAG and possibly Tillman, would be improved to add operational storage. The operational storage at LAG would be approximately 10 MG. The storage at Tillman would be approximately 60 MG and would be optional (see Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer discussion below). LAG would no longer discharge to the Los Angeles River, instead providing recycled water to users or discharging back into the sewer when demand are unavailable. Biosolids management and handling would continue to occur at Hyperion, which would require additional digesters. Figure 3 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 3 within the service area.

This alternative would include three new sections of large diameter sewer (approximately 5 to 8 feet in finished diameter) that would extend from the Eagle Rock area north and west to Tillman. These sewer sections are NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS. As an option, buried wet weather storage tanks could be constructed at Tillman in lieu of the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer. The sewer sections are as follows:

- NEIS II would extend from approximately San Fernando Road at Cazador Street northward to the vicinity of SR 134. NEIS II would also connect with LAG.
- GBIS would extend westward along the Los Angeles River from the northern terminus of NEIS II (vicinity of SR 134 and the Los Angeles River) to the Toluca Lake area.
- The VSLIS would extend from the western terminus of GBIS (Toluca Lake area) to Tillman, if wet weather storage at Tillman is not implemented.

The sewer projects are likely to cross beneath one or more freeways, railroads, storm drains, utilities, and the Los Angeles River. The three sewers would be constructed using tunneling and/or open-trench methods.

IRP Alternative 3 would include potential expansion of the recycled water distribution system to reuse up to 43,000 acre-feet per year of non-potable recycled water. The proposed recycled water distribution system expansion would connect with the existing recycled water distribution system and would occur in the Valley, Downtown, Westside, and Harbor areas. Specific locations of the recycled water facilities have not yet been identified.

Dry weather runoff would be reduced through the implementation of smart irrigation devices on various city properties, schools, and residences. Dry weather runoff would also be managed through diversions of runoff into the wastewater collection system for treatment at existing plants. Only general locations of dry weather runoff facilities and urban runoff plants have been identified.

Wet weather runoff would be managed through a suite of measures that include onsite, percolation and beneficial reuse for new developments, onsite percolation of runoff in vacant lots, alleys, and parks; and wet weather runoff treatment at new urban runoff plants. Only general locations of wet weather runoff facilities have been identified.

Figure 3 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 3 within the City and outlying areas.

9.4 IRP Alternative 4

IRP Alternative 4 would expand Tillman to 100 mgd (currently 64 mgd of capacity). The treatment processes at Tillman would also be upgraded to advanced treatment such as MFRO, as conditions dictate. LAG, and possibly Tillman, would be improved to add operational storage. The operational storage at LAG would be approximately 10 MG. The storage at Tillman would be approximately 60 MG and would be optional (see Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer discussion below). LAG would no longer discharge to the Los Angeles River, instead providing recycled water to users or discharging back into the sewer when demand are unavailable. Biosolids management and handling would continue to occur at Hyperion, which would require additional digesters. Figure 4 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 4 within the service area.

This alternative would include three new sections of large diameter sewer (approximately 5 to 8 feet in finished diameter) that would extend from the Eagle Rock area north and west to Tillman. These sewer sections are NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS. As an option, buried operational storage tanks could be constructed at Tillman in lieu of the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor Sewer. The sewer sections are as follows:

- NEIS II would extend from approximately San Fernando Road at Cazador Street northward to the vicinity of SR 134. NEIS II would also connect with LAG.
- GBIS would extend westward along the Los Angeles River from the northern terminus of NEIS II (vicinity of SR 134 and the Los Angeles River) to the Toluca Lake area.
- The VSLIS would extend from the western terminus of GBIS (Toluca Lake area) to Tillman, if wet weather storage at Tillman is not implemented.

The sewer projects are likely to cross beneath one or more freeways, railroads, storm drains, utilities, and the Los Angeles River. The three sewers would be constructed using tunneling and/or open-trench methods.

IRP Alternative 4 would include potential expansion of the recycled water distribution system to reuse up to 56,000 acre-feet per year of non-potable recycled water. The proposed recycled water distribution system expansion would connect with the existing recycled water distribution system and would occur in the Valley, Downtown, Westside, and Harbor areas.

