
SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 - Purpose

This DEIR is prepared in accordance with CEQA to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the MacArthur Park Improvements Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007121152). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

The purpose of this DEIR is to disclose information to the public and decision makers about the potential environment effects of a Proposed Project. This DEIR does not recommend either approval or denial of a Proposed Project; rather, it is intended to provide a source of independent and impartial analysis of the foreseeable environmental impacts of a proposed course of action. This DEIR describes the Proposed Project, analyzes its environmental effects, and discusses reasonable alternatives that would avoid, reduce, or minimize environmental impacts. The Los Angeles Board of Recreation and Parks Commissioners will consider the information presented in this document in making an informed decision regarding the approval, conditions of approval, or denial of the Proposed Project.

2.2 - Project Summary

2.2.1 - Project Location

The Proposed Project is located within MacArthur Park, which is a little over a mile west of downtown Los Angeles. The park is bounded by Alvarado Street on the southeast, W. 6th Street on the northeast, S. Park View Drive on the northwest, and W. 7th Street on the southwest – Wilshire Boulevard bisects the park in a northwest-southeast direction.

2.2.2 - Project Objectives

The objectives of the Proposed Project are to:

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

2.2.3 - Project Description

The City Recreation and Parks Department proposes the following improvements to MacArthur Park:

Component	Size/Area	General Comments
Reconstruct Soccer Field	Approx. 37,320 SF	Install artificial turf for year-round use, longevity, and reduced maintenance costs
Install New Field and Security Lighting	NA	Install state-of-the-art lighting for extended use and improve safety at dusk and nighttime – soccer field to have 6 new poles with a maximum height of 40 feet and the security lighting will have 8 new poles with a maximum height of 30 feet.
Reconstruct Landscaping And Hardscape Areas	Approx. 20,000 SF	Relocate existing and/or install new landscaping, walkways, etc. to support reconstruction of the soccer field and improve security
Reconstruct existing and construct new Children’s Play Areas	Approx. 2,710 SF	Reconstruct existing and construct new children’s play areas, install equipment, and support facilities for children and parents (e.g., benches, etc.) including new exercise area near soccer field.
Renovate Signal Building	Approx. 14,500 SF	Make needed safety improvements while maintaining historical design elements
Replace Boat House	Approx. 2,100 SF	Make needed safety and user improvements while maintaining existing design elements
Install historical monument	NA	Install an historical monument to honor Oscar Romero, an El Salvadorean catholic priest killed in 1980.
SF = square feet Source: Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2007.		

2.3 - Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The DEIR has identified no environmental issues where, after the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would still result in impacts that cannot be fully reduced to a less than significant level. Since the Proposed Project will not create significant and unavoidable impacts, the Los Angeles Parks Commission is not required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

2.4 - Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the Proposed Project considered in Section 5, Alternatives.

2.4.1 - No Project – No Improvements Alternative

Under the No Project –No Improvements Alternative, the park site would remain in its existing condition, and the Proposed Project would not be constructed.

2.4.2 - Alternative 1 – No Soccer Field Improvements

This alternative would eliminate the proposed synthetic turf and lighting to be added to the existing dirt soccer field, which would eliminate potential controversy about installation of these improvements and associated impacts from construction (e.g., dust, vehicular emissions, etc.).

2.4.3 - Alternative 2 – No Boathouse Improvements

This alternative would eliminate planned replacement of the Boathouse Building, which would reduce temporary impacts related to air pollutant emissions during demolition and reconstruction.

2.4.4 - Alternative Sites

This alternative would relocate the planned improvements to other park facilities, which might reduce the significance of the impact or impacts based on conditions specific to MacArthur Park.

2.5 - Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects. Some of these issues include:

- The choice of synthetic turf versus natural turf for renovation of the soccer field;
- The need for field lighting on the renovated soccer field;
- Historical treatment of the planned improvements to the Signal building; and
- Relocation or replacement of historical landscaping within the park.

A NOP for the Proposed Project was issued on August 9, 2007 but was not filed with the State Clearinghouse. Therefore, a second NOP was filed with the state on December 27, 2007. The NOP described the development concept for the project and range of issues to be addressed in the EIR. It was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period that extended from December 28, 2007 through January 28, 2008. The NOP identified the need to evaluate potential impacts on the environment in the following topical areas:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- Air Quality;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use;
- Noise;
- Population and Housing;
- Public Services;
- Recreation;
- Transportation;
- Utility Systems;
- Agriculture; and
- Mineral Resources.

2.5.1 - Disagreement Among Experts

This EIR contains substantial evidence to support all the conclusions presented herein. It is possible that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions, although the City of Los Angeles is not aware of any disputed conclusions at the time of this writing. Both the CEQA Guidelines and case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts.

Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the lead agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the Proposed Project.

2.5.2 - Potentially Controversial Issues

Below are a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this DEIR.

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- Construction and Operational Air Emissions;
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change;
- Construction and Operational Noise;
- Public Safety;
- Public Services;
- Biological Resources; and
- Historical Resources.

It is also possible that evidence will be presented during the 45-day statutory DEIR public review period that may create disagreement. Decision makers would consider this evidence during the public hearing process. In rendering a decision on a project where there is disagreement among experts, the decision makers are not obligated to select the most environmentally preferable viewpoint. Decision makers are vested with the ability to choose whatever viewpoint is preferable and need not resolve a dispute among experts. In their proceedings, decision makers must consider comments received concerning the adequacy of the DEIR and address any objections raised in these comments. However, decision makers are not obligated to follow any directives, recommendations, or suggestions presented in comments on the DEIR, and can certify the Final EIR without needing to resolve disagreements among experts.

2.6 - Public Review of the Draft EIR

The DEIR will be available for public review for the statutory 45-day review period beginning on or about February 28, 2008. The document will be available for public review at the following locations:

City of Los Angeles
Recreation and Parks Department
1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Hours: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday - Friday

Los Angeles Central Library
630 W. 5th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Hours: 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. (Mon-Th). 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. (Fri-Sat), 1-5 p.m. (Sun)

Felipe de Neve Branch Library
2820 W. 6th Street
Los Angeles, 90057
(213) 384-7676
Mon. 10:00 – 8:00, Tue. 12– 8:00,
Wed. 10:00– 8:00, Thu. 12– 8:00, Fri. 10:00
– 6:00, Sat. 10:00– 6:00, Sun. CLOSED

During the 45-day review period, agency representatives and members of the public will be able to submit written comments on the DEIR to the address provided below:

Paul Davis, Project Manager
City of Los Angeles
Recreation and Parks Department
1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone: (213) 928-9137
Fax: (213) 928-9130
Email: Paul.J.Davis@lacity.org

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word format is encouraged. After the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised in the comments will be prepared and made available for review by the public agencies that submitted comments for a minimum of 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the Final EIR will be considered for certification by the Los Angeles Board of Recreations and Parks Commissioners. The DEIR, comments on and responses to the DEIR, the Final SEIR, and findings will be included as part of the environmental record for consideration and certification by the City of Los Angeles for the Proposed Project.

2.7 - Executive Summary Matrix

Table 2-1 below summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the Proposed Project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussion for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this DEIR. Table 2-1 is included in the DEIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1) and summarizes the analysis conducted in Sections 4.1 through 4.10 in the DEIR. Section 7 of the DEIR explains why certain environmental topics or issues within specific topics had no potential to create significant impacts and so were not analyzed further in the EIR (i.e., in Section 4), and, therefore, do not appear in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: Executive Summary Matrix

