To: **Interested Persons, Agencies, and Organizations**

Subject: **Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report**

Project Title: **Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project**

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is the Lead Agency and will prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex (SLRC) Storage Replacement Project. LADWP proposes to remove Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs from direct service to the LADWP water distribution system. Water storage currently provided by the SLRC would be replaced by a 110 million gallon (MG) underground covered storage reservoir at the former Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG site). The new storage reservoir would be accompanied by a 4-megawatt (MW) hydroelectric power generation facility at or near the HWSG site to capture energy from the water pressure coming into the reservoir. The addition of a regulating station and a new bypass pipeline through Silver Lake Reservoir would convey water to existing service areas. Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs would no longer be used for drinking water storage. Construction of the SLRC Storage Replacement Project is anticipated to require up to 6 years to complete.

As a related but separate project, the proposed SLRC Storage Replacement Project would also provide beneficial uses at the HWSG site, potentially including natural space/parkland on top of the reservoir for passive recreation, and establishment of wetlands and/or a natural ecosystem consisting of native vegetation on the remainder of the HWSG site. This project will be initiated by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, with the City of Los Angeles being the local sponsor. Construction of HWSG site enhancements may be initiated simultaneously to construction of the 110-MG buried reservoir, but will likely be completed following construction of the water and power facilities proposed on the HWSG site.

In conjunction with the development of the proposed project, it is necessary to address the potential adverse effects of the proposed project on the environment. This Notice of Preparation (NOP) serves two purposes: to solicit information on the scope of the environmental analysis for the proposed project and to notify the public that LADWP will prepare a Draft EIR to further assess potential adverse environmental impacts that may result from implementing the proposed project. The Draft EIR will discuss all topical content required by CEQA and will focus, as appropriate, on the environmental impacts determined to be potentially significant through the NOP process.

LADWP invites the views of your agency or organization regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR, including any information that would be necessary to meet any statutory responsibilities related to the proposed project. If the proposed project has no bearing on you or your organization, no action on your part is necessary. The project location is shown in the attached figure, and a description of the proposed project and potential environmental impacts are in the attached Project Description (Attachment A) and Initial Study (Attachment B).

Comments focusing on your area of expertise, your agency's area of jurisdiction, or issues relative to the environmental analysis should be addressed to Mr. Paul Liu at 111 North Hope Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90051. Comments may also be sent by FAX to (213) 367-0928 or by e-mail to paul.liu@LADWP.com. Due to time limits imposed by state law, your response must be received at the above address no later than **5:00 p.m.** on **September 24, 2003**. Please include the name and phone number of the contact person for your agency or organization.

The public is invited to attend a public scoping meeting at the date and time listed below. The scoping process will be used to focus EIR discussion on significant issues. All comments received at this meeting will be considered during the preparation of the EIR.

Date: September 17, 2003

Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Location: Friendship Hall
3201 Riverside Drive
Los Angeles, California 90027

Date: August 22, 2003

Signature: Glenn P. Singley

Glenn Singley, Director
Water Planning and Project Management

LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
111 North Hope Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, California 90051

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project Title:

Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project

Project Location:

Headworks Spreading Grounds, located at 6001 West Forest Lawn Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90068, and Silver Lake Reservoir Complex, located at 2700 Tesla Avenue, Silver Lake, CA 90026.

Description of Nature, Purpose, and Beneficiaries of Project:

To meet state and federal water quality regulations, LADWP proposes to remove Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs from direct service to the LADWP water distribution system. Water storage currently provided by the SLRC would be replaced by a 110-million-gallon (MG) underground covered storage reservoir at the former Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG site). The new storage reservoir would be accompanied by a 4-megawatt (MW) hydroelectric power generating facility at or near the HWSG site to capture energy from the water pressure coming into the reservoir. The addition of a regulating station and a new bypass pipeline through or around Silver Lake Reservoir would convey water to existing service areas, and operation of Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs as drinking water storage facilities would change. Construction of the SLRC Storage Replacement Project is anticipated to require up to 6 years to complete.