**Placeholder for Figure 3: Tillman Expansion Moderate
11x17 Black & White Insert**

**2nd Page for Figure 3: Tillman Expansion Moderate
to maintain page numbering**

**Placeholder for Figure 4: Tillman Expansion High.
11x17 Black & White Insert**

**2nd Page for Figure 4: Tillman Expansion High
to maintain page numbering**

Dry weather runoff would be reduced through the implementation of smart irrigation devices on various city properties, schools, and residences. Dry weather runoff would also be managed through diversions of runoff into the wastewater collection system for treatment at existing plants, new urban runoff plants, or constructed treatment wetlands. Only general locations of dry weather runoff facilities and urban runoff plants have been identified.

Wet weather runoff would be managed through a suite of measures that include onsite storage (in cisterns) for irrigation use; onsite percolation of runoff for new developments, schools, and governmental buildings, vacant lots, alleys, and parks; conveyance of runoff from the West Valley and percolation at existing spreading grounds in the East Valley; and wet weather runoff treatment at new urban runoff plants. Only general locations of wet weather runoff facilities have been identified.

Figure 4 depicts the primary facilities of IRP Alternative 4.

10 Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Various approvals and/or permits will be required from other agencies or jurisdictions in order to implement one or more of the components of the IRP alternatives. These agencies and jurisdictions may include, but are not limited to:

FEDERAL

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Federal Aviation Administration

STATE

- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Conservation, Department of Oil and Gas
- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Department of Transportation
- State Office of Historic Preservation
- Department of Health Services
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
- State Water Resources Control Board

REGIONAL

- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

LOCAL

- City of Burbank
- City of Glendale
- City of El Segundo
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety
- City of Los Angeles, Community Redevelopment Agencies
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Planning
- City of Los Angeles, Police Commission
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks
- City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation
- Kern County
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
- Los Angeles Unified School District

OTHER

- Union Pacific Railroad

11. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing		

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>



 Signature

July 9, 2004

 Date

Adel Hagekhali
 Printed Name

Division Manager / WESD
 Title/Division

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

There are no known designated scenic vistas in the vicinity of existing wastewater treatment facilities or known locations of proposed facilities. However, Hyperion is located at the base of a bluff that overlooks the Santa Monica Bay. All of the build alternatives for the IRP include the addition of digesters at Hyperion. Consequently, the IRP could have an impact on views from the bluff. In addition, recycled water tanks and other structures would be constructed and operated, which could also affect other views. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to views resulting from the IRP alternatives.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The portion of Vista del Mar north of Hyperion and Imperial Highway has been designated a Scenic Highway by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, several streets in and around the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin, where improvements to Tillman could occur, have been designated as Scenic Highways. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to scenic highways.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would result in facility modifications at existing treatment plants or other new facilities, which could affect the visual character of their surroundings. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to visual character of facility surroundings from construction and from the facilities.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

New and expanded facilities would require facility and security lighting once completed. Reflective glare could be a concern with Hyperion modifications. In addition, some night construction may be necessary and associated lighting could intrude onto nearby properties. The EIR will evaluate potential for new lighting to adversely affect day or nighttime views and potential glare impacts at Hyperion, Tillman and LAG.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

2. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The majority of the land within the City of Los Angeles and surrounding areas are zoned for residential, commercial and industrial land uses. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) maintains control of the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin where Tillman is located. The Corps has prepared a master plan for the basin, which identifies much of the land for recreational uses. The Corps does however lease some of the land in the basin to farmers for agricultural use on a revocable basis. Because the basin is designated for flood control and recreational purposes by a public agency, and because the basin experiences frequent flooding, the agricultural land used in the basin is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Consequently, the proposed project is not expected to affect prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

None of the IRP alternatives would involve facilities that would affect agriculturally zoned land or affect a Williamson Act contract (see Checklist Item 2. a) above).