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.1 – Aesthetics, Light, And Glare		
Impact AES-1: The Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AES-2: The project would not substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.	MM AES-2a. Signal Building historical treatment. MM AES-2b. Boat House Building historical consideration. MM AES-2c. Evaluation of historical landscaping prior to relocation. MM AES-2d. Paint light poles and fixtures green to blend into park.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact AES-3: Development of the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AES-4: The Proposed Project would create new sources of substantial light or glare that may adversely affect day or nighttime views.	MM AES-4a. “Tune” soccer field lights to minimize offsite spillover. MM AES-4b. Develop and publish schedule for soccer field lighting. MM AES-4c. Review design of Boathouse and Signal Buildings so no reflective surfaces create offsite glare.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.2 - Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: The Proposed Project would result in substantial emissions of criteria pollutants during construction.	MM AIR-1a. Grading and construction “best management practices” including watering, track-out prevention, covering soil trucks, replanting, etc. MM AIR-1b. Construction Traffic Control Plan (if needed). MM AIR-1c. Maintain equipment in offsite location. MM AIR-1d. Limit idling to 5 minutes or less. MM AIR-1e. Provide electrical hookups to eliminate gas powered generators.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact AIR-2: Construction activities would not expose construction workers or the public to substantial amounts of toxic air pollutants.	AIR-1a though 1e will help reduce potential - no additional mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-3: The Proposed Project would result in substantial emissions of criteria pollutants during operations.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-4: The Proposed Project would not create carbon monoxide hot spots that would exceed federal or State concentration standards.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-5: Because operational emissions would exceed regional thresholds, the Proposed Project would have a significant cumulative impact on air quality.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-6: The Proposed Project would be inconsistent with the projections contained in the SCAQMD AMQP.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-7: The Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-8: The Proposed Project would not generate objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-9: Emissions from the Proposed Project would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions.	MM AIR-9a. Install energy efficient lighting and electronic controls MM AIR-9b. Recycle at least 50 percent of construction waste. MM AIR-9c. Use drought tolerant landscaping where possible. MM AIR-9d. Install irrigation controllers to limit water use. MM AIR-9e. Apply LEED requirements except where it conflicts with historical preservation requirements.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.3 - Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: Special status wildlife species may be adversely affected by project construction activities.	MM BIO-1. Nesting bird survey and restrictions if found.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact BIO-2: The Proposed Project would not adversely affect riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-3: The Proposed Project would not adversely affect wetlands.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-4: Development of the Proposed Project would not result in adverse impacts to wildlife movement.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-5: The Proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances related to the protection of biological resources.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No mitigation is necessary.	No Impact.
Section 4.4 - Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities associated with the Proposed Project have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources.	MM CUL-1a. Maintain arches of Signal Building. MM CUL-1b. Maintain overall exterior appearance of Signal Building. MM CUL-1c. Maintain appearance of doors, windows, etc. of Signal Bld. MM CUL-1d. Preserve trees and artwork within the park as practical.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.5 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
Impact GEO-1: The Proposed Project would not expose persons or structures to seismic hazards.	MM HYD-1a and HYD-1b in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality. No additional mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact GEO-2: The Proposed Project may result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
Impact GEO-3: The project site contains fill of	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
unknown origin that may be unable to adequately support structures associated with the Proposed Project if left unmitigated.		
Impact GEO-4: The project site contains moderately expansive soils that may create substantial risks to life or property if left unmitigated.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact GEO-5: The project site will not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: The Proposed Project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	MM HAZ-1. Verify hazmat use and potential conflicts prior to work.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: The Proposed Project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, therefore, would not create a potential hazard to the public and the environment.	MM HAZ-2. Conduct surveys for Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs) and Lead-Based Paint (LBP) in Boathouse and Signal Buildings identified for demolition and/or reconstruction – contaminated materials to be remediated by licensed contractors and disposed of in appropriate landfills.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-3: The Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-4: The Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-5: The Proposed Project is 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 the project area.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-6: The Proposed Project is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-7: The Proposed Project 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.	MM HAZ-7. Verify and install fire hydrants if needed for soccer field.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-8: The Proposed Project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving other types of hazards or risks.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-8: The Proposed Project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving other types of hazards or risks (nighttime safety with new lighting system).	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could adversely impact water quality.	MM HYD-1a. Prepare and process a SWPPP prior to grading if disturbance area exceeds one acre. MM HYD-1b. Implement Best Management Practices in all construction areas to minimize runoff into lake or City storm drains.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact HYD-2: Land use activities associated with the Proposed Project could adversely impact water quality.	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HYD-3: The project may substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HYD-4: Development of the Proposed Project would create additional impervious surface coverage and alter existing drainage patterns, potentially leading to downstream flooding or substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite.	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HYD-5: Development of the Proposed Project will not substantially change the amount or direction of runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.8 – Noise		
Impact NOI-1: The Proposed Project would generate substantial construction noise that may adversely impact nearby noise-sensitive land uses.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact NOI-2: Operational vibration associated with the Proposed Project may subject project residents to substantial vibration.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact NOI-3: Operational activities associated with the Proposed Project would not create any substantial offsite noise impacts.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact NOI-4: Project occupants may be exposed to noise levels that exceed normally acceptable standards.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.9 - Public Services		
Impact PSR-1: Development of the Proposed Project may create the potential for increased calls and response times that may result in a need for new or physically altered fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-2: Development of the Proposed Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-5: Development of the Proposed Project would not result in a need for new or physically altered parks in order to maintain acceptable parkland ratios.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.12 – Transportation and Circulation		
Impact TRANS-1: Trips associated with the Proposed Project would substantially degrade short-term roadway or intersection performance.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-2: Trips associated with the Proposed Project would substantially degrade long-term roadway or intersection performance.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-3: The Proposed Project would contribute to deficient freeway operations.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-4: The Proposed Project would not provide adequate off-street parking in accordance with the requirements of the City Development Code.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-5: The Proposed Project may result in traffic hazards from the street layout or project design.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-6: The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-7: The Proposed Project would provide public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian opportunities and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-8: The Proposed Project may create substantial short-term traffic, parking, and vehicular access impacts associated with construction activities.	MM TRANS-8a. Prepare and implement a Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation