Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Spane Park Stormwater Capture Project

SCH No. 2023070443

AUGUST 2023

Prepared for:

CITY OF PARAMOUNT
16400 Colorado Drive
Paramount, California 90723
Contact: John Carver

Prepared by:

DUDEK

2280 Historic Decatur Road Suite 200
San Diego, California 92106
Contact: Alex Hardy

Table of Contents

SECTION **PAGE**

APPENDICES

FIGURES

TABLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
AB	Assembly Bill
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model
AQMP	air quality management plan
BMP	best management practice
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CAP	climate action plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFC	California Fire Code
CH_4	methane
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
City	City of Paramount
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DPM	diesel particulate matter
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
HARP2	Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program Version 2
HRA	health risk assessment
ips	inches per second
IS	initial study
LACM	Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County
L_{eq}	equivalent noise level over a given period
LLAR	Lower Los Angeles River
LST	localized significance threshold
MM	Mitigation Measure
MND	mitigated negative declaration
MT	metric tons
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_x	oxides of nitrogen
O_3	ozone

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
PM_{10}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 10 microns
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	California Public Resources Code
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SB	Senate Bill
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SLF	Sacred Lands File
SR	State Route
SWPPP	stormwater pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TCR	tribal cultural resource
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WMP	Watershed Management Program

1 Introduction

The City of Paramount (City) has prepared this mitigated negative declaration (MND) to assess and disclose the potential impacts on the environment of the Spane Park Stormwater Capture Project (project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000, et. seq). This section of the MND provides information on project background, explains the project's purpose and need, and describes the City's CEQA obligations associated with approving and implementing the project.

1.1 Project Background and Overview

The Lower Los Angeles River (LLAR) Watershed Management Program (WMP) Group identified a suite of watershed control measures and structural best management practices (BMPs) to address the water quality objectives within the LLAR watershed. The WMP Group is a collaborative effort of 10 participating agencies[1] with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System facilities within the subwatersheds of Reach 1 and Reach 2 of the Los Angeles River, Compton Creek, and Rio Hondo. The WMP was developed to implement the requirements of Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Order Nos. R4-2012-0175 and R4-2014-0024 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Nos. CA004001 and CA004003, respectively) on a watershed scale. In addition, elements of this WMP relating to Total Maximum Daily Loads address requirements of California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 2012-0011-DWQ (the California Department of Transportation Stormwater Permit) for those Total Maximum Daily Loads within the watershed area. Potential sites for targeted control measures were identified in the WMP and recommended by the LLAR WMP Group for further evaluation and potential implementation to meet compliance for the watershed.

Spane Park is an active recreational facility maintained by the City (additional information regarding Spane Park is provided in Section 2.1). The park is located within the Los Angeles River Reach 2 subwatershed. Spane Park sits at the bottom of a 1,338-acre drainage area (including jurisdictions of the Cities of Paramount, Downey, and South Gate) consisting of residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation land uses. Stormwater runoff is conveyed through the storm drain network to the project site in Rosecrans Avenue. The drainage area encompasses various jurisdictions, providing benefit to multiple watershed partners.

The project would divert and capture stormwater runoff into a subterranean concrete storage basin proposed beneath the park's turf multi-use field, where it would be treated. Prior to flow into the subsurface storage container, runoff would be directed through a pre-treatment device that would remove trash, sediments, and solids present in the runoff. Stormwater would infiltrate beneath the basin, allowing physical filtration into permeable earth materials, where it would help recharge groundwater. An outflow pipe and filtration pump unit would be installed to accommodate water during periods of heavy storm flow when the reservoir fills to its capacity, treating the water before discharging it into the existing storm drain system in Rosecrans Avenue. This project has the potential to offer runoff storage and water quality benefits for these jurisdictions and can address the additional needs for stormwater management identified to achieve compliance in the WMP.

In addition to the proposed stormwater capture and filtration facility, the City also intends to implement other park improvements as part of this project to benefit community members and the environment. These improvements

[1] The LLAR WMP Group is comprised of 10 participating agencies, including the Cities of Signal Hill, Downey, Lakewood, Long Beach, Lynwood, Paramount, Pico Rivera, and South Gate, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and the California Department of Transportation.

include installing a soccer field, replacing the basketball courts and restroom building, reconstructing the parking lot, revitalizing of the pond and stream, and other ancillary improvements. Additional information on park improvements is provided in Section 2.2.

The City is implementing the project in their capacity as a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permittee and member of the WMP, and would be responsible for operating and maintaining the project facilities. The City has initiated the design process and intends to issue a construction contract for project implementation subject to approval by the City Council, which would be considered a discretionary action of the City subject to CEQA compliance.

1.2 Purpose and Need

The project's purpose is to decrease the amount of pollutants in stormwater and dry-weather runoff entering the Los Angeles River. The LLAR WMP Group has identified a need for watershed control measures and structural BMPs to address water quality objectives within the watershed. The City's objectives in implementing the project are as follows:

- Improve the water quality within the Los Angeles River
- Restore and rehabilitate park facilities and install a dedicated soccer field
- Educate the public on the local stormwater issues

1.3 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

1.3.1 Authority to Prepare an MND

Approval by the City Council to award a construction contract to build the project constitutes a discretionary action that triggers environmental review requirements pursuant to CEQA, with the City serving as lead agency. The City prepared a CEQA initial study (IS) to analyze and consider the environmental impacts of implementing the project, which is included as Chapter 3 of this document. Based on the results of the IS, the City determined that an MND is the appropriate environmental document for compliance with CEQA. As stated in Section 21064 of the CEQA statute, an MND may be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when an IS has identified no potentially significant effects on the environment when mitigation is identified that can reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

1.3.2 Public Review and Final MND Process

The City is making the MND available for public review and comment pursuant to Section 15073 of the State CEQA Guidelines. A copy of the MND and related documents are available for review on the City's website (https://www.paramountcity.com). The City has identified a 20-day review and comment period for the MND commencing July 21, 2023, and terminating August 9, 2023.

Comments on the MND may be submitted to the City in writing before the end of the public review period. In reviewing and commenting on the MND, interested public agencies and members of the public should focus on the adequacy of the document in identifying and analyzing the project's potential impacts on the environment. Written

comments on the IS/MND will be accepted in hard copy or email format, and should be received at the following street address or email address by 5:00 p.m., August 9, 2023:

City of Paramount
16400 Colorado Avenue
Paramount, California 90723
Contact: John Carver
Email: JCarver@paramountcity.com

Following the close of the public comment period, City staff will review all comments and may revise the MND if necessary to clarify the document's content. City staff will then prepare a final MND that includes all comment letters received during the public review period and send the final MND to the City Council for adoption and consideration in their decision to approve the project.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location and Environmental Setting

The project is located on the western side of the City, which is within the southern portion of Los Angeles County, as shown in Figure 1, Project Location. The project site covers the majority of Spane Park, an active recreation facility maintained by the City. The park is in a developed area of the City that features a mixture of residential, industrial, commercial, and public uses. The park is bounded by Rosecrans Avenue to the north, an industrial warehouse to the east, Gundry Avenue to the west, and Los Cerritos Elementary to the south. Interstate 105 runs west–east approximately 0.5 miles north of the site, and Interstate 710 runs north–south approximately 0.5 miles west of the site, with a concrete-lined section of the Los Angeles River flowing north–south just east of Interstate 710. An electrical utility easement oriented in a north–south direction is located approximately 250 feet east of the site, on the other side of the abutting warehouse property. The site is designated as Park in the City General Plan Land Use Map, with other General Plan designations in the vicinity of the site including School, Industrial, Commercial, and Utility/Easement (City of Paramount 2022).

Spane Park is approximately 4.2 acres. As shown in Figure 2, Project Site and Existing Features, it features a turf multi-use field, two half-court basketball courts, a children's playground, a restroom building, and a community center building. The park also features an artificial pond at the southern end, fed by a meandering artificial channel. There are paved walking paths, benches, and a picnic area. A paved parking lot with 15 parking stalls and ornamental landscaping with mature trees is located along the western side of the park, adjacent to Gundry Avenue. An irrigation system with underground pipes and sprinkler heads is in place throughout the park.

2.2 Project Characteristics

The project entails constructing and operating a stormwater capture and filtration facility within the central portion of the park, as well as other ancillary park improvements. The stormwater capture and filtration facility would intercept stormwater and dry-weather flow from a storm drain channel and convey flows into an underground reservoir beneath the proposed soccer field for infiltration into the groundwater basin. An outflow pipe would be installed to convey excess water from the reservoir during heavy storms when all the water is not able to infiltrate. The water would pass through a filtration system before discharging back into the existing storm drain channel. Additional detail on the various project features, which are shown in Figure 3, Proposed Stormwater Capture and Treatment System, and Figure 4, Proposed Park Improvements, is provided below.

2.2.1 Diversion Structure and Stormwater Pretreatment Device

A 20 cubic feet per second diversion concrete structure with manhole access would be constructed within Rosecrans Avenue just north of Spane Park. The diversion structure would connect to the existing 10.5- by 6.5-foot storm drain within Rosecrans Avenue maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. This would divert stormwater by gravity from the storm drain to the pretreatment device and eventually the subsurface storage reservoir. The diversion structure would be approximately 10.5 feet wide and 3 feet long.

The pretreatment device would remove sediment, trash, and debris to prevent them from entering the storage reservoir and compromising its performance, which will reduce maintenance frequency and extend the system's

lifespan. The pretreatment system would be a hydrodynamic separator located to the south of the diversion structure, within Spane Park. A typical hydrodynamic separator directs water through a screen to filter out large debris and into a cylindrical separation chamber where water swirls and forces particles out of the runoff, settling them in an isolated sump. Hydrocarbons float to the top of the water surface and are prevented from being transported downstream.

2.2.2 Storage Reservoir and Infiltration Gallery

After pretreatment, water would continue into an underground storage reservoir that would be installed as part of the project beneath the proposed soccer field (refer to Section 2.2.4). The storage reservoir would have a capacity of 8.5 acre-feet, with an approximate 0.8-acre footprint. The field surface would be removed and earth material would be excavated, removed, and hauled off site for reuse or disposal. Excavation is anticipated to be approximately 20 feet deep. The storage reservoir would be a precast concrete storage system made with reinforced high-strength concrete. Once the system is installed and tested, the project team would install the proposed soccer field and park improvements, and use of the park would resume similar to existing conditions (see Section 2.2.4).

A geotechnical evaluation of the project site concluded that soils beneath Spane Park are suitable to support the project. The reservoir will be designed to facilitate infiltration of captured stormwater, allowing water to seep into the underlying aquifer and providing natural filtration through the soil. To reduce the size of the reservoir and maximize treatment capacity, the system would not be designed to handle all captured storm flows solely through infiltration; during periods of heavy flow, some water would be pumped out of the basin and filtered for discharge back into the storm drain, as described below in Section 2.2.3.

2.2.3 Discharge System and Treatment

During smaller storm events, stormwater collected by the system is anticipated to infiltrate into the soils beneath the storage reservoir and infiltration gallery.

During larger storm events, a proposed electric pump would carry stormwater into a filtration system to provide additional pollutant removal prior to discharging back into the existing storm drain channel in Rosecrans Avenue. When the water level in the reservoir reaches a predetermined elevation during heavy storm flow, the proposed pump would lift the excess water from the storage reservoir to a filter unit on the northern side of the reservoir. The pump would be placed in an underground concrete vault approximately 28 feet beneath the ground surface. A sampling manhole would be located between the discharge filtration unit and the outlet junction to the existing storm drain. Other components of the discharge treatment include a flow meter and a check valve structure to prevent backflow into the system, located below the ground surface within the proposed habitat planting area (see Section 2.2.4).

The proposed pump would also divert a portion of the captured stormwater through a proposed pipe running south and feeding water to the revitalized on-site stream that ultimately drains into the on-site pond (see Section 2.2.4).

2.2.4 Other Stormwater Capture

The project includes 24-inch drop inlets within the proposed reconstructed parking lot and western portion of the storage reservoir to collect surface storm flows within the park and carry water into the infiltration system. These drop inlets would connect to the storage reservoir via new 12-inch reinforced concrete pipe.

2.2.5 Park Improvements

The project includes the following improvements to Spane Park, in addition to the stormwater capture and filtration infrastructure described above, as shown in Figure 4. The existing Learning Center building, parking area in the northwest corner of Spane Park, and playground would remain in place.

Soccer Field

The project would remove and replace the existing multi-use field and install a new youth soccer field with new turf grass over the proposed storage reservoir. The proposed soccer field would be approximately 175 by 120 feet.

Basketball Court

The project would remove and replace the two existing concrete half-court basketball courts with a single new concrete full basketball court. The proposed basketball court would be located to the west of the proposed soccer field.

Exercise Area

To the north of the proposed basketball court and west of the proposed soccer field, a new exercise area with several fitness stations would be installed.

New Restroom Building

The project would remove and replace the existing restroom building with a new restroom building of similar size, providing the same number of restroom facilities as the existing structure. The proposed restroom building would be located south of the proposed basketball court and reconstructed parking lot.

Parking Lot Reconstruction

The existing 15-stall (including one Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] compliant stall) parking lot would be reconstructed to provide 35 stalls (including four ADA-compliant stalls and two electric vehicle charging stalls). The reconstructed parking lot would be located in the same location as the existing parking lot, but would extend east into the area occupied by the existing basketball courts (to be demolished).

Habitat Garden

The project includes an approximately 5,200-square-foot habitat garden located in the northwestern portion of Spane Park, above the proposed underground discharge system. The habitat planting area would be planted with native species; the planting palette would be determined as project design progresses and preliminarily includes narrowleaf milkweed (*Asclepias fascicularis*), sticky monkeyflower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*), coyote mint (*Monardella villosa*), hummingbird sage (*Salvia spathacea*), and woolly bluecurls (*Trichostema lanatum*).