Lead Agency:	**Division:**
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Water Planning and Project Management

Initial Study and All Supporting Documentation Are Available at:	**or by calling:**	**or by accessing:**
LADWP Headquarters 111 North Hope Street, Room 1348 Los Angeles, CA 90051	(213) 367-0761	http://www.ladwp.com/ceqa/

Initial Study Review Period:

August 25, 2003 – September 24, 2003

Contact Person:	**Phone Number:**
Paul Liu	(213) 367-0761

Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15082(a), 15103, and 15375

Notice of Preparation Attachment A

Description of the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project

Project Purpose and Need

Several recent state and federal water quality regulations require that Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) make changes to its open reservoir system. The two regulations of concern are the Stage 2 Disinfection By-Products Rule (S2DBR) and the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR). In order to meet these two regulations along with the previous Surface Water Treatment Rule (1989), LADWP is required to cover or remove from service its 10 open-air distribution reservoirs and covert its system to chloramines. The S2DBR addresses chlorination by-products such as trihalomethanes (THMs) and halo acetic acids (HAAs). Chlorine is effective at treating algae in open reservoirs such as Silver Lake and Ivanhoe, but it also reacts with naturally occurring organic materials that produce THMs and HAAs. The higher the level of algae and other organic material in the reservoirs, the greater the potential of forming THMs and HAAs. Both compounds are Cancer Group B carcinogens (shown to cause cancer in laboratory animals). The LT2ESWTR requires that all existing open finished water reservoirs be covered or meet 99.99 percent virus kill before the water enters the distribution system. LADWP has investigated several onsite and offsite alternatives to functionally replace the open storage capacity at Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs and has determined that the Proposed Project is the best alternative from a cost, construction, and maintenance perspective.

Project Description

The Proposed Project would remove Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs (850 million-gallons total) from direct service to the LADWP water distribution system. Water storage currently provided by the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex (SLRC) would be replaced by a 110-million-gallon (MG) underground covered storage reservoir at the former Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG site) along with additional Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) connections and other pipelines being constructed as part of our Trunk Line Replacement Program. The new storage reservoir would be accompanied by a 4-megawatt (MW) hydroelectric power generating facility at or near the HWSG site to capture energy from the water pressure coming into the reservoir. The addition of a regulating station and a new bypass pipeline through Silver Lake Reservoir would convey water delivery flow to existing service areas. Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs would no

longer be used for drinking water storage. Construction of the SLRC Storage Replacement Project is anticipated to require up to 6 years to complete. The project location and setting are described below, as is each element of the Proposed Project.

As a related but separate project, the proposed SLRC Storage Replacement Project would also provide beneficial uses at the HWSG site, potentially including natural space/parkland, and establishment of wetlands and/or a natural ecosystem on the remainder of the HWSG site. This project will be initiated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, with the City of Los Angeles being the local sponsor. Construction of HWSG site enhancements may be initiated simultaneously to construction of the 110-MG buried reservoir, but will likely be completed following construction of the water and power facilities proposed on the HWSG site.

Project Location

The Proposed Project would be located at the HWSG and at the SLRC. The HWSG site consists of 43-acres of undeveloped land adjacent to the Los Angeles River and between the City of Burbank and Griffith Park. It is bounded on the north by the Los Angeles River and the 134 Freeway, and on the east and south by Forest Lawn Drive. The property is owned by the City of Los Angeles and LADWP retains an easement over the entire property.

The SLRC is located in the community of Silver Lake and consists of LADWP-owned Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs and related facilities. Silver Lake is five miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles and just east of Griffith Park.

General Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

Land use immediately adjacent to the HWSG site is composed of the Los Angeles River (LA River), State Highway 134, parks, and cemeteries. The HWSG site is fronted on the south by the Mount Zion and Forest Lawn Cemeteries. Griffith Park lies to the southeast of the site. Immediately north of the site is the LA River channel, along with the transportation corridor for the 134 Freeway. To the north of the freeway are residential neighborhoods; north and west of the site are the extensive complexes of NBC Studios, Disney Studios, and Warner Brothers Studios. To the northeast of the site is the Los Angeles Equestrian Center, and just east of the site is Traveltown Museum in Griffith Park.

The community of Silver Lake surrounding the SLRC is generally bordered by Interstate 5 to the north, the Glendale Freeway and Glendale Boulevard to the east, Sunset Boulevard to the south, and Griffith Park Boulevard to the west. Land use immediately surrounding SLRC is almost exclusively residential. Commercial uses in the immediate vicinity are primarily limited to the major cross streets, including Silver Lake, Sunset, and Glendale Boulevards, and Rowena Avenue.

110-MG Underground Storage Reservoir

LADWP would construct a 110-MG buried reservoir at the HWSG site occupying approximately 15.5-acres and would be located on the east side of the HWSG site. Following construction, a 15-acre natural space or park would be created on top of the reservoir for passive recreation and a scenic overlook into the remaining portion of the HWSG site.

4-MW Hydroelectric Power Generating Facility

To capitalize on a green power opportunity and reduce the water pressure coming into the new storage reservoir, LADWP would construct a 4-MW hydroelectric power generating facility at or near the HWSG site. The hydroelectric facility would require an above- or below-ground powerhouse to house the turbine/generator and associated controls and instrumentation. The facility would also require an outdoor substation and backup emergency generator, and would be connected to the existing 35-kilovolt (kV) LADWP distribution system.

Bypass Pipeline and Regulating Station at SLRC

A bypass line is also needed to convey the water through the Silver Lake Complex to the rest of the system. This line would be approximately 3,200 feet of 72-inch diameter pipe installed at the bottom of Silver Lake Reservoir, connecting to an existing 60-inch diameter pipeline in the reservoir. Silver Lake Reservoir would be drained for approximately one year during construction \and refilled afterwards. In addition, 850 feet of 72-inch diameter pipeline would be installed to connect the new bypass pipeline with the new River Supply Conduit (RSC) at Tesla Avenue; this portion of pipeline would be installed by tunneling methods.

A regulating station to control water pressure would be located at the SLRC just south of the Silver Lake Reservoir dam on West Silver Lake Drive. The purpose of the regulating station is to reduce excess pressure from the Headworks Reservoir before entering the distribution system. The station would be approximately 45-feet long by 25-feet wide, buried, with top access.

Changed Operation of Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs

Because Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs at SLRC would no longer be used for water supply, day-to-day operations would change. Specifically, the water currently flowing into Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs would bypass SLRC as described in the above paragraphs.

The SLRC facility and property would be maintained consistent with the appearance and condition that LADWP has provided at this facility for several years. No other significant changes at the SLRC facility are being anticipated by LADWP at this time.

Attachment B

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST
(Article IV – City CEQA Guidelines)

LEAD CITY AGENCY	**COUNCIL DISTRICT**	**DATE**
City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power 111 North Hope Street, Room 1044 Los Angeles, CA 90012	IV and XIII	August 22, 2003

PROJECT TITLE/NO.	**CASE NO.**
Silver Lake Reservoir Complex Storage Replacement Project	YYMMDD-X

PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	☐ DOES have significant changes from previous actions. ☒ DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions
NA	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In order to meet State and federal water quality regulations, LADWP proposes to remove Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs from direct service to the LADWP water distribution system. Water storage currently provided by the SLRC would be replaced by a 110 million gallon (MG) buried storage reservoir at the former Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG site). The new storage reservoir would be accompanied by a 4-megawatt (MW) hydroelectric power generating facility at or near the HWSG site to capture energy from the water pressure coming into the reservoir. The addition of a regulating station and a new bypass pipeline through Silver Lake Reservoir would convey water delivery flow to existing service areas, and operation of Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs as drinking water storage facilities would change. Construction of the SLRC Storage Replacement Project is anticipated to require up to six years to complete. Please refer to Attachment A for more information.

PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project would be located at the Headworks Spreading Grounds (HWSG) and at the Silver Lake Reservoir Complex (SLRC). The HWSG site consists of 43 acres of undeveloped land adjacent to the Los Angeles River and between the City of Burbank and Griffith Park. It is bounded on the north by the Los Angeles River and the 134 Freeway, and on the east and south by Forest Lawn Drive. The property is owned by the City of Los Angeles and the LADWP retains an easement over the entire property. The SLRC is located in the community of Silver Lake and consists of LADWP-owned Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs. Silver Lake is five miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles and just east of Griffith Park.