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Some of the IRP alternatives would require expansion of the Tillman in the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin, but the proposed extension will not exceed the area currently leased from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Corps maintains jurisdiction over the lands within the basin. The Corps leases excess lands to farmers on a revocable basis. The site where the Tillman would be expanded would fall primarily within the bermed area, although the wet weather storage tank would be located outside bermed area. The improvements at Tillman would not encroach upon land currently leased for agricultural use. Consequently, the IRP alternatives are not expected to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would be implemented to meet current and future regulations, as well as to safely accommodate the future wastewater and water needs within the service area. The IRP alternatives are based on future population projections developed by SCAG. The potential for the IRP alternatives to induce population growth beyond the levels projected by SCAG, which could obstruct the implementation of the current Air Quality Management Plan (serves as the State Implementation Plan for bringing the air basin into attainment) will be discussed in the EIR.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction of the IRP alternatives has the potential to affect localized traffic circulation patterns, which could in turn result in increases in carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots or an exceedance of carbon monoxide standards. Similarly, operation of IRP facilities could result in increased traffic, which could result in carbon monoxide hotspots. The EIR will evaluate the potential for the IRP alternatives to result in violations carbon monoxide standards.

In addition, construction and operation of the IRP alternatives would result in the generation of criteria pollutants, which could result in significant impacts. The EIR will evaluate the construction and operational air quality impacts of the IRP Alternatives.

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

The EIR will evaluate the potential for the IRP alternatives to result in cumulatively considerable increases in criteria pollutants.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The EIR will evaluate the potential for construction and operation of the IRP alternatives to affect sensitive receptors.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The wastewater components of the IRP alternatives (treatment plant expansions and new large diameter conveyance system projects) have the potential to result in objectionable odors. Potential odor impacts of the IRP alternatives will be evaluated in the EIR.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Tillman and LAG both discharge effluent into the mid and upper reaches of the Los Angeles River. An unlined portion of the river is located downstream of the effluent discharges (Glendale Narrows), and this section of the river is populated with riparian habitat.

In addition, there is foraging habitat (algal based) along the lower reach of the Los Angeles River (above the tidal zone). Overflow from the low flow channel in this reach regularly spills onto the river apron (from the low flow channel), creating an algal mat layer that supports migrating shorebirds.

Biological resources could also be present in the vicinity of specific proposed IRP facilities.

Effluent from Hyperion is currently discharged to the Santa Monica Bay through a 5-mile outfall. The City is required by their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for Hyperion to monitor the quality of biological resources in and around the outfall. Because the IRP alternatives would manage increased wastewater generated within the service area, increases in effluent discharge to the Santa Monica Bay would occur. The EIR will evaluate potential impacts to biological resources along the Los Angeles River from potential changes in river flow due to increase use of recycled water and diversion of dry weather runoff, at known specific facility locations, and to marine resources.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

Issues	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please see Checklist item 4a) above.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

None of the IRP alternatives are expected to result in direct impacts to existing protected wetlands, as the IRP components would be implemented primarily in the urbanized areas of the City. However, there may be protected wetlands in some of the watercourses that convey urban runoff that would be diverted to the wastewater conveyance system or treated and beneficially reused. The EIR will discuss potential impacts to biological resources either programmatically or specifically, depending on the level of component information available.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives are not expected to directly affect the movement of migratory fish or terrestrial wildlife species, as the project area is largely urbanized. In addition, none of the IRP alternatives are expected to result in structures or facilities that would impede wildlife corridors or the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Rather, the IRP alternatives would beneficially reuse urban runoff and reclaimed water, which may provide pockets of human-made habitat (from beneficial reuse of reclaimed water and runoff, including constructed treatment wetlands) that could be used by wildlife. No further analysis is recommended.

However, migratory shore bird habitat in Long Beach along the lower reach of the Los Angeles River is significant and is dependent on flow within the river. The EIR will evaluate potential to affect migratory bird habitat along the lower reach of the Los Angeles River.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The City of Los Angeles has various tree ordinances and policies that may apply to the IRP alternatives. In addition, other jurisdictions (such as the Cities of Burbank, El Segundo, and Glendale) may have similar ordinances or policies. The EIR will discuss and evaluate the applicable biological resource policies as they apply to the IRP alternatives.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There are no areas of natural habitat with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan in the vicinity of the project.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The IRP alternatives may affect historic resources that are located in the vicinity of IRP facilities. The EIR will evaluate the potential impacts of the IRP alternatives on historic resources.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Archaeological resources may be present in the vicinity of IRP facilities, and excavation for IRP facilities may disturb or damage such resources. The EIR will evaluate the projects potential for impacts to archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Paleontological resources may be present in the vicinity of IRP facilities, and excavation for IRP facilities may disturb or damage such resources. The EIR will evaluate the projects potential for impacts to archaeological resources.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

Issues	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

None of the IRP facilities are expected to affect formal cemeteries or other places of human burial. Human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries that represent native American culture would be addressed in the EIR as described in Checklist Item 5b) above.

If human remains are exposed during construction, the Los Angeles County Coroner would be contacted in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code. State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code 5097.98. No further analysis is recommended.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NEIS II will cross the Hollywood-Raymond fault in the Glendale Narrows area. Numerous other earthquake faults are located in the City, which could affect the components of the IRP alternatives. The EIR will discuss the potential fault and seismic impacts related to the IRP alternatives.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See Checklist Item 6a) i) above.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Liquefaction is caused by the vibration of loose fine sand or silt that is saturated with water. Liquefaction only occurs if the sediment: 1) is of fine sand or silt size, 2) is loosely consolidated, 3) is saturated, and 4) is subject to vibration.

The potential for IRP facilities to be located in liquefaction zones and associated impacts would be discussed in the EIR.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP wastewater and urban runoff components are expected to be located far enough from elevated landmasses or far enough below ground that potential landslide impacts would be minimal or nonexistent. However, wet weather management measures that capture and percolate runoff could affect slope stability in hillside areas. The EIR will evaluate the general potential for the IRP alternatives to affect slope stability from wet weather management projects.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The majority of the City is urbanized with limited exposure of topsoil. However, the IRP alternatives have the potential to result in soil erosion during construction when soil is excavated and exposed. The EIR will discuss the potential soil erosion impacts of the IRP alternatives.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The wastewater collection system components of the IRP alternatives (NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS) would be constructed using tunneling and/or open-trench methods. There is a potential for construction-related soil settlement in and around the construction of the sewers, and such impacts would be discussed in the EIR.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Some of the IRP components may occur in areas known for expansive soils. However, expansive soils are not anticipated to pose problems for the IRP alternatives because the facilities would either be constructed underground (sewers and pipelines) or because foundations design features would be incorporated in to the facilities as a standard practice. No further analysis is recommended.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

Issues	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not result in the creation of additional alternative wastewater disposal systems; rather, the IRP alternatives would provide capacity to accommodate wastewater flows from unsewered areas currently on private disposal systems. No further analysis is recommended.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The IRP alternatives all involve some level of treatment plant expansion or improvement. Existing treatment processes at Tillman and LAG utilize some materials that may be considered hazardous such as sodium hypochlorite (for disinfections through chlorination) and sodium bisulfite (for dechlorination prior to effluent discharge). Both of these substances come in either a solid form or liquid form and do not pose a safety risk to the public. Hyperion treatment processes do not require the use of sodium hypochlorite or sodium bisulfite because disinfection is not required prior to discharge of the effluent.

With the IRP alternatives, the treatment processes at Tillman and LAG would be upgraded to MFRO (depending on the alternative), which would require lime or caustic soda for pH adjustments. The upgrade to MFRO would also replace the current disinfection process (chlorination/dechlorination) with an ultraviolet disinfection system, eliminating the need for sodium hypochlorite and sodium bisulfite. Hydrogen peroxide may be used as part of the disinfection process. Acids such as sulfuric acid, as well as anti-scalents would be used in limited quantities for cleaning. The IRP alternatives are expected to result in less chlorine-based chemicals at the treatment plants. The storage and handling of other hazardous chemicals such as caustic soda, hydrogen peroxide, and acids would be designed to prevent exposure to the public in the event of a release. Such design features could include proper storage containers, and bermed secondary containment. In addition, chemicals such as lime, caustic soda, acids, hydrogen peroxide, and anti-scalents do not readily form a gas upon exposure to the atmosphere. Because proper hazardous materials storage and secondary containment would be incorporated into the treatment plant design, and because of the relatively stable nature of the chemicals, the IRP alternatives are not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment. No further analysis is recommended.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction of the IRP alternatives has the potential to encounter contaminated soils and groundwater (from adjacent industrial properties, historic landfills, superfund sites, etc.), which could pose a safety risk to the public and workers. The EIR will evaluate the anticipated impacts related to the potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The potential for the IRP alternatives to generate hazardous emissions as part of their operations will be evaluated in the EIR.

If schools are located within one-quarter mile of an IRP facility that handles hazardous materials, the schools would be identified and potential impacts evaluated in the EIR.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

As part of the EIR, an environmental site assessment would be prepared for the IRP facilities with known locations to determine the potential for encountering hazardous materials during construction. The EIR would evaluate the potential construction-related hazardous materials impacts.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would include facilities that would be located within 2 miles of a public airport. Tillman is located within 2 miles of the Van Nuys Airport (VNY), but falls outside of

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

the airports land use plan area. Hyperion is located within 2 miles of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), but outside of the master plan area.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has prepared Advisory Circular No. 150/5200-33, which provides guidance on locating land uses that have the potential to attract wildlife in the vicinity of public use airports. The guidance is intended to minimize wildlife-aircraft collisions. The EIR will discuss the applicability of the FAA circular to the IRP and anticipated impacts.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project may include facilities that would be located within 2 miles of a private airport. The EIR will discuss potential safety impacts associated with IRP components in the vicinity of private airports.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The EIR will evaluate the potential for IRP facilities to affect emergency response or evacuation plans and routes.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The IRP alternatives would be constructed and operated largely in the urban environment and are not expected to occur in areas prone to wildland fires. Consequently, the IRP alternatives are not anticipated to expose people or structures to risk of injury, death, or loss. No further analysis is recommended.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Although the IRP alternatives are designed to comply with existing water quality laws and regulations, the potential for the IRP alternatives to affect water quality would be evaluated in the EIR.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

Issues	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The IRP alternatives would beneficially reuse urban runoff (not reclaimed water from Tillman) for groundwater recharge, to varying degrees, which could affect the level of groundwater. The effects of the runoff recharge on groundwater quality and quantity would be discussed in the EIR.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would manage wet weather runoff via facilities, but also through onsite runoff management measures on public and private property. These measures would include the installation of cisterns to capture and percolate stormwater and retention facilities to capture and beneficially reuse runoff. Such facilities would have the effect of reducing the amount of runoff and associated silt and eroded material from the parcels.

In addition, the IRP alternatives would divert some dry weather urban runoff from various drainage channels, with corresponding decreases in the amount of silt and eroded material that is conveyed downstream. Overall, the IRP alternatives are expected to result in net improvements to drainage patterns. However, because the urban runoff management features are integral to the IRP alternatives, further discussion of these benefits would be included in the EIR.

Construction of the IRP alternatives could result in the erosion of excavated materials into the local drainage system or water body. Potential impacts to water quality as a result of erosion during construction would be discussed in the EIR.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As discussed in Checklist Item 8c) above, the IRP alternatives would include onsite runoff management facilities that retain and percolate or reuse runoff onsite. These facilities would have the effect of lessening the amount of runoff that enters the drainage system as well as leveling the peak flow. Consequently, the IRP alternatives are expected to improve overall drainage patterns and peak runoff flow characteristics. However, because the urban runoff management features are integral to the IRP alternatives, further discussion of these benefits would be included in the EIR.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Please see Checklist Item 8c) and 8d) above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would include various treatment plant improvements and runoff management facilities and features that would result in improved effluent quality and urban runoff quality, which in turn would result in improved water quality along the beaches and in surface waters. Because the treatment plant improvements and urban runoff management features are integral to the IRP alternatives, further discussion of these benefits would be included in the EIR.

The IRP alternatives would utilize urban runoff for groundwater recharge, which could affect groundwater quality, and such impacts would be discussed in the EIR.

IRP Alternative 1 would increase Hyperion's capacity by 50 mgd, which would result in increased effluent being discharged to the Santa Monica Bay via the 5-mile outfall. The increased effluent discharge could adversely affect marine water quality in and around the outfall, depending on the initial dilution of the effluent. Such impacts would be evaluated in the EIR.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

None of the IRP alternatives include the creation of new housing. No further analysis is recommended.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives include various runoff management features, some of which are likely to occur in flood hazard areas. However, because the runoff components of the IRP alternatives would reduce the amount of runoff generated or would manage runoff in a manner that reduces the conveyance of runoff to streets and storm drains, the IRP alternatives would result in improvements in flood hazards and conditions. No further analysis is recommended.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would include improvements at Tillman, which is located in the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin upstream of the Sepulveda Dam. The process and treatment capacity improvements at the plant would occur entirely within Tillman's bermed area and would not affect flood storage capacity or affect the integrity of the Sepulveda Dam. However, the wet weather storage tank at Tillman, if implemented, would be constructed outside of the bermed area between Tillman and the Sepulveda Dam. The EIR will discuss potential flood-related impacts from the wet weather storage option.