Pond and Stream Revitalization

The existing artificial pond and stream located at the southern portion of the project site would be improved through planting with native plant species, including dwarf umbrella plant (*Schefflera arboricola*), striped sweet flag (*Acorus calamus 'Variegatus'*), and water pennywort (*Hydrocotyle verticillate*). The planting palette would be determined as project design progresses. The existing pond pump station would be removed. The existing concrete

walkway would be removed and replaced with a new concrete walkway, including two small bridge structures. The existing wooden deck would be removed and replaced in kind. The stream alignment would be reconfigured and shortened, but would be located in the same area to the east of the pond. The stream would be lined with rocks and include two waterfalls to help aerate the water and provide an aesthetic element. The pond would retain its existing size, but with wetland cells added along the edges to encourage ecosystem development. The existing shotcrete pond edges would be removed and replaced with rocks and planting beds to provide a more natural pond appearance and a barrier between the sidewalk and the pond. Additionally, an overflow pipe comprised of 12-inch reinforced concrete would be installed on the northern boundary of the pond to carry water back to the storage reservoir and prevent the pond from overflowing during heavy storms.

Tree Removal and Replacement

Most of the existing trees within Spane Park would be unaffected by construction of the proposed project. However, approximately 24 existing trees would be removed. As part of the project's park improvements, the City will plant approximately 88 trees within Spane Park. Additional shrubs and turf ground cover would be installed throughout the park.

Ancillary Park Improvements

The project would include various other improvements throughout Spane Park, including the following:

- New picnic tables and benches would be installed in the northern and central portion of the park.
- New shade structures would be installed over the playground and seating areas in the central portion of the park.
- The majority of the existing concrete walkways would be removed and replaced in kind to match the existing walkways. This includes reconfiguring the walkway alignment adjacent to the stream. New walkways would be provided to the new basketball courts and restroom facility, as well as to provide additional walking connections throughout the park. The walkway to the north of the proposed exercise area and soccer field would be constructed to allow maintenance access to the subgrade stormwater improvements. For maintenance truck access purposes, an approximately 1,200-square-foot grass paver would be installed in the northern portion of the park.
- New fencing would be installed throughout the park, including replacement of the existing fence separating the northern half of the park from the southern half, where the pond is located. The new fencing would be similar in scale and material as the existing fencing.
- New interpretive signage would be installed within the habitat garden and the pond.
- New lighting, including four soccer field lighting fixtures, would replace existing fixtures throughout the park, designed and installed per City standards.
- A new irrigation system would be installed throughout the park.
- The existing art sculpture located south of the existing parking lot and west of the existing restroom building would be relocated to the habitat garden.

2.2.6 Project Staging and Access

Spane Park is accessed from Gundry Avenue and the central parking lot. Construction staging, including equipment storage, material laydown, and worker parking is anticipated to occur in the central parking lot and throughout the construction area as needed. Depending on the construction phase, affected portions of Spane Park would be

temporarily closed to the public for the duration. The construction area would be fenced off for safety and security purposes and made unavailable for public use during project construction.

Construction would also require temporary encroachment into the southernmost lane of Rosecrans Avenue for construction of the diversion structure and outfall junction.

2.3 Construction Phasing and Schedule

Table 2-1 presents the anticipated construction phasing, equipment usage, and duration assumed for the project for purposes of environmental impact analysis in this MND. These assumptions were developed in consultation with the project design engineers for consideration in Section 3.3, Air Quality; Section 3.6, Energy; Section 3.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; and Section 3.13, Noise. The total duration of project construction is anticipated to be 18 months, with some phases overlapping. Typical construction work hours would be Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Night work is not anticipated.

Table 2-1. Anticipated Construction Phasing and Equipment

Construction Phase	Anticipated Equipment	Estimated Duration
Site mobilization, clearing, grubbing, and vegetation removal	Dozer	8 weeks
	Grader	
	Skid steer loader	
	Haul trucks	
Demolition of existing basketball courts and restroom building	Dozer	4 weeks
	Skid steer loader	
	Jack hammer	
	Haul trucks	
Reservoir excavation	Dozer	10 weeks
	Backhoe loaders	
	Skid steer loader	
	Haul trucks	
Reservoir construction	Crane	15 weeks
	Dozer	
	Skid steer loader	
Pipe, diversion structure, and treatment facility/ pump installation	Crane	8 weeks
	Trencher	
	Skid steer loader	
	Haul trucks	
Field surface replacement	Grader	4 weeks
	Skid steer loader	
	Turf aerator	
	Spreader sprayer	
Restroom building construction	Crane	10 weeks
	Telehandler	
	Cement mixer	
	Boom lift	

Table 2-1. Anticipated Construction Phasing and Equipment

Construction Phase	Anticipated Equipment	Estimated Duration
Basketball court construction	Crane	4 weeks
	Telehandler	
	Cement mixer	
	Boom lift	
Parking lot reconstruction	Skid steer loader	6 weeks
	Drum roller	
	Dump trucks	
	Compactor	
	Asphalt paver	
Concrete pathway improvements	Concrete mixer	4 weeks
Pond and stream revitalization	Skid steer loader	8 weeks
	Telehandler	
	Crane	
	Cement mixer	
Ancillary park improvements	Crane	8 weeks
	Skid steer loader	
	Forklift	
	Cement mixer	

2.4 Project Operation

Once construction is complete, project operation is anticipated to entail routine maintenance activities at the stormwater capture facility performed by the City. Activities would include removal of debris and pollutant constituents from the treatment devices, pump testing and calibration, and cleaning the storage reservoir. Proposed park improvements would not expand the footprint of Spane Park or result in a major expansion of facilities that would induce substantial demand or park users. Park operations would resume to normal, existing conditions.

2.5 Permits and Approvals

The City of Paramount is the CEQA lead agency, with the Paramount City Council holding primary responsibility for adopting this IS/MND, approving the project, and issuing a construction contract. The project will also require the issuance of a building permit by the City for the proposed restroom building. Other public agency approvals include the following:

- A Flood Construction Permit issued by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District
- The SWRCB will serve as a responsible agency under CEQA for their approval of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) in compliance with the Construction General Permit.

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:**

   Spane Park Stormwater Capture Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

   City of Paramount,
   16400 Colorado Avenue,
   Paramount, California 90723

3. **Contact person and phone number:**

   John Carver
   562.220.2048

4. **Project location:**

   The project is located on the western side of the City of Paramount within a portion of the existing Spane Park.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

   City of Paramount,
   16400 Colorado Avenue,
   Paramount, California 90723

6. **General plan designation:**

   Park

7. **Zoning:**

   Light Manufacturing (M-1)

8. **Description of project. (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):**

   Refer to Section 2.2.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):**

   Refer to Section 2.1.

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

Los Angeles County Flood Control District, SWRCB

11. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

Refer to Section 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources.

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 and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

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 off site as well as on site, 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 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" 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 "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, 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 Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which 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

3.1 Aesthetics

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**AESTHETICS** – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Scenic vistas generally refer to views of expansive open space areas or other natural features, such as mountains, undeveloped hillsides, large natural water bodies, or coastlines. Certain urban settings or features, such as a striking or renowned skyline, may also represent a scenic vista. Scenic vistas generally refer to views that are accessible from public vantage points, such as public roadways and parks. The City's General Plan Resource Management Element does not specifically list or identify any designated scenic vistas or specific scenic resources within the City. Distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and of the Puente Hills to the northeast are obscured by distance and the intervening streetscape and development. Project construction would result in temporary visual changes to the park, including the presence of excavated areas and staging of construction equipment. Upon completion of construction, these temporary visual changes would cease. The project's infrastructure would mostly be located underground and would not be visible during project operation. Other project components would include replacement of the existing park infrastructure, revitalization of the existing pond and stream, new landscaping, and other improvements to park facilities as described in Section 2.2.4, which are intended in part as improvements to the visual environment. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. There are no designated state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site. The nearest eligible scenic highway is the State Route (SR) 1 segment from SR-5 near San Juan Capistrano to SR-19 near Long Beach, located approximately 8.1 miles southwest of the project site (Caltrans 2022). Due to intervening development and distance, the project site is not visible from this segment of SR-1. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway and no impact would occur.

c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

No Impact. Per PRC Section 21071, an "urbanized area" is defined as "(a) An incorporated city that meets either of the following criteria: (1) Has a population of at least 100,000 persons. [or] (2) Has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined equals at least 100,000 persons." The project site is located in the incorporated City of Paramount, which has a population of 53,733 persons as of the 2020 census (U.S. Census Bureau 2020). However, with the incorporation of the population of a contiguous city such as the City of Bellflower, which has a population of 79,190 as of the 2020 census, the project site is considered to be located in an urbanized area (U.S. Census Bureau 2020).

As discussed in Section 3.1(a) above, the project site is not visible from any prominent public viewpoints. Temporary visible elements associated with the project include construction equipment, staging activities, and temporary fencing to be included for safety and security purposes. Visual impacts resulting from construction activities would be temporary, ceasing upon completion of construction.

The project would comply with any applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality. The project site is not subject to overlay zones or other such designations specific to scenic resources or quality. The proposed stormwater capture and filtration facility would be located primarily underground. In addition, the project would include replacement of existing park infrastructure, revitalization of the existing pond and stream, new landscaping, and other improvements to park facilities as described in Section 2.2.4, which would enhance the park's visual quality. The project would result in the continued use of the site as a park and would not substantially visually differ from its current use. Implementation of the project would not conflict with the applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. No impact would occur.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project is located in an urban area with existing sources of nighttime lighting from roadways, residences, and the existing Spane Park. Existing lighting at Spane Park consists of lighting within facilities, including existing multi-use field lighting, and along pedestrian pathways for safety and security. No nighttime work would occur during construction of the project. New lighting, including four soccer field lighting fixtures, would replace existing fixtures throughout the park, designed and installed per City standards. New lighting would be shielded and directed downward to minimize slipover onto adjacent

properties. Operation of new nighttime lighting would be similar to that of the existing lighting within Spane Park, and would be subject to the same operating hours. The materials that would be used for the project would not be reflective in nature and would not serve as a new source of glare (such as large areas of glass). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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. Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project 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?

No Impact. According to the California Important Farmland Finder database, the project site and its immediate surroundings are classified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" (DOC 2022). The project would not be located on land classified as Farmland pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and would therefore not convert any Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The project site is zoned Light Manufacturing (M-1). Surrounding Spane Park are areas also zoned M-1, as well as Medium Density Residential (R-2), Multiple Family Residential (R-M), and Heavy Manufacturing (M-2) (City of Paramount 2022). The City does not contain any lands zoned for agricultural use. There are no existing lands under a Williamson Act contract within the City. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The project site and surrounding areas are not zoned for and do not contain any forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or cause the rezoning or conversion of forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact**.** Refer to Section 3.2(c). No impact would occur.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Refer to Sections 3.2(a) through 3.2(d). The project site is located in an urbanized area with no existing agricultural uses, Farmland, or forest lands in the vicinity. The City does not contain any lands zoned for agricultural uses. Therefore, the project would not involve other changes that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

This section is based on technical analysis conducted by Dudek, including quantitative estimates of air pollutant emissions based on assumptions developed in consultation with the project design engineers. The results of the emissions estimates are provided as Appendix A to this MND, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Modeling.

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes all of Orange County and the western, non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. The site is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAQMD administers the SCAB's air quality management plan (AQMP), which is a comprehensive document outlining an air pollution control program for attaining the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The most recently adopted AQMP for the SCAB is the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017a).[2] The 2016 AQMP focuses on available, proven, and cost-effective alternatives to traditional air quality strategies while seeking to achieve multiple goals in partnership with other entities seeking to promote reductions in greenhouse gases (GHGs) and toxic risk, as well as efficiencies in energy use, transportation, and goods movement (SCAQMD 2017a).

[2] The SCAQMD has initiated the development of the 2022 AQMP to address the attainment of the 2015 8-hour ozone standard (70 parts per billion) for the SCAB and the Coachella Valley. The SCAQMD is in the process of developing the 2022 AQMP, which is currently undergoing public review and is expected to be adopted in 2022, including control measures developed through Residential and Commercial Buildings and Mobile Source Working Groups.

The purpose of a consistency finding with regard to the AQMP is to determine if a project is consistent with the assumptions and objectives of the 2016 AQMP, and if it would interfere with the region's ability to comply with federal and state air quality standards. The SCAQMD has established criteria for determining consistency with the currently applicable AQMP in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. These criteria are as follows (SCAQMD 1993):

- **Consistency Criterion No. 1:** Whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP.
- **Consistency Criterion No. 2:** Whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

To address the first criterion, project-generated criteria air pollutant emissions have been estimated and analyzed for significance and are addressed under Section 3.3(b). Detailed results of this analysis are included in Appendix A. As presented in that analysis and summarized in Section 3.3(b), the proposed project would not generate construction or operational criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, and the project would therefore be consistent with Criterion No. 1.

The second criterion regarding the potential of the proposed project to exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase is primarily assessed by determining consistency between the proposed project's land use designations and its potential to generate population growth. In general, projects are considered consistent with, and not in conflict with or obstructing implementation of, the AQMP if the growth in socioeconomic factors is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP (SCAQMD 1993). The SCAQMD primarily uses demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories (e.g., population, housing, and employment by industry) developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for its 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)[3] (SCAG 2016). SCAQMD uses this document, which is based on general plans for cities and counties in the SCAB, to develop the AQMP emissions inventory (SCAQMD 2017a).[4] The SCAG RTP/SCS and associated Regional Growth Forecast are generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the 2016 AQMP is generally consistent with local government plans. The relevant local plan for the proposed project is the City of Paramount General Plan.

The project does not include a change in zoning designation, no housing is proposed, and no additional employees would be required. Furthermore, the proposed project would serve an existing need in the City. Accordingly, the project does not conflict with the SCAG RTP/SCS forecasts used in the SCAQMD AQMP development and does not propose activities that would induce additional population in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

3 SCAQMD is currently working on the 2022 AQMP, which will incorporate SCAG's recently adopted 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. However, until the adoption of the 2022 AQMP, project AQMP consistency will be analyzed off the 2016 AQMP and the RTP/SCS that was adopted at the time, the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

4 Information necessary to produce the emissions inventory for SCAB is obtained from SCAQMD and other governmental agencies, including the California Air Resources Board (CARB), California Department of Transportation, and SCAG. Each of these agencies is responsible for collecting data (e.g., industry growth factors, socioeconomic projections, travel activity levels, emission factors, emission speciation profile, and emissions) and developing methodologies (e.g., model and demographic forecast improvements) required to generate a comprehensive emissions inventory. SCAG incorporates these data into its Travel Demand Model for estimating/projecting vehicle miles traveled and driving speeds. SCAG's socioeconomic and transportation activities projections in their 2016–2040 RTP/SCS are integrated in the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017a).

b) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and the SCAQMD develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are used to determine whether a project's individual emissions would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality. If a project's emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable contribution. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant (SCAQMD 2003a).