PLANNING DISTRICT	**STATUS**
SLRC – Silver Lake-Echo Park Headworks - Hollywood	☐ PRELIMINARY ☒ PROPOSED _____ ☐ ADOPTED date

EXISTING ZONING SLRC - [Q] OS-1XL HWSG - OS-1XL	**MAX. DENSITY ZONING** SLRC - Open Space HWSG - Open Space	☒ DOES conform to plan
PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE SLRC - Open Space HWSG – Open Space	**MAX. DENSITY PLAN** SLRC - Open Space HWSG – Open Space	☐ DOES NOT conform to plan
SURROUNDING LAND USES Recreation, water course, transportation corridor, commercial, residential.	**PROJECT DENSITY** SLRC - Open Space HWSG - Open Space	☐ No district plan

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.

☒	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture Resources	☒	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Geology/Soils
☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology/Water Quality	☐	Land Use/Planning
☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Noise	☐	Population/Housing
☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation	☒	Transportation/Traffic
☐	Utilities/Service Systems	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Determination: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier

analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Glenn C. Singley
Signature

8/22/03
Date

Glenn C. Singley
Printed Name

Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power
For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

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

3) Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

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

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The HWSG site is not a scenic vista or located in the vicinity of a state scenic highway. While LADWP holds an all-encompassing easement for the construction and operation of water facilities at the site, the property is bounded by the Los Angeles River on the north and extensive parkland in Griffith Park to the southeast. In addition, Mount Zion and Forest Lawn Cemeteries are located to the south and southwest of the site, respectively. State Highway 134 also provides views of the HWSG site. The nature of these surrounding land uses are associated with frequent public use and views of the HWSG site from these areas would potentially be impacted through the introduction of project facilities (primarily the proposed buried storage reservoir). Potential impacts to the existing visual character of the HWSG site could be mitigated through the use of vegetative screening.

The SLRC is considered a local scenic resource and adverse changes resulting from construction activities for the regulating station and/or bypass pipeline or changed operation of Silver Lake and Ivanhoe Reservoirs would be considered significant. The Draft EIR for the Proposed Project will include a detailed evaluation of potential aesthetics impacts.

II. 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 Dept. 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	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The HWSG site is located in a highly developed portion of Los Angeles County adjacent to the cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Universal City, with little open space for cultivation. Surrounding land uses include a major transportation corridor (State Highway 134 and associated on-ramps), Griffith Park, Mount Zion and Forest Lawn Cemeteries. No impacts to agricultural lands including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would occur. The SLRC is owned by LADWP and does not contain any agricultural lands. Adjacent land is highly urbanized.

III. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Draft EIR will include an air quality analysis to determine the significance of short-term air quality impacts associated with project construction.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Vegetation on the HWSG site consists of native and non-native grasses and trees. Wildlife species onsite consists of native and exotic species adapted to urban habitats. Vegetation at the SLRC consists of primarily landscaped and ornamental vegetation. Wildlife at the site consists of species adapted to an urban environment. The Proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The Draft EIR will include a biological resources survey to determine if sensitive resources will be adversely affected by the Proposed Project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The SLRC and HWSG sites have been previously disturbed by substantial landform and grading improvements associated with existing water resource facilities. The Draft EIR will include an archaeological resources survey to determine if sensitive resources will be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. Mitigation, if needed, will be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

VI. 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.	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The SLRC and HWSG sites have been previously disturbed by substantial landform and grading improvements associated with existing water resource facilities. The Draft EIR will include a geotechnical analysis to determine if the Proposed Project elements would be subject to faulting or other geotechnical hazards. Appropriate mitigation, if needed, will be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

VII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or working in the project area?				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No known contamination is present on the HWSG site, and contamination is unlikely considering the historic land use of the site for infiltration and well pumping. The only present-day source of contamination on the site may be from fertilizer and pesticide application on the upslope cemetery sites. However, any compounds draining onto HWSG from these sites would be expected to be water soluble, and would be transported off the HWSG site with surface flows. The HWSG site is located over the San Fernando Basin (SFB) groundwater basin. Groundwater contamination in the SFB is reported, and the SFB has wells contaminated with TCE and PCE at the Headworks Well Field in the Los Angeles Equestrian Center, which is 762-m (2,500 feet) northeast of HWSG site.

No known contamination is present at the SLRC.

The appropriate records search and field reconnaissance will be conducted for the Draft EIR to confirm the potential for hazardous materials impacts and appropriate mitigation, if needed, will be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	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 which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project purpose is to comply with increasingly more stringent state and federal water quality regulations and specifically addresses protection of drinking water quality by providing a covered drinking water reservoir(s). In this light, the project will have a direct beneficial impact on LADWP drinking water quality.

Potential hydrology/water quality/flooding impacts associated with the project at both the HWSG site and the SLRC will be considered in the design of project facilities. Mitigation, if needed, will be proposed to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The HWSG site is owned by the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, however LADWP holds an all-encompassing easement for the construction and operation of water facilities at the site. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with intended uses of the site and not conflict with any applicable land use plan or policy or applicable conservation plan. The site does not contain residences and the project would therefore not divide an established community. The SLRC is owned by LADWP; proposed activities at the SLRC would be consistent with intended uses of the site.

X. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Draft EIR will include an analysis to determine the mineral composition of the HWSG site and potential for the occurrence of important mineral resources. Potential impacts to mineral resources contained within the site would be mitigated, if necessary, to a less than significant level. The SLRC contains no known mineral resources.

XI. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Draft EIR will include a noise analysis to establish existing noise conditions and determine the significance of short-term noise impacts associated with project construction. Mitigation, if needed, will be proposed to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

XII. 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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project provides additional protection of existing drinking water supplies in accordance with increasingly more stringent state and federal regulations, through the construction of covered reservoir(s) and does not involve the acquisition of additional water supplies or higher quality water. Therefore, no direct or indirect impact to population growth would occur. The project does not involve the displacement of existing housing or populations and would not require construction of replacement housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project provides additional protection of existing drinking water supplies in accordance with increasingly more stringent state and federal regulations, through the construction of covered reservoir(s) and does not involve the acquisition of additional water supplies or higher quality water. Therefore no significant direct or indirect impact to population growth would occur and increases in public services including fire and police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities would not occur. The permanent increase in staff required to operate the proposed facilities would total less than 20 people and would not significantly affect public services.

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Recreation areas adjacent to the HWSG site include the extensive parkland in Griffith Park to the southeast. Other recreational facilities in the area include the Los Angeles Equestrian Center to the northeast of the site across the LA River and the 134 Freeway, and the Traveltown Museum to the east. The Proposed Project would not be anticipated to increase use of these recreational facilities. Following construction of the buried storage reservoir at the HWSG site, a 15-acre natural space or park would be created on top of the reservoir for passive recreation and a scenic overlook into the remaining portion of the HWSG site. This recreational enhancements would not be considered to have an adverse effect on the environment or result in substantial physical deterioration of existing or future recreational facilities, however this will be further discussed in the Draft EIR.

The SLRC is not used for public recreation, and the Proposed Project would not be anticipated to result in increased use of neighborhood parks in the vicinity.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which 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)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial long-term increase in traffic, however, temporary significant impacts to transportation and traffic in the vicinity of the HWSG site and SLRC may occur during project construction. The Draft EIR will include a traffic analysis to determine the significance of short-term traffic impacts associated with project construction.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is intended to provide additional protection of existing drinking water supplies in accordance with increasingly more stringent state and federal regulations, through the construction of covered reservoir(s), and does not involve the acquisition of additional water supplies or higher quality water. Therefore, no direct or indirect impact to population growth would occur and increased utilities or service systems would not be required.

Construction of the project is not anticipated to produce construction debris or solid waste in excess of existing landfill capacities and disposal of these materials will comply with all applicable federal, state, and local policies and regulations.

XVII. 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects)				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