Some recycled water pipelines may be constructed within the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin. These structures would be constructed underground during non-flood seasons and would not affect storage capacity within the basin. No further analysis is recommended.

Aside from Tillman, the IRP alternatives would not involve facilities that could affect an existing dam or levee. In addition, the IRP alternatives would result in improvements to flood hazard conditions related to in-site management of runoff (see Checklist Item 8h) above). No further analysis is recommended.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Some of the components of the IRP alternatives would be constructed in close proximity to the ocean; however, none of the facilities would result change or increase the risk of inundation by tsunami. Although there are several water bodies, mountains, and hills in and

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

around the City, none of the IRP alternatives would involve facilities that could change or increase the risk of inundation by seiche or mudflows.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Major facility components of the IRP alternatives include expansions at existing treatment plants and installation of large diameter wastewater collection system projects beneath the ground surface. Other facilities include small urban runoff plants, recycled water distribution pipelines, and improvements on individual parcels. The IRP alternatives do not include facilities that could physically divide an established community. No further analysis is recommended.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The components of the IRP alternatives that would be implemented on parcels (as opposed to easements, streets, and other publicly-owned rights-of-way) that require property acquisitions, may conflict with existing zoning. In addition, some of the IRP components would be implemented within the coastal zone and/or within local coastal program areas. The potential for the IRP alternatives to conflict with zoning, general plans, local coastal programs, and other applicable land use plans would be evaluated in the EIR.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

There are no known habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that would be affected by the IRP alternatives. However, there are numerous plans and studies concerning the Los Angeles River, which the IRP alternatives would affect. The EIR would discuss the applicable plan and studies concerning the LA River and assess compatibility of the IRP alternatives to those plans.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP Project area is largely urbanized and is generally not used for mineral extraction. However, the Hansen Dam area is mined for rock and aggregate material. The IRP alternatives would utilize runoff for groundwater recharge, primarily through existing spreading grounds. However, new spreading grounds may be required by the IRP alternatives if existing spreading grounds cannot accommodate the runoff amounts. Much of the land in the eastern San Fernando Valley suitable for spreading grounds is also suitable for aggregate mining. As such, the EIR would discuss the potential for the IRP alternatives to affect the availability of mineral resources.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See Checklist Item 10a) above.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives have the potential to result in elevated noise levels from both construction and operation.

Construction of the various IRP facilities would result in temporary noise increases, primarily from construction equipment and associated activities. The majority of construction would occur during daytime hours; however, some facilities may require night construction, which could affect nearby receptors during sensitive hours. Night construction would most likely occur for sewer projects (NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS). The City of Los Angeles has a noise ordinance that governs construction noise and night construction. The EIR will evaluate potential noise impacts of constructing the IRP alternatives, as well as discuss the noise ordinances of the City of Los Angeles and other jurisdictions such as the City of Burbank, City of El Segundo, and the City of Glendale.

Operation of the IRP facilities also has the potential to result in elevated noise levels. At Hyperion, digester and activated sludge facilities would produce elevated noise levels, as would additional truck trips for supplies and to haul biosolids. In addition, existing flares at Hyperion for burning excess digester gas could have to be operated more frequently and

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

therefore result in increased noise levels. Currently, decibel limits at the fence line of Hyperion are in effect. The EIR will evaluate potential noise impacts related to the expansion of Hyperion under the IRP alternatives.

In addition, Tillman is located in the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin, which is also used for recreation. The EIR will evaluate the potential noise impacts of Tillman improvements on recreational uses in the basin.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives have the potential to result in excessive groundborne noise and vibration levels from both construction and operation.

Groundborne noise and vibration could be generated from construction of the sewer and pipeline components of the IRP alternatives. The sewers (NEIS II, GBIS, and VSLIS) may be constructed using tunneling methods, jacking or micro-tunneling, and/or open trench methods. Tunneling methods involve the use of rail cars, which may produce vibrations and groundborne noise as the rail cars travel along the rails. Jacking and micro tunneling could generate groundborne vibration and noise under some conditions as the machine moves forward. Open trench construction could result in the generation of groundborne vibrations and noise if vibratory methods are used to install shoring or if pile driving is used. The EIR will evaluate potential groundborne noise and vibration impacts related to the construction of the IRP alternatives.

There is a potential for the operation of the expansion of Hyperion to result in the generation of groundborne noise and vibration from more frequent operation of the flares. Based on past experience, the flares can generate groundborne vibrations when the flares are operated above a certain level. The IRP EIR will evaluate potential groundborne vibration and noise impacts related to operation of the flares.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response to Checklist Item 11. a) above.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See response to Checklist Item 11. a) above.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would involve increased digester capacity at Hyperion, which is located within 2 miles of the Los Angeles International airport, but outside its land use plan area. Residents near Hyperion are also exposed to flight noise from aircraft as they take off and land at LAX. Tillman is located within 2 miles of the Van Nuys airport but outside its land use plan area. Residential areas in the outer vicinity of Tillman are located to the north across Victory Boulevard and to the east across the Sepulveda Dam.

Noise from Tillman is expected to have a minimal effect, if any, on the ambient noise levels in these residential areas due to attenuation from distance and obstructions. This will be confirmed in the EIR.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would include facilities that could be located within 2 miles of a private airport. If an IRP facility is located within the requisite distance, the EIR will evaluate potential noise impacts related to proximity.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The IRP alternatives are intended to address water resource deficiencies in the largely urbanize Los Angeles area. These concerns include meeting existing and proposed discharge and water quality standards, meeting the water needs of the residents, and providing capacity to serve an increasing population. The issues related to IRP and the SCAG projected population growth in the area would be discussed in the EIR.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

Issues	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Some of the components of the IRP facilities could be constructed on parcels currently occupied by residential, commercial, and/or industrial structures. The IRP facilities that have the greatest potential for housing displacements are accessory structures for the sewer projects, such as air treatment facilities, drop structures or shaft sites. In general, the City tries to avoid acquiring residences for such structures, but this is not always possible. The accessory structures are not expected to be numerous, and the IRP alternatives are not expected to displace a substantial number of persons or housing. Nonetheless, the EIR will identify and evaluate the potential housing displacement impacts.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

See Checklist Item 12b) above.

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

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve improvements to the City's water-related infrastructure and would not include a housing component that could directly result in increases in demand for fire protection services. However, construction of some of the IRP components, in particular the sewer and recycled water pipeline facilities, could adversely affect access to fire stations and/or response times. The EIR will discuss the potential for IRP construction to affect the provision of fire protection services.

b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve improvements to the City's water-related infrastructure and would not include a housing component that could directly result in increases in demand for police protection services. However, construction of some of the IRP components, in particular the sewer and recycled water pipeline facilities, could adversely affect access to police stations and/or response times. The EIR will discuss the potential for IRP construction to affect the provision of police protection services.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Because the IRP alternatives would not include a housing component, direct increases in demand for schools or school capacity are not anticipated. However, construction of some of the IRP components, in particular the sewer and recycled water pipeline facilities, could adversely affect access to or pedestrian routes to and from schools. The EIR will discuss the potential for IRP construction to affect schools.

d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would not include a housing component that could directly result in increases in demand for parks or recreational facilities. However, construction of some of the IRP components could adversely affect access to, or activities that occur at, such facilities. Tillman improvements have the potential to affect other recreational activities within the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin. The wet weather storage facility, if implemented, would occur outside the bermed area in what is currently being used as a cricket field. Sewers and pipelines, as well as urban runoff facilities have to potential to temporarily affect access to or activities at parks and recreational facilities. The EIR will discuss the potential for IRP construction to affect parks and recreational facilities.

e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would not include a housing component that could directly result in increases in demand for other public services. However, construction of some of the IRP components, in particular the sewer and recycled water pipeline facilities, could adversely affect access to other governmental or public services located in the vicinity of such components. The EIR will discuss the potential for IRP construction to affect other public facilities.

14. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Checklist Item 13d) above.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See Checklist Item 13d) above.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Operation of the IRP alternatives has the potential to adversely affect traffic in and around the treatment plant expansions. Hyperion, in particular, could result in significant traffic impacts due because of relative size of the expansion and because biosolids handling would be expanded.

Construction of the IRP facilities could also adversely affect local traffic conditions in the vicinity of construction staging areas, street construction, and access shafts. Sewer and pipeline construction is likely to result in a temporary reduction in the number of travel lanes along the route. The EIR will discuss the anticipated operational and construction-related impacts of the IRP alternatives.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The EIR will discuss potential impacts to designated roads listed in the congestion management plan that could result from project operation or construction.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve improvements to the City's water-related infrastructure and are not expected to affect air travel patterns or demand for air travel. No further analysis is recommended.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would involve construction in streets and public rights-of-way, which could temporarily pose safety hazards to motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists. The EIR would evaluate the potential travel-related safety hazards of the IRP alternatives.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

See Checklist Items 13a) and 13b) above.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives would involve construction in streets and public rights-of-way, which could temporarily reduce the amount of on-street parking. In addition, improvements at Hyperion could affect parking onsite. The EIR would evaluate the potential of the IRP alternatives to affect parking supply.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve improvements to the City's water-related infrastructure and are not expected to affect or conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies. However, the IRP alternatives would involve construction in streets and public rights-of-way, which could temporarily require detouring or elimination of bike lanes. The EIR would evaluate the potential of the IRP alternatives to affect bike lanes.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The IRP alternatives included facility improvements that would meet wastewater treatment requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve expansion of wastewater facilities and the associated environmental effects would be evaluated in the EIR.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives involve expansion of stormwater and urban runoff management facilities and the associated environmental effects would be evaluated in the EIR. Overall, the long-term effects of the IRP alternatives are expected to be beneficial, as the IRP alternatives would result in cleaner urban runoff and beach conditions along the Santa Monica Bay.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternates include varying levels of non-potable recycled water reuse. The anticipated levels of recycled water reuse is needed by the City's Department of Water and Power to help meet the future water demands projected for Los Angeles. As such, the IRP alternatives play an integral part of meeting the future water needs of the residents.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The IRP alternatives would provide the conveyance and treatment capacity to safely accommodate projected needs, based on population projects for the area by the Southern California Association of Governments. No further analysis is recommended.

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction of IRP facilities is expected to result in the net export of soil, which is typically utilized as landfill cover or utilized as fill by other projects. Potential impacts to landfill capacity from the IRP alternatives would be discussed in the EIR.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The IRP facilities would be implemented over the next 20 years or more. Contractors would construct many of the facilities. Standard City practices and standard provisions in City construction contracts require compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including those related to solid waste. No further analysis is recommended.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction and/or operation of the IRP alternatives have the potential to reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species and eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory.

The IRP alternatives also have the potential to degrade the environment related to:

- Aesthetics (views)
- Air Quality,
- Biological Resources,
- Cultural Resources,
- Geology & Soils,
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials,
- Hydrology & water Quality,
- Land Use and Planning,
- Mineral Resources
- Noise & Vibration,
- Population and Housing,
- Public Services,

Integrated Resources Plan: Initial Study Checklist

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

- Recreation,
- Transportation, and
- Utilities and Service Systems

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction and operation of the IRP alternatives would result in impacts that are individually limited, but may be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with other projects. The EIR will discuss the anticipated cumulative impacts of the IRP alternatives.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The IRP alternatives have the potential to result in substantial adverse direct or indirect impacts to humans in the following areas:

- Air Quality,
- Geology & Soils,
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials,
- Hydrology & water Quality,
- Noise & Vibration,
- Public Services, and
- Transportation.

REFERENCES

Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Northeast Interceptor Sewer, City of Los Angeles, June 2000.

Encino-Tarzana Community Plan, City of Los Angeles, February 9, 2000.

Integrated Resources Plan, Volume 4 – Alternatives Development and Analysis, CH:CDM, July, 2004

Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan, A part of the Los Angeles General Plans, Updated May 2001.

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Guidelines, California Dept of Conservation, Division of and Resource Protection, <http://www.consrv.ca.gov>.

Transportation Element of the General Plan. City of Los Angeles, June 1998.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Natural Resources Group, April 2004.