A quantitative analysis was conducted to determine whether the proposed project might result in emissions of criteria air pollutants that may cause exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS, or cumulatively contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Criteria air pollutants include ozone (O_3), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide, particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead. Pollutants that are evaluated herein include volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), which are important because they are precursors to O_3, as well as CO, sulfur oxides, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$.

Regarding NAAQS and CAAQS attainment status,[5] the SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for federal and state O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ standards (CARB 2019; EPA 2021). SCAB is also designated as a nonattainment area for state PM_{10} standards; however, it is designated as an attainment area for federal PM_{10} standards. The SCAB is designated as an attainment area for federal and state CO and NO_2 standards, as well as for state sulfur dioxide standards. Although the SCAB has been designated as nonattainment for the federal rolling 3-month average lead standard, it is designated attainment for the state lead standard.[6]

The proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants for which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have adopted ambient air quality standards (i.e., the NAAQS and CAAQS). Projects that emit these pollutants have the potential to cause, or contribute to, violations of these standards. The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds, as revised in April 2019, set forth quantitative emission significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, which, if exceeded, would indicate the potential for a project to contribute to violations of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Table 3.3-1 lists the revised SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds (SCAQMD 2019).

5 An area is designated as in attainment when it is in compliance with the NAAQS and/or the CAAQS. These standards for the maximum level of a given air pollutant that can exist in the outdoor air without unacceptable effects on human health or the public welfare are set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and CARB, respectively. Attainment = meets the standards; attainment/maintenance = achieves the standards after a nonattainment designation; nonattainment = does not meet the standards.

6 Re-designation of the lead NAAQS designation to attainment for the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB is expected based on current monitoring data. The phase-out of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Since gasoline no longer contains lead, the project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.

Table 3.3-1. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds (lbs/day)		
Pollutant	**Construction**	**Operation**
VOC	75	55
NO_x	100	55
CO	550	550
SO_x	150	150
PM_{10}	150	150
$PM_{2.5}$	55	55
Lead[a]	3	3
Toxic Air Contaminants and Odor Thresholds		
Toxic air contaminants[b]	Maximum incremental cancer risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Cancer Burden > 0.5 excess cancer cases (in areas ≥ 1 in 1 million) Chronic and Acute Hazard index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	

Source: SCAQMD 2019.
Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District.
[a] The phaseout of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Since gasoline no longer contains lead, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.
[b] Toxic air contaminants include carcinogens and noncarcinogens.

A project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase for O_3, which is a nonattainment pollutant, if the proposed project's construction or operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD VOC or NO_x thresholds shown in Table 3.3-1. These emission-based thresholds for O_3 precursors are intended to serve as a surrogate for an O_3 significance threshold (i.e., the potential for adverse O_3 impacts to occur) because O_3 itself is not emitted directly, and the effects of an individual project's emissions of O_3 precursors (i.e., VOCs and NO_x) on O_3 levels in ambient air cannot be determined through air quality models or other quantitative methods.

California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate emissions from construction of the project. CalEEMod is a statewide computer model developed in cooperation with air districts throughout the state to quantify criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction and operational activities from a variety of land use projects, including residential development. The following discussion summarizes the quantitative project-generated construction emissions and impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Detailed assumptions and results of this analysis are provided in Appendix A.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would include demolition, site preparation, grading, trenching, building installation, landscaping, paving, and application of architectural coatings. These construction activities would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by on-site sources (e.g., off-road construction equipment, soil disturbance, and VOC off-gassing from architectural coatings

and asphalt pavement application) and off-site sources (e.g., vendor trucks, haul trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Specifically, entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, haul trucks, vendor trucks (i.e., delivery trucks), and worker vehicles would result in emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Application of architectural coatings, such as exterior paint and other finishes, and application of asphalt pavement would also produce VOC emissions. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day depending on the level of activity; the specific type of operation; and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Proposed project construction emissions were estimated using a combination of CalEEMod default assumptions and information provided the project engineer. It was assumed that approximately 2.72 acres of the project site would require grading, with a total of 19,950 cubic yards of soil exported over the construction duration. The existing basketball courts and restroom building would be demolished, generating approximately 5,500 cubic feet of material that would be hauled off site. ~~For the purposes of air~~ Air quality emissions modeling~~, it is~~ assumed that construction of the project would commence in summer 2023 and would last approximately 18 months. The construction schedule has since been delayed, but the emissions modeling remains valid, and even slightly more conservative, as equipment efficiency increases over time. Default values for horsepower and load factor provided in CalEEMod were used for all construction equipment, and the equipment mix was provided by the City. For the analysis, it was generally assumed that heavy-duty construction equipment would be operating at the site 5 days per week, up to a maximum of 8 hours per day, in accordance with the City's Municipal Code (City of Paramount 2020). Detailed construction equipment modeling assumptions are provided in Appendix A.

Emissions generated during construction and operation of the project are subject to the rules and regulations of the SCAQMD. Rule 403, Fugitive Dust,[7] requires the implementation of measures to control the emission of visible fugitive/nuisance dust, such as wetting soils that would be disturbed. It was assumed that the active sites would be watered at least two times daily, resulting in an approximately 55% reduction of fugitive dust (CalEEMod default value), to represent compliance with SCAQMD standard dust control measures in Rule 403.

Table 3.3-2 shows the estimated maximum daily construction emissions associated with the construction of the project occurring in 2023, 2024, and 2025.

Table 3.3-2. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Construction Year	VOCs	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}[a]	$PM_{2.5}$[a]
	Pounds per Day					
2023	2.44	29.03	16.25	0.06	7.89	4.25
2024	1.97	19.27	13.59	0.03	1.41	0.96
2025	1.21	9.45	12.49	0.03	0.98	0.53
Maximum	*2.44*	*29.03*	*16.25*	*0.06*	*7.89*	*4.25*

[7] SCAQMD Rule 403 requires implementation of various best available fugitive dust control measures for different sources for all construction activity sources within its jurisdictional boundaries. Dust control measures include, but are not limited to, maintaining stability of soil through pre-watering of site prior to clearing, grubbing, cut and fill, and earth-moving activities; stabilizing soil during and immediately after clearing, grubbing, cut and fill, and other earth-moving activities; stabilizing backfill during handling and at completion of activity; and pre-watering material prior to truck loading and ensuring that freeboard exceeds 6 inches. Although SCAQMD Rule 403 requires fugitive dust control beyond watering control measures, compliance with Rule 403 is represented in CalEEMod by assuming twice daily watering of active sites (55% reduction in PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ [CAPCOA 2021]).

Table 3.3-2. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Construction Year	VOCs	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}[a]	$PM_{2.5}$[a]
	Pounds per Day					
SCAQMD threshold	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: SCAQMD 2019.
Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District.
See Appendix A for detailed results.
[a] These estimates reflect control of fugitive dust (watering twice daily) required by SCAQMD Rule 403.

As shown in Table 3.3-2, the proposed project's maximum daily construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria pollutant and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation Emissions

Once construction associated with the stormwater facilities is complete, operational activities associated with the project (e.g., routine maintenance vehicle trips) would be required. Proposed park improvements would not expand the footprint of Spane Park or result in a major expansion of facilities that would induce substantial demand or park users. Vehicle trips associated with maintenance activities would continue to be infrequent and would not generate daily vehicle-exhaust emissions that could exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds; impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative

Cumulative localized impacts would potentially occur if a project were to occur concurrently with another off-site project. Schedules for potential future projects near the project area are currently unknown; therefore, potential impacts associated with two or more simultaneous projects would be considered speculative.[8] However, future projects would be subject to CEQA and would require air quality analysis and, where necessary, mitigation. Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction activity of future projects would be reduced through implementation of control measures required by the SCAQMD. Cumulative PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would be reduced because all future projects would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, which sets forth general and specific requirements for all sites in the SCAQMD.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutants and impacts would be less than significant during construction and operation.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. According to SCAQMD, sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare

[8] The CEQA Guidelines state that if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact (14 CCR 15145).

centers, long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes (SCAQMD 1993).

The closest off-site sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences located approximately 55 feet west of the site's western boundary, a mobile home park approximately 100 feet north of the site's northern boundary, and the elementary school immediately adjacent to the south. The on-site playground and multi-use field will be closed during construction.

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD recommends a localized significance threshold (LST) analysis to evaluate localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project as a result of proposed project activities. The impacts were analyzed using methods consistent with those in the SCAQMD's Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (SCAQMD 2008a). The project is located within Source-Receptor Area 5 (Southeast Los Angeles County). Although the closest receptors to the project site are immediately adjacent, the shortest and most stringent receptor distance available in the SCAQMD LST Methodology is 25 meters (82 feet); therefore, that was assumed for this analysis.

Project construction activities would result in temporary sources of on-site criteria air pollutant emissions associated with exhaust from on-site construction equipment and diesel haul and vendor trucks and fugitive dust generation. According to the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, "off-site mobile emissions from the project should not be included in the emissions compared to the LSTs" (SCAQMD 2008a). Trucks and worker trips associated with the project are not expected to cause substantial air quality impacts to sensitive receptors along off-site roadways since emissions would be relatively brief in nature and would cease once the vehicles pass through the main streets. Nonetheless, because the project site is relatively large, vehicle activity may occur within the project boundary (i.e., fence line); therefore, a small portion (i.e., 1,000 feet [0.19 miles]) of the off-site vehicle travel for worker vehicles, vendor trucks, and haul trucks was conservatively assumed as on-site emissions for the LST analysis.

The maximum daily on-site emissions generated from construction of the proposed project are presented in Table 3.3-3 and are compared to the SCAQMD localized significance criteria for Source-Receptor Area 5 to determine whether project-generated on-site emissions would result in potential LST impacts.

Table 3.3-3. Construction Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis - Unmitigated

Construction Year	NO_x	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day			
2023	23.77	15.26	6.55	3.86
2024	19.03	12.32	0.89	0.82
2025	9.29	11.18	0.41	0.37
Maximum	*23.77*	*15.26*	*6.55*	*3.86*
SCAQMD LST Criteria[a]	*80*	*571*	*4*	*3*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Notes: NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; PM_{10} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; LST = localized significance threshold.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding.

See Appendix A for detailed results.
[a] Localized significance thresholds are shown for a 1-acre disturbed area for a sensitive receptor distance of 25 meters in Source-Receptor Area 5 (Southeast Los Angeles County).

As shown in Table 3.3-3, proposed construction activities would generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ without mitigation, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure (MM) AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2, which require site watering and minimum construction equipment emissions standards, would be incorporated into project construction. The maximum daily on-site emissions generated from construction of the proposed project including MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 are presented in Table 3.3-4 and are compared to the SCAQMD localized significance criteria for Source-Receptor Area 5 to determine whether project-generated on-site emissions would result in potential LST impacts.

Table 3.3-4. Construction Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis - Mitigated

Construction Year	NO_x	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day			
2023	4.19	18.00	3.76	2.05
2024	4.64	14.63	0.20	0.18
2025	3.05	12.88	0.10	0.09
Maximum	*4.64*	*18.00*	*3.76*	*2.05*
SCAQMD LST Criteria[a]	*80*	*571*	*4*	*3*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; PM_{10} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns; $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; LST = localized significance threshold.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.
The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding.
See Appendix A for detailed results.
Includes application of MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2.
[a] Localized significance thresholds are shown for a 1-acre disturbed area for a sensitive receptor distance of 25 meters in Source-Receptor Area 5 (Southeast Los Angeles County).

As shown in Table 3.3-4, with implementation of MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2, impacts would be less than significant.

CO Hotspots

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed federal and/or state standards for CO are termed "CO hotspots." The transport of CO is extremely limited, as it disperses rapidly with distance from the source. However, under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting sensitive receptors. Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with severely congested intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (level of service E or worse is unacceptable). Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of a CO hotspot. Additional analysis of CO hotspot impacts would be conducted if a project would result in a significant impact or contribute to an adverse traffic impact at a signalized intersection that would potentially subject sensitive receptors to CO hotspots. CO concentrations at congested intersections would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour CO CAAQS unless projected daily traffic would be at least over 100,000 vehicles per day. The project's estimated vehicle trips anticipated during construction is minimal, and is not of a magnitude expected to raise the traffic volumes at intersections within proximity of the project to the 100,000 vehicles per day that could result in a CO hotspot.

Ambient CO levels are monitored at the SCAQMD Pico-Rivera air quality monitoring station, which is approximately ~~1.759~~ miles ~~southwest~~ northeast of the project site and represents ambient air quality in the project area. Ambient CO levels monitored at this representative monitoring station indicate that the highest recorded 1-hour concentration of CO is 3.1 parts per million (ppm) (the state standard is 20 ppm) and highest 8-hour concentration is 1.7 ppm (the state standard is 9 ppm) during the past 3 years of available data (2019–2021) (EPA 2022). As discussed above, the highest CO concentrations typically occur during peak traffic hours, so CO impacts calculated under peak traffic conditions represent a worst-case analysis. Even if combined with the concentrations presented in the AQMP for the four worst-case intersections in the SCAB with average daily traffic of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day, the CO concentrations at the Pico-Rivera air quality monitoring station would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour standards or result in a CO hotspot.

Given the considerably low level of CO concentrations in the project area and the minimal increase in daily trips, project-related mobile emissions are not expected to contribute significantly to CO concentrations and a CO hotspot is not anticipated to occur. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the SCAB is steadily decreasing. The project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality with regard to potential CO hotspots.

Toxic Air Contaminants

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions during project construction would be diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks. Use of heavy-duty construction equipment is subject to a CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions; use of diesel trucks is also subject to an Airborne Toxics Control Measure. The health risk assessment (HRA) analyzes long-term cancer and noncancer health risk from the project's use of diesel equipment and trucks during construction.

The most recent guidance from the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) is the 2015 Risk Assessment Guidelines Manual (OEHHA 2015). Cancer risk parameters, such as age-sensitivity factors, daily breathing rates, exposure period, fraction of time at home, and cancer potency factors were based on the values and data recommended by OEHHA as implemented in Hotspots Analysis and Reporting Program Version 2 (HARP2). SCAQMD's Modeling Guidance for American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model (AERMOD) (SCAQMD 2023), Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis (SCAQMD 2003b), and Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212 (SCAQMD 2017b) provide guidance to perform dispersion modeling for use in HRAs within the SCAB.

Risk Thresholds

The exhaust from diesel engines is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and particles, many of which are known human carcinogens. Health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. SCAQMD recommends a cancer risk threshold of 10 in one million.

Some TACs also increase noncancer health risk due to long-term (chronic) exposures. The Chronic Hazard Index is the sum of the individual substance chronic hazard indices for all TACs affecting the same target

organ system. A hazard index less than 1.0 means that adverse health effects are not expected. Accordingly, noncarcinogenic exposures of less than Chronic Hazard Index 1.0 are considered less than significant.

In addition to these chronic health risk thresholds, the SCAQMD recommends an acute hazard index of 1.0. However, whereas DPM has established cancer risk factors and relative exposure values for long-term chronic health hazard impacts, no short-term, acute reference exposure levels for DPM are established by CARB or OEHHA. Therefore, the HRA does not address acute exposures to DPM.

Methodology

The dispersion modeling was performed using AERMOD, which is the model SCAQMD requires for atmospheric dispersion of emissions. AERMOD (Version 21112) is a steady-state Gaussian plume model that incorporates air dispersion based on planetary boundary layer turbulence structure and scaling concepts, including treatment of surface and elevated sources, building downwash, and simple and complex terrain.

Dispersion of DPM emissions was modeled using AERMOD; cancer risk and noncancer health impacts were then modeled using CARB's HARP2. A unit emission rate (1 gram per second) was normalized over the line of adjacent volume sources for the AERMOD run to obtain the "X/Q" values. X/Q is a dispersion factor that is the average effluent concentration normalized by source strength and is used to simplify the representation of emissions from project construction. The maximum concentrations were determined for the 1-hour and period-averaging periods.[9]

HARP2 (Version 22118) implements the March 2015 OEHHA age-weighting methodology for assessing toxics risks. The project's potential cancer and noncancer construction-related health impacts were evaluated assuming an exposure duration of approximately 18 months and starting at the third trimester of pregnancy. A construction HRA CalEEMod run was performed to estimate on-site emissions of exhaust PM_{10}, which was used as a surrogate for DPM.[10] The predominant source of construction exhaust PM_{10} is operation of off-road diesel construction equipment. However, it was conservatively assumed that emissions from heavy-duty haul and vendor trucks, which could be diesel- or gasoline-fueled, traveling 1,000 feet would occur on site to represent potential on-site travel and nearby local off-site travel. Total exhaust PM_{10} emissions from CalEEMod were averaged over the project's construction duration to estimate the annual and hourly exposure, which were estimated to be 87.96 pounds per year and 0.042 pounds per hour of DPM. Consistent with SCAQMD guidance, the Risk Management Policy using the Derived Method was used to estimate cancer risk and the OEHHA Derived Method was used to estimate chronic noncancer risk (SCAQMD 2017b). The cancer and noncancer risk results were then compared to SCAQMD thresholds

9 Period-averaging periods means entire met data period averaging.

10 Under California regulatory guidelines, DPM is used as a surrogate measure of carcinogen exposure for the mixture of chemicals that make up diesel exhaust as a whole. The California Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that "potential cancer risk from inhalation exposure to whole diesel exhaust will outweigh the multi-pathway cancer risk from the speciated components" (OEHHA 2015).

to assess project impact significance. Principal parameters of this modeling are presented in Table 3.3-5. The results of the HRA analysis are presented in Table 3.3-6.

Table 3.3-5. Construction Health Risk Assessment AERMOD Construction Principal Parameters

Parameter	Details
Meteorological Data	The latest 5-year (2010–2012, 2015–2016) meteorological data for the Pico Rivera station (PICO, Station ID 3166) from SCAQMD were downloaded, then input to AERMOD.
Urban versus Rural Option	Urban areas typically have more surface roughness as well as structures and low-albedo surfaces that absorb more sunlight—and thus more heat—relative to rural areas. According to SCAQMD guidelines, the urban dispersion option was selected.
Terrain Characteristics	Digital elevation model files were imported into AERMOD so that complex terrain features were evaluated as appropriate. Per SCAQMD guidance, the National Elevation Dataset with resolution of 1/3 arc-second was used (SCAQMD 2022).
Receptors	To ensure receptors in the nearby project area were adequately captured, a fine uniform Cartesian grid of receptors spaced 10 meters (33 feet) apart, 410 meters (1,345 feet) across, was included in the AERMOD run. To include all potential sensitive receptors in all directions of the project site that may be impacted by project construction, consistent with the SCAQMD recommendations for AERMOD (SCAQMD 2022), a coarse uniform Cartesian grid of receptors spaced 50 meters (164 feet) apart, 1,000 meters (3,281 feet) from the project site was placed around the project site. All Cartesian grid receptors were then converted to discrete receptors.
Emission Sources and Source Release Parameters	Air dispersion modeling of construction activities was conducted using emissions generated using CalEEMod, assuming 5 days per week and 22 days per month. For cancer or chronic noncancer risk assessments, the average cancer risk of all years modeled was used. The construction equipment DPM emissions were modeled as a line of adjacent volume sources where construction activity is anticipated to occur. The line of adjacent volume sources was assumed to have a release height of 5 meters, a plume height of 10 meters, and a plume width of 9 meters (SCAQMD 2008b).

Source: See Appendix A for detailed results.
Notes: AERMOD = American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; DPM = diesel particulate matter; CalEEMod = California Emissions Estimator Model.

Table 3.3-6. Construction Health Risk Assessment Results - Unmitigated

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impact	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance
MICR (residential)	Per Million	53	10.0	**Potentially Significant**
HIC	Not Applicable	0.035	1.0	Less than Significant

As shown in Table 3.3-6, the results of the HRA demonstrate that the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in a cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold and a Chronic Hazard Index less than 1. Therefore, TAC emissions from construction of the project would result in a potentially significant impact. MM-AQ-2, which requires use of Tier 4 Final engines for off-road equipment to reduce DPM emissions during project construction would be incorporated into the project, as detailed below.

Table 3.3-7 summarizes the results of the HRA after implementation of MM-AQ-2 for construction of the proposed project. After mitigation, TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in cancer risk below the 10 in 1 million threshold and the Chronic Hazard Index would still be less than the 1.0 threshold. Therefore, after mitigation, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to exposure to TAC emissions during construction.

Table 3.3-7. Construction Health Risk Assessment Results - Mitigated

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impact	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance
MICR (residential)	Per Million	8.16	10.0	Less than Significant
HIC	Not Applicable	0.035	1.0	Less than Significant

Health Effects of Criteria Pollutants

Construction and operation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions. However, due to the nature of the project and the short duration of construction, which would last approximately 18 months, the project would not exceed the SCAQMD mass-emission thresholds, as shown in Table 3.3-2.

The SCAB is designated as nonattainment for O_3 for the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, existing O_3 levels in the SCAB are at unhealthy levels during certain periods. Health effects associated with O_3 include respiratory symptoms, worsening of lung disease leading to premature death, and damage to lung tissue (CARB 2021). The contribution of VOCs and NO_x to regional ambient O_3 concentrations is the result of complex photochemistry. The increases in O_3 concentrations in the SCAB due to O_3 precursor emissions tend to be found downwind of the source location because of the time required for the photochemical reactions to occur. The potential for exacerbating excessive O_3 concentrations would also depend on the time of year that the VOC emissions would occur because exceedances of the O_3 NAAQS and CAAQS tend to occur between April and October when solar radiation is highest. Due to the lack of quantitative methods to assess this complex photochemistry, the holistic effect of a single project's emissions of O_3 precursors is speculative. Because the project would not involve activities that would result in O_3 precursor emissions (i.e., VOCs or NO_x) that would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, as shown in Table 3.3-2, the project is not anticipated to substantially contribute to regional O_3 concentrations and its associated health impacts during construction or operation.

In addition to O_3, NO_x emissions contribute to potential exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO_2. Health effects associated with NO_x include lung irritation and enhanced allergic responses (CARB 2021). As shown in Table 3.3-2, project construction and operations would not exceed the SCAQMD NO_x threshold and existing ambient NO_2 concentrations would be below the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, the project is not expected to result in exceedances of the NO_2 standards or contribute to associated health effects.

Health effects associated with CO include chest pain in patients with heart disease, headache, light-headedness, and reduced mental alertness (CARB 2021). CO hotspots were discussed previously as a less-than-significant impact. Thus, the project's CO emissions would not contribute to the health effects associated with this pollutant.

The SCAB is designated as nonattainment for PM_{10} under the CAAQS and nonattainment for $PM_{2.5}$ under the NAAQS and CAAQS. Health effects associated with PM_{10} include premature death and hospitalization,

primarily for worsening of respiratory disease (CARB 2021). As with O_3 and NO_x, and as shown in Table 3.3-2, the project would not generate emissions of PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ that would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. Accordingly, the project's PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions are not expected to cause an increase in related regional health effects for this pollutant.

In summary, the project would not result in a potentially significant contribution to regional concentrations of nonattainment pollutants and would not result in a significant contribution to the adverse health effects associated with those pollutants. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

MM-AQ-1 Fugitive Dust During Construction. The City shall water exposed soil during construction three times daily. The City shall also replace ground cover of area disturbed during construction.

MM-AQ-2 Require Use of Tier 4 Off-Road Equipment During Construction. Prior to the commencement of construction activities for the project, the Applicant shall require its construction contractor to demonstrate that all 75-horsepower or greater diesel-powered equipment is powered with California Air Resources Board–certified Tier 4 Final engines.

An exemption from this requirement may be granted if (1) the City documents that equipment with Tier 4 Final engines is not reasonably available and (2) the required corresponding reductions in criteria air pollutant emissions can be achieved for the project from other combinations of construction equipment. Before an exemption may be granted, the City's construction contractor shall (1) demonstrate that at least two construction fleet owners/operators in the County of Los Angeles were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 equipment could not be located within the County of Los Angeles during the desired construction schedule and (2) the proposed replacement equipment has been evaluated using California Emissions Estimator Model or other industry standard emission estimation method and documentation provided to the City to confirm that necessary project-generated emissions reductions are achieved.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The occurrence and severity of potential odor impacts depends on numerous factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Potential odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, and architectural coatings. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction would be less than significant.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Dudek conducted a literature review and field visit to determine the existing biotic and abiotic conditions and the presence of sensitive biological resources within the project site and a 100-foot buffer (study area).

Literature Review

The following data sources were reviewed to assist with the analyses:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CDFW 2022a)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (USFWS 2022a)
- California Native Plant Society's Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants (CNPS 2022)
- USFWS Wetland Mapper online viewer (USFWS 2022b)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Web Soil Survey (USDA 2022)
- CDFW Biogeographic Information and Observation System (CDFW 2022b)
- Current and historical aerial imagery and topographic maps (Google Earth 2022; NETR 2022)

Field Visit

Dudek Biologist Tracy Park performed a field survey on August 8, 2022. Temperatures during the survey were between 79°F and 84°F, with 0% cloud cover and wind speeds ranging between 0 and 1 miles per hour. The biological survey included vegetation mapping, the mapping of sensitive biological resources (if present) within the study area, and an evaluation of the potential for special-status species to occur. The species lists are included as Appendix B to this MND.

a) Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. There are 55 special-status plant species and 34 special-status wildlife species with recorded occurrences in the U.S. Geologic Survey's South Gate California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle, in which the project is located, and surrounding eight quadrangles (CDFW 2022a; CNPS 2022; USFWS 2022a). The study area primarily supports two land cover types (ornamental plantings and urban/developed), as shown in Figure 5, Existing Vegetation Communities; therefore, any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS, is not expected to occur due to the lack of suitable habitat. No impact to these biological resources would occur as a result of the project.

b) Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The study area predominantly supports two land cover types (ornamental plantings and urban/developed), as shown in Figure 5, and the project site is within upland areas. The park does include a closed-system artificial pond and stream along the southern boundary; however, these features do not contain any significant stands of vegetation and are likely subject to water treatment based on the presence of blue dye in the water. Both features would remain in place with enhanced native vegetation post-construction. The study area does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS. No impact to these biological resources would occur as a result of the project.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. Refer to Section 3.4(b). The study area does not contain any state or federally protected wetlands; no impact to these resources would occur as a result of the project.

d) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Common domesticated and/or naturalized waterfowl species, such as domestic mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos domesticus*), swan goose (*Answer cygnoides*), and Muscovy duck (*Carina moschata*), were observed during biological resources surveys conducted for the project. The study area does not occur within any designated wildlife corridors or habitat linkages, so impacts on wildlife corridors and habitat connectivity would not occur as a result of the project. However, on-site trees and shrubs provide suitable nesting habitat for bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703–712) and California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503.5, 3503, and 3513. Vegetation trimming or removal associated with the project could cause mortality to young or breeding adults and/or destruction of eggs or active nests if occurring during the general nesting season of February 1 through August 31. Implementation of MM-BIO-1, which requires nesting bird avoidance, would reduce potential direct impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

Potential short-term indirect impacts to special-status wildlife could result from noise generated by construction activities conducted during the avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31). Construction-related noise has the potential to disrupt reproductive and feeding activities for nesting birds, potentially causing mortality due to the abandonment of an active nest. These indirect impacts would be considered significant, absent mitigation. Project implementation of MM-BIO-1 (nesting bird avoidance) would reduce these potential indirect impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

MM-BIO-1 Nesting Bird Avoidance. Project construction shall be conducted in compliance with the conditions set forth in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code to protect active bird/raptor nests. Vegetation removal shall occur during the non-breeding season for nesting birds and nesting raptors (October 1–January 31) to avoid impacts to nesting birds and raptors. If the project requires that work be initiated during the breeding season for nesting birds (March 1–September 30) and nesting raptors (February 1–June 30), in order to avoid direct impacts on active nests, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted in the study area by qualified biologists for nesting birds and/or raptors within 3 days prior to project activities. If the biologist does not find any active nests within or immediately adjacent to the impact areas, the vegetation clearing/construction work shall be allowed to proceed.

If the biologist finds an active nest within or immediately adjacent to the construction area and determines that the nest may be impacted or breeding activities substantially disrupted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest depending on the sensitivity of the species and the nature of the construction activity. To protect any nest site, the following restrictions to construction activities shall be required until nests are no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist: (1) clearing limits

shall be established within a buffer around any occupied nest and (2) access and surveying shall be restricted within the buffer of any occupied nest, unless otherwise determined by a qualified biologist. The buffer shall be 100–300 feet for non-raptor nesting birds and 300–500 feet for nesting raptors. Construction can proceed into the buffer when the qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact.- The project entails removal of 24 existing trees and replacement with 88 trees within Spane Park, resulting in a net increase in trees. Construction would comply with Section 12.32.030, Public Tree Care, of the City's Municipal Code, as it relates to the trimming, planting, and removal of trees within Spane Park (City of Paramount 2020). The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and no impact would occur.

f) Would the project 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 Impact. The study area is not within any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan (CDFW 2019). As such, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted conservation plan and no impact would occur.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	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 pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

This section is based on the results of archival research, including a search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) database, and a pedestrian survey conducted by Dudek.

Geology and Soils Setting

According to the to the Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey (USDA 2022), soils within the project site predominantly consist of the urban land-Hueneme, drained-San Emigdio complex and is composed of the following: urban land (45%), Hueneme (20%), San Emigdio (15%), Pico (10%), Xerothents (5%), and Metz (5%).

This soil complex accounts for approximately 80% of the project site. The remaining 20% of the project site consists of urban land-Metz-Pico complex and is composed of the following: urban land (45%), Metz (20%), Pico (15%), Hueneme (5%), San Emigdio (5%), Corralitos (5%), and Xerothents (5%).

The dominant soil series within the project site, urban land, refers to soils in areas of high population density in a largely built environment and can include human-transported or human-altered materials, minimally altered materials, or intact native soils (USDA 2019). The horizontal or slope data for this series are associated with soils that have been significantly altered by human activities and therefore associated with nearly level or low slopes (USDA 2022).

A review of the U.S. Geological Survey mineral resources (USGS 2022) online spatial data for geology indicates that existing development is underlain by Quaternary alluvium and marine deposits, generally dating between the Pleistocene and the Holocene geologic age. The terminal Pleistocene-era and Holocene-era alluvial formations do have the potential to support the presence of buried archaeological resources. These soils are associated with the period of prehistoric human use and represent ongoing processes of development that have potential to preserve cultural material in context, depending on area-specific topographical setting.

Archival Research

On May 19, 2022, Dudek conducted a search of the CHRIS at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton. The search included any previously recorded cultural resources and investigations within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. The CHRIS search also included a review of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Places (CRHR), the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list.

Results of the CHRIS database records search indicate that 13 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within the records search area between 1975 and 2016. None of the studies identified address the project site. The closest area studied is located approximately 645 meters (2117 feet) southeast of the project site. The entirety of the project site has not been subject to previous cultural investigations. Previous cultural resources studies within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site are presented in Appendix C (confidential).

The SCCIC records indicate that two cultural resources have been previously recorded within 0.5 miles of the project site, neither of which are located within or adjacent to the project site. Both resources are historic built environment resources, including one residence and one electrical transmission line. No historic-period or prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within 0.5 miles of the project site. Recorded cultural resources identified within the records research radius are presented in Appendix C (confidential).

In addition to the SCCIC records search, Dudek consulted historical topographic maps and aerial photographs through Nationwide Environmental Title Research LLC and the U.S. Geological Survey Historical Topographic Map Explorer (USGS 2022) to better understand any natural or human-made changes to the project site and surrounding properties over time.

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources within or near the proposed project, Dudek requested a search of the Sacred Land Files (SLF) maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the

~~present~~ project site (completed June 22, 2022). The SLF search was conducted to determine the presence of any reported Native American cultural resources within proximity of the project site as listed in the NAHC-maintained SLF. The NAHC SLF records search results were negative. The NAHC identified nine Native American individuals who would potentially have specific knowledge as to whether or not Native American cultural resources are identified within the project boundaries. In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City has contacted all tribal representatives who were provided by the NAHC as traditionally and geographically affiliated with the project area and who have formally requested notification of projects under the City's jurisdiction. These efforts are summarized in Section 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this MND. Documentation of the NAHC SLF search results is provided in Appendix C (confidential).

Pedestrian Survey

Following review of the records search results, Dudek Archaeologist Linda Kry, BA, RA, conducted an archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site on July 29, 2022. In consideration of the geotechnical report findings and present use of the project site as a recreational facility with maintained lawns, turf field, and other existing ancillary facilities, significantly limiting ground surface visibility, an intensive-level archaeological pedestrian survey was not conducted. Alternatively, a mixed approach (opportunistic survey) and reconnaissance survey (visual inspection) were used, selectively examining areas of exposed ground surfaces, where possible.

The ground surface was inspected for prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, ground stone tools, ceramics, fire-affected rock), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, features indicative of structures and/or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, post holes, foundations), and historical artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics, building materials). Ground disturbances such as rodent burrows, cut banks, landscaped areas, base of trees, and drainages were also visually inspected for exposed subsurface materials. The field reconnaissance survey identified no cultural resources within the project site.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As defined by the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), a "historical resource" is considered to be a resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or CRHR, has been identified as significant in a historical resource survey, or is listed on a local register of historical resources. Under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause "a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource" (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5[b]). If a site is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1[q]), it is a historical resource and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for the purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5[a]).

A review of historical aerial photographs indicates that the project site has been subjected to consistent ground disturbance for several decades, shifting from undeveloped land in the late 1890s to agricultural use in the 1950s and transforming steadily to include the development of buildings between the early 1980s to the late 1980s. By 1991, the project site is shown to be consistent with the present site conditions.

A review of the CHRIS database records search for the project site identified two historic built environment resources; neither of these resources are within or adjacent to the project site. Additionally, no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within the project site or 0.5-mile records search

area. An archaeological pedestrian survey of the project site did not identify any archaeological resources within the project footprint that are historic in age. Additionally, the results of the cultural resources research and pedestrian survey indicate no known historical resources pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 are within or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and impacts would be less than significant. The potential for a yet-unknown archaeological resource that could potentially be considered a historical resource is addressed in Section 3.5(b).

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. A CHRIS database records search, NAHC SLF search, background research (including a review of a geotechnical report), and archaeological pedestrian survey were conducted as in support of the project. As discussed under Section 3.5(a), the CHRIS records search identified two previously recorded historic built environment resources within the 0.5-mile records search area. No previously recorded historic-period or prehistoric archaeological resources are on file with the SCCIC as being present within project site. Additionally, a search of the NAHC's SLF database yielded negative results for any reported tribal cultural resources within proximity to or within the project site.

A review of a geotechnical reports prepared for the project site determined that fills soils were encountered from the surface to between 2 and 9 feet below existing ground surface within all eight exploratory boring locations. Current project design indicates that the minimum depth of ground disturbance for the project site is 5 feet below the existing ground surface for removal and replacement of existing structures, landscaping, and utility and ancillary improvements, with a maximum depth of approximately 30 feet below the existing ground surface for the underground stormwater capture and filtration facility within the central portion of the project site.

No cultural materials were observed within the project site as a result of the archaeological pedestrian survey. The geotechnical study conducted for the project indicates the project site is predominantly covered in fill soils, although the origin of the soils was not identified. The presence of fill soils demonstrates that native soils within which cultural deposits might exist in context could not have been observed during the survey; thus, the survey findings are less than reliable. Any exposed soils observed during the survey were likely fill soils and not a good representation of the native soils present prior to development/ground disturbing activities.

In consideration of all these factors, the potential to encounter intact deposits containing archaeological resources within soils from the current grade and between 2 and 9 feet below existing ground surface is low. However, the potential for intact cultural deposits to exist within native soils (below between 2 and 9 feet below ground surface) at the depths of proposed ground disturbance (5 feet to 30 feet below ground surface) is unknown. The project site should be treated as potentially sensitive for archaeological resources. In the event that unanticipated archaeological resources are encountered during project implementation, impacts to these resources would be potentially significant.

Thus, mitigation is required to address impacts related to the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources during construction, as outlined in MM-CUL-1, MM-CUL-2, and MM-CUL-3. MM-CUL-1 requires that all project construction personnel participate in a Workers Environmental Awareness Program training

for the proper identification and treatment of inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources. MM-CUL-2 requires the retention of an on-call qualified archaeologist to respond to and address inadvertent discoveries and survey the project site after the removal of fill soils to determine if there is evidence of cultural deposits currently underlying the fill layer. MM-CUL-3 requires construction work occurring within 50 feet of a cultural resource discovery to be immediately halted until the qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology, can assess and evaluate the discovery pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, MM-CUL-3 requires the inadvertent discovery clause be included on all construction plans. With implementation of MM-CUL-1, MM-CUL-2, and MM-CUL-3, potentially significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

MM-CUL-1 Workers Environmental Awareness Program. Prior to the start of construction activities, all construction personnel and monitors shall be trained regarding identification and treatment protocol for inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources (archaeological and tribal) and human remains. A basic presentation and handout or pamphlet shall be prepared in order to ensure proper identification and treatment of inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources and human remains. The purpose of the Workers Environmental Awareness Program training is to provide specific details on the kinds of materials that may be identified during ground disturbing activities and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of human remains and significant cultural resources. Each worker shall also be trained in the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities. These procedures include but are not limited to work curtailment or redirection and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and archaeological monitoring staff.

MM-CUL-2 Retention of an On-Call Qualified Archaeologist. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained and on-call to respond to and address any inadvertent discoveries identified during project implementation. Additionally, in consideration of the potential to encounter intact cultural deposits beneath fill soils, the qualified archaeologist shall survey the project site once fill soils have been removed to ensure no cultural deposits underlie the fill layer. If it is determined, based on the aforementioned survey, that cultural resources are present or may be present and may be impacted during project construction, monitoring may be warranted. Any identified cultural resources shall be assessed and evaluated pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. If it is determined that monitoring is warranted, a qualified archaeological principal investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, shall oversee and adjust monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material. The archaeological monitor will be responsible for maintaining daily monitoring logs.

MM-CUL-3 Inadvertent Discovery Clause. In the event that potential archaeological resources sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during ground disturbing activities, all construction work occurring within at least 50 feet of the find shall immediately stop and the qualified archaeologist that has been retained on call must be notified immediately to assess the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find under the California Environmental Quality Act

(CEQA), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work (e.g., preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, data recovery, or monitoring) may be warranted if the resource cannot be feasibly avoided. If the discovery is Native American in nature, consultation with and/or monitoring by a tribal representative may be necessary.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less-than-Significant Impact. No prehistoric or historic period burials, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were identified within the project site as a result of the CHRIS records search or pedestrian survey. In the event that human remains are inadvertently encountered during ground disturbing activities, they shall be treated consistent with state and local regulations including California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and the California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 15064.5(e). In accordance with these regulations, if human remains are found, the county coroner must be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the project site or any nearby (no less than 100 feet) area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains can occur until the county coroner has determined if the remains are potentially human in origin. If the county coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she is required to notify the NAHC, which shall notify those persons believed to be the most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains. Compliance with these regulations would ensure that impacts to human remains resulting from the project would be less than significant.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less-than-Significant. Project implementation would result in energy use for construction and operation, including use of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels.

The proposed project's impact on energy resources is discussed separately below for construction and operation. Dudek estimated energy consumption (electricity, natural gas, and petroleum consumption)

using CalEEMod data from the air quality and GHG assessment, which in turn was based on assumptions developed in consultation with the project design engineers. For further detail on the assumptions and results of the energy analysis, please refer to Appendix A.

Construction Energy Use

Electricity

Electricity consumed during project construction would vary throughout the construction period based on the construction activities being performed. Various construction activities would require electricity, including conveying water that would be used for dust control (supply and conveyance), powering any necessary lighting or electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power. Such electricity demand would be temporary, nominal, and would cease upon the completion of construction. Southern California Edison is the electricity provider to the project site and provided approximately 81,000 gigawatt-hours of electricity in 2019 (CEC 2022). Overall, construction activities associated with the proposed project would require limited electricity consumption that would not be expected to have an adverse impact on available Southern California Edison electricity supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, the use of electricity during project construction would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Natural Gas

There would be no natural gas used during construction. Equipment and vehicles would be powered by petroleum-based fuels as discussed below. Therefore, the use of natural gas during project construction would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Petroleum-Based Fuels

Petroleum-based fuel usage represents most energy consumed during construction. Petroleum fuels would be used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the project site, construction worker travel to and from the project site, and delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling of material to disposal facilities).

Fuel consumption from construction equipment and vehicles was estimated by converting the total carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions from each construction phase to gallons using the conversion factors for CO_2 to gallons of gasoline or diesel. All off-road equipment and hauling and vendor trucks are assumed to be diesel, and worker vehicles are assumed to be gasoline. For the purposes of energy estimation, construction is anticipated to occur between 2023 and 2025, over an 18-month duration. The conversion factor for gasoline is 8.78 kilograms per metric ton CO_2 per gallon, and the conversion factor for diesel is 10.21 kilograms per metric ton CO_2 per gallon (The Climate Registry 2021). The estimated diesel fuel usage from construction equipment for Phase I and Phase II of the project is shown in Table 3.6-1.

Table 3.6-1. Estimated Construction Fuel Use

Source	Fuel Use (gallons)	
	Diesel	Gasoline
Offroad Equipment	23,909	0
Haul Trucks	7,203	0
Vendor Trucks	603	0
Worker Trips (passenger vehicles)	0	4,496
Total	**31,715**	**4,496**

Source: Conversion factors from The Climate Registry (2021).
See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 3.6-1, construction of the project is anticipated to consume 4,496 gallons of gasoline and 31,715 gallons of diesel. The proposed project would be required to comply with CARB's Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation that requires the vehicle fleet to reduce emissions by retiring, replacing, or repowering older engines or installing Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategies. Therefore, impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.

Operational Energy Use

Once construction is complete, operation of the proposed project would involve routine maintenance activities performed by the City. Proposed park improvements would not expand the footprint of Spane Park or result in a major expansion of facilities that would induce substantial demand or park users. The energy used for maintenance purposes would be minimal and would decrease over time, as staff vehicles and equipment become increasingly efficient, in accordance with the energy efficiency and GHG reduction standards. Thus, the project would result in minimal energy consumption during operation, including petroleum consumption from staff vehicle trips and electricity consumption from operation of maintenance equipment; the project's operational energy use would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less-than-significant. The proposed project would follow applicable energy standards and regulations during the construction phases. Worker vehicles would meet the applicable standards of AB 1493 (vehicles manufactured 2009 or later) and, as a result, would likely consume less energy as fuel efficiency standards are increased and vehicles are replaced. In addition, the proposed project would be built and operated in accordance with all existing, applicable regulations at the time of construction. Impacts related to the project's potential to conflict with plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency would be less than significant.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 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 direct or indirect 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Ninyo & Moore prepared a geotechnical evaluation for the proposed project. The geotechnical evaluation is included as Appendix D to this MND. Further detail on the background and methodologies regarding the geology and soils analysis is found in Appendix D.

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause 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.

and

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project is located within a seismically active region, as is most of the Southern California region. The project would likely be exposed to seismic ground shaking at multiple points in the future. The intensity of ground shaking at any specific location within the region depends on the characteristics of the earthquakes, the distance from the earthquake epicenter, and the local geologic and soil conditions. Earthquake fault zones are delineated boundaries encompassing active faults that constitute potential hazards to structures from surface faulting or fault creep (DOC 2018). The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; the nearest fault (Puente Hills Fault) is located approximately 2.1 miles northeast of the project site (Appendix D). The project would also operate passively beyond the proposed pump to divert stormwater flows into the storage facility, which would not directly or indirectly increase or exacerbate the potential for fault rupture. The project would contain no habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy. Compliance with applicable seismic design requirements would reduce the potential risk to both people and structures, including the proposed storage reservoir and restroom facility, with respect to strong seismic ground shaking. As part of the project design process, continued geotechnical investigations would be performed to inform final design of the project relative to potential geotechnical risks. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, and impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Liquefaction occurs when pore water pressure builds up in the affected soil layer to a point where a total loss of shear strength may occur during a seismic event, causing the soil to behave as a liquid. Liquefaction is known generally to occur in saturated or near saturated cohesionless soils at depths shallower than 50 feet. Factors known to influence liquefaction potential include composition and thickness of soil layers, grain size, relative density, groundwater level, degree of saturation, and both intensity and duration of ground shaking. The State of California Hazard Zones map indicates that the subject site is located in an area mapped as being potentially susceptible to liquefaction; as part of the geotechnical evaluation, soils were tested for liquefaction potential using cone penetrating tests (Appendix D). Groundwater depth at the time of performance of the cone penetrating tests was approximately 50 feet below ground surface and the historic high depth to groundwater at the site is 8 feet (Appendix D). In the event that the groundwater level were to rise, under the right conditions, underlying soils are susceptible to liquefaction during a seismic event (Appendix D). Full project design would include engineering design standards associated with seismic events, including liquefaction. Standard design and construction techniques such as spread footings, mat foundations, or other design considerations would be incorporated per California Building Code requirements, minimizing hazards due to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. Landslides typically occur on moderate to steep slopes that are affected by such physical factors as slope height, slope steepness, shear strength, and orientation of weak layers in the underlying geologic units. The project site and surroundings are generally flat with soils stabilized by development and landscaping. The project would not result in the creation of moderate to steep slopes that may become susceptible to landslides. As such, no impact would occur.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the project would require earthwork activities that could potentially contribute to soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Construction of the project would result in more than 1 acre of land disturbance; therefore, a site-specific SWPPP in accordance with SWRCB Order No. 2009-0008-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit No. CAS00002 (Construction General Permit), amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ and Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, would be prepared and implemented during project construction. One of the purposes of the SWPPP is to address potential pollutants and their sources, including sources of sediment and site erosion. Conditions of these existing regulations would include adherence to sediment and stormwater pollutant control BMPs, such as covering of exposed soil stockpiles, sediment barriers, storm drain protection, and various other measures designed to minimize potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Disturbed areas would be returned to existing conditions or stabilized by new field replacement, asphalt, or landscape plantings. Operation of the proposed stormwater capture and filtration facility would not affect erosion. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion of the loss of topsoil and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As previously discussed, the project site contains soils susceptible to liquefaction. Full project design would include continued geotechnical investigations to inform final design and construction of the project relative to minimization of potential geotechnical risks, including soil stability, per applicable California Building Code requirements. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate geotechnical hazards related to unstable soils and impacts would be less the significant.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Expansive soils are clay-based and tend to increase in volume due to water absorption and decrease in water volume due to drying. The project site consists of undocumented fill underlain by young alluvium consisting of soft clay and silt and loose to moderately dense sand and silty sand (Appendix D). According to the geotechnical investigation, the on-site soils would be suitable for reuse and imported fill material would consist of clean, non-expansive, granular material (Appendix D). Therefore, soil expansion would not pose a potential concern for project implementation. If such conditions are encountered, the project would employ standard engineering protocols to limit the potential effects on project-related infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site and underlying soils have been previously disturbed by the development of the existing Spane Park, underlying infrastructure, and surrounding development.

Geotechnical borings indicated the project site consists of undocumented fill underlain by up to approximately 60 feet of Holocene alluvial deposits (Appendix D). However, caliche nodules and oxidation staining was reported from approximately 19–26 feet below ground surface in one of the borings. Caliche nodules and oxidation could indicate a middle to early Holocene or Pleistocene age of the sediments.

Dudek submitted a paleontological records search request to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM) of the project site and the surrounding vicinity on July 9, 2022, and the results were received on July 24, 2022. The LACM reported no fossil localities within the project site; however, they did report nearby Pleistocene terrestrial and marine fossil localities. The marine fossil locality, LACM IP (invertebrate paleontology) 7, produced oysters on a pecten (scallop) fragment from 735 feet below ground surface in a well near Compton. Mammoth (*Mammuthus*) were recovered from LACM VP (vertebrate paleontology) 3382, 3319, 3660, and 3365. LACM VP 3382 was collected in Compton at 5 feet below ground surface, LACM VP 3319 was collected at 30 feet below ground surface in Carson, LACM VP 3660 was collected at 19 feet below ground surface in Lakewood, and LACM VP 3365 was collected from an unknown depth in Athens on the Hill (Los Angeles). Finally, LACM VP 3266 produced unspecified vertebrates from 15 to 18 feet below ground surface in the West Athens area of Los Angeles.

With regards to paleontological resources, Holocene alluvial deposits have low sensitivity on the surface that increases to high with depth. The project has the potential for encountering previously undiscovered paleontological resources at subsurface levels during ground-disturbing activities. Implementation of MM-GEO-1 would reduce the project's potential impacts on paleontological resources during construction activities to below a level of significance.

MM-GEO-1 Prior to the commencement of any grading activity on site, the City of Paramount (City) shall retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist (QPP). A QPP is defined as a person who has a PhD or MS or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology), has a demonstrated knowledge of Southern California paleontology and geology, and has documented experience performing professional paleontological procedures and techniques. The QPP or a Qualified Paleontological Monitor (QPM) shall attend the pre-excavation meetings with representatives of the City and contractors to explain the importance of fossils, the laws protecting fossils, the need for mitigation, the types of fossils that might be discovered during excavation work, and the procedures that should be followed if fossils are discovered. A QPM is defined as an individual with at least 1 year of experience in field identification and collecting of fossil materials. The QPP, or a QPM under the direction and supervision of a QPP, shall be on site during original cutting of middle Holocene to Pleistocene-age

alluvial deposits. These deposits are anticipated below a depth of 15 feet below the ground surface. Monitoring of the noted geologic unit may be either increased or decreased after the original cutting depending upon if ongoing grading activities would involve cutting into native Pleistocene-age alluvium deposits, as determined by the qualified paleontologist. After 50% of excavations are complete in either an area or rock unit and no fossils of any kind have been discovered, the level of monitoring can be reduced or suspended entirely at the QPP's discretion.

1. In the event that well-preserved fossils are discovered, the QPP or QPM shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities in the discovery area to allow recovery in a timely manner. All collected fossil remains shall be cleaned, sorted, cataloged, and deposited in an appropriate paleontological repository as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's 2010 Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources at the applicant's expense.
2. A Final Monitoring Report (with a map showing fossil site locations) summarizing the results, analyses, and conclusions of the above-described monitoring/recovery program shall be submitted to the project proponent and designated fossil repository (if fossils are recovered) within 3 months of terminating monitoring activities. The final report should emphasize the discovery of any new or rare taxa, or paleoecological or taphonomic significance. A complete set of field notes, geologic maps, and stratigraphic sections and a list of identified specimens must be included in or accompany the final report. This report should be finalized only after all aspects of the mitigation program are completed, including preparation, identification, cataloging, and curatorial inventory. The final report (with any accompanying documents) and repository curation of specimens and samples constitute the goals of a successful paleontological resource mitigation program. Full copies of the final report should be deposited with both the lead agency and the repository institution with the request that all locality data remain confidential and not made available to the general public.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less-Than-Significant. GHGs are those that that absorb infrared radiation (i.e., trap heat) in the Earth's atmosphere. The trapping and buildup of heat in the atmosphere near the Earth's surface (the troposphere), is referred to as the "greenhouse effect," and is a natural process that contributes to the regulation of the Earth's temperature, creating a livable environment on Earth. The Earth's temperature depends on the balance between energy entering and leaving the planet's system, and many factors (natural and human) can cause changes in Earth's energy balance. Human activities that generate and emit GHGs to the atmosphere increase the amount of infrared radiation that gets absorbed before escaping into space, thus enhancing the greenhouse effect and causing the Earth's surface temperature to rise. This rise in temperature has led to large-scale changes to the Earth's system (e.g., temperature, precipitation, wind patterns), which are collectively referred to as climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project contributes to this impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs. Thus, GHG impacts are recognized exclusively as cumulative impacts (CAPCOA 2008).

As defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 38505(g) for purposes of administering many of the state's primary GHG emissions reduction programs, GHGs include CO_2, methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride (see also CEQA Guidelines Section 15364.5). The primary GHGs that would be emitted by project-related construction and operations include CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O.[11]

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change developed the global warming potential (GWP) concept to compare each GHG's ability to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The reference gas used is CO_2; therefore, GWP-weighted emissions are measured in metric tons (MT) of CO_2 equivalent (CO_2e). Consistent with CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0, this GHG emissions analysis assumed the GWP for CH_4 is 25 (i.e., emissions of 1 MT of CH_4 are equivalent to emissions of 25 MT of CO_2) and the GWP for N_2O is 298, based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007).

As discussed in Section 3.3, the proposed project is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the SCAQMD. In October 2008, the SCAQMD proposed recommended numeric CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions for lead agencies to use in assessing GHG impacts of residential and commercial development projects as presented in its Draft Guidance Document—Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (SCAQMD 2008b). This document, which builds on the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's previous guidance, explored various approaches for establishing a significance threshold for GHG emissions. The draft interim CEQA thresholds guidance document was not adopted or approved by the Governing Board. However, in December 2008, the SCAQMD adopted an interim 10,000 MT CO_2e per-year screening level threshold for stationary source/industrial projects for which the SCAQMD is the lead agency (SCAQMD 2010). The 10,000 MT CO_2e per-year threshold, which was derived from GHG reduction targets established in Executive Order S-3-05, was based on the

[11] Emissions of hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride are generally associated with industrial activities, including the manufacturing of electrical components and heavy-duty air conditioning units and the insulation of electrical transmission equipment (substations, power lines, and switch gears.). Therefore, emissions of these GHGs were not evaluated or estimated in this analysis because the project would not include these activities or components and would not generate hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride in measurable quantities.

conclusion that the threshold was consistent with achieving an emissions capture rate of 90% of all new or modified stationary source projects.

The SCAQMD formed a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group to work with SCAQMD staff on developing GHG CEQA significance thresholds until statewide significance thresholds or guidelines are established. From December 2008 to September 2010, the SCAQMD hosted working group meetings and revised the draft threshold proposal several times, although it did not officially provide these proposals in a subsequent document. The SCAQMD has continued to consider adoption of significance thresholds for residential and general land-use development projects. The most recent proposal issued by SCAQMD, issued in September 2010, uses the following tiered approach to evaluate potential GHG impacts from various uses (SCAQMD 2010):

Tier 1. Determine if CEQA categorical exemptions are applicable. If not, move to Tier 2.

Tier 2. Consider whether or not the proposed project is consistent with a locally adopted GHG reduction plan that has gone through public hearing and CEQA review, that has an approved inventory, includes monitoring, etc. If not, move to Tier 3.

Tier 3. Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of screening thresholds for individual land uses. The 10,000 MT CO_2e per-year threshold for industrial uses would be recommended for use by all lead agencies. Under option 1, separate screening thresholds are proposed for residential projects (3,500 MT CO_2e per year), commercial projects (1,400 MT CO_2e per year), and mixed-use projects (3,000 MT CO_2e per year). Under option 2, a single numerical screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO_2e per year would be used for all non-industrial projects. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable screening threshold, move to Tier 4.

Tier 4. Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of applicable performance standards for the project service population (population plus employment). The efficiency targets were established based on the goal of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The 2020 efficiency targets are 4.8 MT CO_2e per-service population for project-level analyses and 6.6 MT CO_2e per-service population for plan-level analyses. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable efficiency targets, move to Tier 5.

Tier 5. Consider the implementation of CEQA mitigation (including the purchase of GHG offsets) to reduce the project efficiency target to Tier 4 levels.

Section 15064.7(c) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that "when adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence." The CEQA Guidelines do not prescribe specific methodologies for performing an assessment, establish specific thresholds of significance, or mandate specific mitigation measures. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines emphasize the lead agency's discretion to determine the appropriate methodologies and thresholds of significance that are consistent with the manner in which other impact areas are handled in CEQA (CNRA 2009).

To determine the proposed project's potential to generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment, its GHG emissions were compared to the SCAQMD 3,000 MT CO_2e per year screening threshold recommended for non-industrial projects.

Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with off-road construction equipment, on-road haul and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. The SCAQMD Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (SCAQMD 2008b) recommends that "construction emissions be amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies." Thus, the total construction GHG emissions were calculated, amortized over 30 years, and added to the total operational emissions for comparison with the GHG significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO_2e per year. Therefore, the determination of significance is addressed in the operational emissions discussion following the estimated construction emissions.

CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the construction scenario described in Section 3.3. For the purposes of GHG emissions modeling, construction of the project is anticipated to commence in August 2023 and would last approximately 18 months. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment, and off-site sources include haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. Table 3.8-1 presents the GHG emissions resulting from construction of the project. For further detail on the assumptions and results of this analysis, please refer to Appendix A.

Table 3.8-1. Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

Construction Year	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	CO_2e
	Metric Tons per Year			
2023	171.99	0.03	0.01	176.31
2024	180.80	0.05	0.00	182.45
2025	10.51	0.00	0.00	10.60
			Total	369.36
			Amortized Emissions (30-year project life)	12.31

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent.
See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 3.8-1, the estimated total GHG emissions over the construction period would be approximately 369 MT CO_2e. Amortized over 30 years, construction GHG emissions would be approximately 12 MT CO_2e per year. In addition, as with project-generated construction criteria air pollutant emissions, GHG emissions generated during proposed construction activities would be short term, lasting only for the duration of the construction period, and would not represent a long-term source of GHG emissions.

Operational Emissions

Once project construction is complete, the project would result in minimal maintenance activities consisting of use of worker vehicles. The proposed project would generate GHG emissions from the operation of a small electric pump that would lift the water to an elevation higher than the existing storm drain. Proposed park improvements would not expand the footprint of Spane Park or result in a major expansion of facilities that would induce substantial demand or park users. GHG emissions from these emission sources are expected to be minor and thus, operational emissions would be less than significant.

As shown in Table 3.8-1, amortized project-generated construction emissions would not exceed the 3,000 MT CO_2e SCAQMD threshold. Therefore, GHG emissions impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project generate conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less-Than-Significant. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Applicable plans for the project site include the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP), SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, and CARB's 2017 and 2022 Scoping Plan Updates to address Senate Bill (SB) 32 and AB 1279. Each of these plans is described below along with an analysis of the proposed project's potential to conflict with the related GHG emission reduction goals.

Project Consistency with the City of Paramount Climate Action Plan

The City's CAP was adopted in July 2021 to provide strategies and measures to ensure the City reduces GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, consistent with the state's SB 32 target. Table 3.8-2 outlines the project's potential to conflict with the applicable measures of the City's CAP. As shown, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any of the applicable measures from the City's CAP and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3.8-2. Project Potential to Conflict with the Applicable City of Paramount CAP Measures and Strategies

CAP Measure/Strategy	Potential to Conflict Prior to Mitigation
Measure EE3: Improve Efficiency of Municipal Operations and Public Infrastructure	**No Conflict.** Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to commence in summer 2023 and would be subject to and would comply with all applicable state energy efficiency regulations including the most recent California Building Code Title 24 (24 CCR, Part 6), as verified through the City's development review and permitting process. Given that the restroom building currently at the project site would be updated consistent with the most recent Title 24 standards, operation of the facility would be an efficiency improvement above existing conditions.
Measure TR1: Support Fuel-Efficient and Alternative-Fuel Vehicles	**No Conflict.** The project proposes reconstruction of the existing parking lot to expand from the existing 15 stalls to 35 stalls. The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with all applicable state sustainable design regulations including the most recent California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code Title 24 (24 CCR, Part 11), as verified through the City's development review and permitting process. Compliance with the most current CALGreen Code would include demonstrating conformance with the minimum required number of electric vehicle charging spaces, as required by Chapter 15.06, Electric Vehicle Charging Station Requirements and Review Process, of the Paramount

Table 3.8-2. Project Potential to Conflict with the Applicable City of Paramount CAP Measures and Strategies

CAP Measure/Strategy	Potential to Conflict Prior to Mitigation
	Municipal Code (City of Paramount 2020). Conformance with the City's Mmunicipal Ceode and CALGreen electric vehicle charging infrastructure requirements would ensure that the proposed project is supporting the City's overall goals for fuel-efficiency and alternative-fuel vehicles as expressed in CAP Measure TR1.
Measure TR2: Improve Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure	**No Conflict**. The project proposes improvement of existing walkways and the addition of new walking connections throughout the project site. There are no formal bicycle lanes or other bicycle infrastructure within the immediate vicinity of the project site, however, the Active Transportation Plan includes a Class III bike lane along Orange Avenue south of Rosecrans and a Class II bike lane north of Rosecrans (City of Bellflower & City of Paramount 2019). and iImplementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the City's overall goals for bicycle infrastructure improvements, including the bike projects planned along Orange Avenue, -as expressed in CAP Measure TR2.
Measure WA1: Promote Water Conservation	**No Conflict**. As discussed previously, the proposed project would be subject to and would comply with all applicable state sustainable design regulations including the most recent CALGreen Code, as verified through the City's development review and permitting process. Given that the restroom building currently at the project site would be updated consistent with the most recent Title 24 standards, the new facility would include design features that promote both indoor and outdoor water conservation during operation. In addition, on-site landscaping associated with the proposed project would include use of native, drought-tolerant plant species.
Measure WA2: Promote Water Recycling and Greywater Use	**No Conflict**. The proposed project includes an approximately 5,200-square-foot habitat garden, in addition to miscellaneous landscaping and tree plantings across the site. During construction, a new irrigation system would be installed throughout the project site, which would use non-potable and recycled water. As such, implementation of the proposed project would support the City's goal of recycled and greywater use as expressed in CAP Measure WA2.
Measure WR1: Solid Waste Diversion Programs	**No Conflict**. The proposed project will comply with the City's waste reduction and recycling programs described in Article 8 of Chapter 13.20 of the City's Municipal Code, including but not limited to the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Program,

Table 3.8-2. Project Potential to Conflict with the Applicable City of Paramount CAP Measures and Strategies

CAP Measure/Strategy	Potential to Conflict Prior to Mitigation
	which require that at least ~~65~~50% of material generated during construction or demolition be diverted from the landfill (City of Paramount 2020).
Measure GA1: Support Urban Tree-Planting, Park Access, and Green Infrastructure	**No Conflict.** As discussed previously, the proposed project includes an approximately 5,200-squre-foot habitat garden, in addition to miscellaneous landscaping and tree plantings across the site. As part of the proposed park improvements, 64 additional trees will be planted at the site. Additionally, the project proposes improvement of existing walkways and the addition of new walking connections throughout the project site that will improve pedestrian park access.

Source: City of Paramount 2021.

Project Consistency with SCAG's 2020 RTP/SCS

On September 3, 2020, the Regional Council of SCAG formally adopted the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS as a regional growth management strategy, which targets per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks in the Southern California region pursuant SB 375. In addition to demonstrating the Region's ability to attain the GHG emission-reduction targets set forth by CARB, the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS outlines a series of actions and strategies for integrating the transportation network with an overall land use pattern that responds to projected growth, housing needs, changing demographics, and transportation demands (SCAG 2020). Thus, successful implementation of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS would result in more complete communities with various transportation and housing choices while reducing automobile use.

The primary objective of the RTP/SCS is to provide guidance for future regional growth (i.e., the location of new residential and non-residential land uses) and transportation patterns throughout the region, as stipulated under SB 375. Given that the proposed project involves constructing and operating a stormwater capture and treatment facility, the goals and strategies of the RTP/SCS are not directly applicable. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with the goals and policies of the RTP/SCS and impacts would be less than significant.

Project Consistency with State Reduction Targets and CARB's Scoping Plan

The California State Legislature passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) to provide initial direction to limit California's GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and initiate the state's long-range climate objectives. Since the passage of AB 32, the state has adopted GHG emissions reduction targets for future years beyond the initial 2020 horizon year. For the proposed project, the relevant GHG emissions reduction targets include those established by SB 32 and AB 1279, which require GHG emissions be reduced to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and 85% below 1990 levels by 2045, respectively. In addition, AB 1279 requires the state achieve net zero GHG emissions by no later than 2045 and achieve and maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter.

As defined by AB 32, CARB is required to develop the Scoping Plan, which provides the framework for actions to achieve the state's GHG emission targets. The Scoping Plan is required to be updated every 5 years and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and initiatives that will reduce GHG emissions statewide. The first Scoping Plan was adopted in 2008, and it was updated in 2014, 2017, and most recently in 2022. Although the Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects, nor is it intended to be used for project-level evaluations,[12] it is the official framework for the measures and regulations that will be implemented to reduce California's GHG emissions in alignment with the adopted targets. Therefore, a project would be found to not conflict with the statutes if it would meet the Scoping Plan policies and would not impede attainment of the goals therein.

CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan update was the first to address the state's strategy for achieving the 2030 GHG reduction target set forth in SB 32 (CARB 2017); the most recent CARB 2022 Scoping Plan update outlines the state's plan to reduce emissions and achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 in alignment with AB 1279 and assesses progress ~~is making~~ toward the 2030 SB 32 target (CARB 2022). As such, given that SB 32 and AB 1279 are the relevant GHG emission targets, the 2017 and 2022 Scoping Plan updates are the most applicable to the proposed project.

The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update included measures to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency (including the mandates of SB 350), measures to increase stringency of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, measures identified in the Mobile Source and Freight Strategies, measures identified in the proposed Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Plan, and measures to increase stringency of SB 375 targets. The 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality builds upon and accelerates programs currently in place, including moving to zero-emission transportation; phasing out use of fossil gas use for heating homes and buildings; reducing chemical and refrigerants with high GWP; providing communities with sustainable options for walking, biking, and public transit; and displacement of fossil-fuel fired electrical generation through use of renewable energy alternatives (e.g., solar arrays and wind turbines) (CARB 2022).

Many of the measures and programs included in the Scoping Plan would result in the reduction of project-related GHG emissions with no action required at the project-level, including GHG emission reductions through increased energy efficiency and renewable energy production (SB 350), reduction in carbon intensity of transportation fuels (Low Carbon Fuel Standard), and the accelerated efficiency and electrification of the statewide vehicle fleet (Mobile Source Strategy). Given that the proposed project is also not anticipated to result in substantial increase in mobile trips (see Section 3.17, Transportation), the project would also not conflict with the 2017 update's goal of reducing GHG emissions through reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) statewide.

The 2045 carbon neutrality goal required CARB to expand proposed actions in the 2022 update to include those that capture and store carbon in addition to those that reduce anthropogenic sources of GHG emissions. The proposed project would support the state's carbon neutrality goals, as implementation includes addition of urban trees and native plantings throughout the project site, which represent opportunities for potential carbon removal and sequestration over the project lifetime. However, the 2022 update emphasizes that reliance on carbon sequestration in the state's natural and working lands will not be sufficient to address residual GHG emissions, and achieving carbon neutrality will require research,

[12] The Final Statement of Reasons for the amendments to the CEQA Guidelines reiterates the statement in the Initial Statement of Reasons that "the Scoping Plan may not be appropriate for use in determining the significance of individual projects because it is conceptual at this stage and relies on the future development of regulations to implement the strategies identified in the Scoping Plan" (CNRA 2009).

development, and deployment of additional methods to capture atmospheric GHG emissions (e.g., mechanical direct air capture). Given that the specific path to neutrality will require development of technologies and programs that are not currently known or available, the project's role in supporting the statewide goal would be speculative and cannot be wholly identified at this time.

Overall, the proposed project would comply will all regulations adopted in furtherance of the Scoping Plan to the extent applicable and required by law. As mentioned above, several Scoping Plan measures would result in reductions of project-related GHG emissions with no action required at the project-level, including those related to energy efficiency, reduced fossil fuel use, and renewable energy production. As demonstrated above, the proposed project would not conflict with CARB's 2017 or 2022 Scoping Plan updates or with the state's ability to achieve the 2030 and 2045 GHG reduction and carbon neutrality goals. Further, the proposed project's consistency with the applicable measures and programs would assist in meeting the City's contribution to GHG emission reduction targets in California. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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 reasonably 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 that 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Relatively small amounts of commonly used hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, adhesive materials, grease, solvents, and architectural coatings would be used during construction. Operation and maintenance of the project would also require routine use of common hazardous substances. These materials are used routinely throughout urban environments for construction projects and operation of utility infrastructure. These materials would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Consequently, use of these materials for their intended purpose would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment. With adherence to state and local regulations, impacts associated with routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

b) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed under Section 3.9(a), construction and operation would involve relatively small amounts of commonly used hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, grease, adhesive materials, and solvents. These materials are not considered acutely hazardous and are used routinely throughout urban environments for both construction and operation of projects. Further, these materials would be transported, handled, and disposed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is bordered by Los Cerritos Elementary School to the south. Construction and operation of the project would involve relatively small amounts of commonly used hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, grease, adhesive materials, and solvents. These materials are used routinely throughout urban environments for construction projects and would not pose a significant risk to the public or environment. Additionally, these materials would be transported and handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials.

Potential health impacts related to construction air emissions are analyzed in Section 3.3 of this MND. As discussed in Section 3.3, proposed construction activities would generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$; therefore, localized impacts of the proposed project warrant implementation of mitigation. MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2, which require site watering and minimum construction equipment emissions standards, would be incorporated into project construction and would reduce emissions to below site-specific LSTs (refer to Table 3.3-4). Additionally, a construction HRA was performed for the project, which demonstrates that the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold and Chronic Hazard Index less than 1. Therefore, TAC emissions from construction of the project would result in a potentially significant impact. MM-AQ-2, which requires use of Tier 4 Final engines for off-road equipment to reduce DPM emissions during project construction, is required. With the incorporation of MM-AQ-2, emissions would be reduced to below applicable thresholds (refer to Table 3.3-7). As such, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

d) Would the project be located on a site that 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?

No Impact. According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database no sites or facilities are located within or adjacent to the project site. The nearest identified active site is the Carlton Forge Works, a Voluntary Cleanup Site, located approximately 0.83 miles southeast of the project site (DTSC 2022). Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List. The SWRCB's GeoTracker database identifies leaking underground storage tanks, waste discharge sites, oil and gas sites, and other waste or cleanup sites. A review of GeoTracker did not identify any sites or facilities within or adjacent to the project site. The nearest identified sites with open-site assessment statuses include the following: Chevron Terminal (ID No. SL377422475), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.18 miles east of the project site; New Century Industries Inc. (ID No. T10000005966), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.22 northeast ~~north~~ of the project site; Cerro Metal Products Co (ID No. SL204891695), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.46 southeast of the project site; and Father Flannagan's Boys and Girls Town (ID No. SLT43657655), a Cleanup Program Site, located approximately 0.84 miles southwest of the project site (SWRCB 2022). These hazardous materials sites are located at adequate distances from the project site such that they would be of no concern to present a worker hazard for construction crews. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The project site is approximately 4 miles northeast of the Compton/Woodley Airport, approximately 5 miles north of Long Beach Airport, and approximately 12 miles east of Los Angeles International Airport. The project site does not fall within the airport land use plan for ~~either~~ these airports. The project is not located within 2 miles of a public use airport. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City has prepared a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. The hazard mitigation plan is a document that contains information to assist in planning for the occurrence of natural and human-caused hazards; it contains action items that address multiple hazards including earthquakes, floods, hazardous materials, severe weather, and wildfires (City of Paramount 2021). Construction of the stormwater capture and filtration facility would require access to the box culvert located along Rosecrans Avenue. Access to the box culvert would be provided via the manhole located within Rosecrans Avenue. As such, project construction would require the temporary partial closure of Rosecrans Avenue. The temporary partial closure of Rosecrans Avenue would be performed pursuant to a traffic-control plan prepared by the contractor and subject to City approval, which would demonstrate that emergency access or evacuation would not be impeded. Traffic on Rosecrans Avenue would resume to existing conditions upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. The project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area and is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2022). The nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is located in Fullerton, approximately 11 miles east of the project site. In the event of an emergency, fire response services for the project are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Construction and operation of the project would comply with Chapter 8.08 of the City's Municipal Code, which adopts the California Fire Code (CFC) by reference. Chapter 33 of the CFC outlines general fire safety precautions during construction and demolition that are intended to maintain minimum levels of fire protection and limit the spread of fire (City of Paramount 2020). The project would not include structures intended for long-term occupancy or include development that could exacerbate fire risk. Furthermore, the project site is relatively flat and would not influence prevailing winds or other factors that could exacerbate wildfire risk. As such, people and structures would not be exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires. No impact would occur.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located within the LLAR WMP Group jurisdiction. The WMP outlines water quality objectives and includes measures to reduce discharge pollutants and protect and improve water quality within the subwatersheds of Reach 1 and Reach 2 of the Los Angeles River, Compton Creek, and Rio Hondo.

Construction of the project would involve ground disturbing activities for grading that could result in sediment discharge in stormwater runoff. Additionally, construction would involve the use of oil, lubricants, and other chemicals that could be discharged from leaks or accidental spills. These potential sediment and chemical discharges during construction would have the potential to impact water quality in receiving water bodies. However, the project would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP, which would include water quality BMPs to ensure that water quality standards are met and that runoff from the construction work areas does not cause degradation of water quality in receiving water bodies. Through the incorporation

of BMPs through implementation of SWPPP requirements, impacts associated with water quality standards during construction would be less than significant.

The purpose of the project is to decrease the amount of pollutants in stormwater and dry-weather runoff entering the LLAR. The project would be implementing identified improvements in the LLAR WMP for pollution reduction. Upon operation, existing stormwater flows would be diverted and treated prior to infiltration and/or discharge, resulting in water quality benefits compared to existing conditions. Ongoing maintenance and sampling would ensure that the project is performing as expected in terms of treatment of stormwater. Therefore, impacts during operation would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Groundwater was not encountered during subsurface borings as part of the project-specific geotechnical evaluation, but cone penetrating test data indicate that the depth of groundwater is approximately 50 feet below the ground surface (Appendix D). The geotechnical evaluation also included percolation testing of on-site soils to inform the design of the infiltration gallery. The storage reservoir would facilitate infiltration of captured stormwater, allowing water to seep into the underlying groundwater table and providing natural filtration through the soil. The project would not otherwise result in a substantial change in impervious surfaces that would affect groundwater infiltration. The proposed expanded parking lot would feature drainage facilities that connect to the infiltration gallery. Additionally, the project would not entail temporary or permanent use of groundwater and, thus, would not deplete groundwater within the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off site?

and

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?

and

iii) 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?

and

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The intent of the project is to capture and divert existing surface water flows, which would be controlled in a manner so as to avoid erosion and off-site flooding. The project would not result in a substantial change in impervious surfaces within the project site. The proposed expanded

parking lot would feature drainage facilities that connect to the infiltration gallery to collect the water flowing across the impervious surface. Therefore, implementation of the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a way that would cause substantial erosions, flooding, polluted runoff, or changes to flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood maps, the project site is not located within a designated high risk or special flood hazard area (Appendix D). Additionally, the project site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone and seiches do not pose a hazard to the project site (DOC 2023). The project would include the construction of a stormwater capture and treatment facility, which would improve the water quality of the LLAR. As discussed in Section 3.10(a), the project would prepare a SWPPP, which would include water quality BMPs to ensure that water quality standards are met and that runoff from the construction work areas does not cause degradation of water quality in receiving water bodies. Upon completion of construction, the project would not require the storage of pollutants that, in the event of inundation, could be released. When the water level in the reservoir reaches a predetermined elevation during heavy storm flows, excess inflow would enter a discharge pipeline for final pollutant removal prior to reentering the storm drain system and discharging into LLAR, similar to existing flow conditions except the stormwater flow would be pre-treated. Therefore, no impact associated with the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone would occur.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1, Introduction, the proposed project is identified in the LLAR WMP as a regional BMP project that would help meet regional pollution reduction goals. The project would implement the applicable water quality control plan for the region. As discussed previously, the project would allow for infiltration into the underlying soils and would not interfere with groundwater supplies. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The entire project would be located within the existing Spane Park. The project would not create a physical division of an existing community, like what could occur with the development of a freeway or large linear infrastructure. The project would not result in a removal of an existing means of access, such as a road or bridge, that would impede mobility with an existing community and other areas. Upon completion, recreational use of the affected portion of the park would resume under existing conditions. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and no impact would occur.

b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The project site is zoned as Light Manufacturing (M-1) and has a General Plan land use designation of Park. The project would include the construction of a stormwater capture and filtration facility, primarily located underground, and improvements to the existing Spane Park. Upon completion, recreational use of the affected portion of the park would resume under similar conditions. Implementation of the project would not result in a change to land uses. Potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the project are analyzed throughout this MND. The project will incorporate applicable mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would not be in conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project 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?

and

b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. According to maps obtained through the California Department of Conservation and California Geological Survey, the project site is located within in an area designated as Mineral Resource Zone 1, which are areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits area present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence (Miller 1994). Therefore, the project would not result in any further loss of availability of the identified resources and no impact would occur.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Existing Setting

The project site is bounded by Rosecrans Avenue to the north, an industrial warehouse to the east, medium density neighborhoods zoned R-2 to the west, and Los Cerritos Elementary School to the south (City of Paramount 2022). Nearby residences and the adjacent school are considered noise sensitive receptors.

Represented by locations ST1, ST2, and ST3 in Table 3.13-1, the existing outdoor ambient sound environment of Spane Park was sampled during a field survey conducted on July 29, 2022. Collected sample sound pressure level measurements at these locations, along with documented investigator observations regarding perceived or

witnessed acoustical contributors to this baseline or pre-project noise environment, also appear in Table 3.13-1. These locations are intended to be representative of the backyards of existing single-family homes adjoining the project area. Photographs, tagged survey positions, and instrument details can be found in Appendix E, Noise Modeling Data.

Table 3.13-1. Measured Samples of Existing Outdoor Ambient Sound Level

Survey Position	Description/Address	Time	L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	Notes (Perceived Sound Sources)
ST1	10 feet north of the south border of Spane Park	10:04 a.m.–10:14 a.m.	59.6	81.1	49.8	Running lake water, birds (honking geese and other avian), nearby and distant conversations/yelling, rustling leaves, distant music from parked car, park visitor footsteps
ST2	20 feet south of Rosecrans Avenue	10:30 a.m.–10:40 p.m.	68.1	80.8	49.0	Nearby and distant roadway traffic (Rosecrans Avenue, I-105, I-710), distant conversations, basketball court, bicyclists
ST3	5 feet northeast of the corner of San Rafael Street and Gundry Avenue	10:50 a.m.–11:00 a.m.	55.8	64.9	50.1	Nearby and distant roadway traffic (Rosecrans Avenue, I-105, I-710), birds, distant conversations, distant dog barking, distant gardener/landscape noise

Source: Appendix E
Notes: L_{eq} = equivalent continuous sound level (time-averaged sound level); dBA = A-weighted decibels; L_{max} = maximum sound level during the measurement interval; L_{min} = minimum sound level during the measurement interval; I = Interstate.

The measured outdoor energy-equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) values appearing in Table 3.13-1 range from 55.8 to 68.1 A-weighted decibels (dBA) and are consistent with expectations for the environment based on the distance to major roadways such as Rosecrans Avenue. For instance, guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on estimating outdoor ambient sound level indicates that noise from "other roadways" 10 to 50 feet away from a receptor would be an estimated 70 dBA L_{eq} during daytime hours (FTA 2018).

Regulatory Setting and Thresholds of Significance

Local Noise Ordinance and General Plan Guidance

The project site is zoned as industrial. Section 9.12.040 sets ambient base noise levels of 82 dBA daytime (6:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.) and 77 dBA nighttime (10:00 p.m.–6:00 a.m.) for the M-1 zoned industrial properties on Rosecrans Avenue that adjoin the park. Section 9.12.040 sets ambient base noise levels of 62 dBA daytime (6:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.) and 57 dBA nighttime (10:00 p.m.–6:00 a.m.) for the R-2 zoned properties on Gundry Avenue that adjoin the park. These noise standards apply to the following related noise sources referenced in Section 9.12.060. Section 9.12.060 B4a of the City of Paramount noise regulations (i.e., Chapter 9.12 of the Municipal Code) does not quantify allowable construction noise levels; however, it prohibits construction without a permit between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Section 9.12.060 B3 prohibits pump and other machinery operation not related to emergency work (City of Paramount 2020). The City of Paramount's General Plan Noise Element (City of Paramount 2007) also provides the following relevant policies:

- Health and Safety Element Policy 34: The City of Paramount will promote the development of a compatible noise environment throughout the City.

Federal Guidance

Lacking quantified noise limits for construction noise at the local level, this assessment adopts the FTA-based guidance of 80 dBA 8-hour L_{eq} at a noise sensitive receptor to determine impact significance.

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less-than-Significant Impact.

Construction

Construction of the project would result in the temporary generation of noise at the project site. Construction would involve the use of heavy equipment and machinery, such as excavators, loaders, cranes, temporary generators, scrapers, and other equipment. Construction would generate levels of noise that can vary from hour to hour and day to day depending on the equipment in use, the operations being performed, and the distance between the source and receptor. Typically, construction equipment operates in alternating cycles of full power and low power, producing average noise levels less than the maximum noise level. The average sound level of construction activity also depends on the amount of time that the equipment operates and the intensity of construction activities during that time. Table 3.13-2 presents the estimated construction noise level (8-hour L_{eq}) for each anticipated phase of project construction activity. Details of these predictions in Appendix E show the expected acoustical contribution from each type of operating construction equipment for each phase.

Table 3.13-2. Estimated Per-Phase Construction Noise Levels

Project Construction Activity Phase	Nearest Horizontal Distance to Nearest Noise-sensitive Receptor (Feet)	Predicted 8-hour L_{eq} (dBA) for Nearest Distance	Centroid Horizontal Distance to Nearest Noise-sensitive Receptor (Feet)	Predicted 8-hour L_{eq} (dBA) for Centroid Distance
Site mobilization, clearing, grubbing, and vegetation removal	78	79.8	270	69.0
Demolition of existing basketball courts and restroom building	80	78.2	230	69.0
Reservoir excavation	267	66.6	360	64.0
Reservoir construction	267	66.4	360	63.8
Pipeline, diversion structure, and treatment facility/pump installation	440	61.6	480	60.8
Field surface replacement	240	72.0	340	69.0
Restroom building construction	275	63.3	303	62.5
Basketball court construction	218	65.3	250	64.1
Parking reconstruction	72	77.4	140	71.6
Concrete pathway improvements	60	73.4	340	58.4
Pond and stream revitalization	105	73.1	235	66.1

Table 3.13-2. Estimated Per-Phase Construction Noise Levels

Project Construction Activity Phase	Nearest Horizontal Distance to Nearest Noise-sensitive Receptor (Feet)	Predicted 8-hour L_{eq} (dBA) for Nearest Distance	Centroid Horizontal Distance to Nearest Noise-sensitive Receptor (Feet)	Predicted 8-hour L_{eq} (dBA) for Centroid Distance
Ancillary park improvements	60	78.0	270	64.9

Note: L_{eq} = energy-equivalent sound level; dBA = A-weighted decibel

The predicted aggregate noise levels for some of the 12 studied construction activity phases are substantially greater than the samples of baseline outdoor ambient noise levels appearing in Table 3.13-1 and would represent an audible change to the environment; however, all predicted levels are less than the 80 dBA 8-hour L_{eq} FTA-based standard and would therefore result in a less-than-significant impact.

Operation

Upon completion of construction, the project would feature underground infrastructure to convey stormwater. These on-site features would include a duplex submersible pump station, and its powered mechanical systems would be enclosed in a concrete "wet well" below grade with only a double-door hatch to the above-surface environment. Hence, noise from operation of pump would be isolated by the closed access hatch and result in predicted noise levels that are less than 30 dBA at a radius of over 25 feet from the hatch, well below the existing noise environment (Table 3.13-1). On this basis, and compared to the measurement samples of L_{eq} presented in Table 3.13-1, project operation noise is anticipated to be less than the existing outdoor ambient level at the nearest existing sensitive receptors, and thereby comply with the set ambient base noise levels per Section 9.12.040. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Vibration is oscillatory movement of mass (typically a solid) over time. Depending on their distances to a sensitive receptor, operation of large bulldozers, graders, loaded dump trucks, or other heavy construction equipment and vehicles on a construction site have the potential to cause high vibration amplitudes.

The City's Municipal Code does not have a vibration threshold against which project construction-related groundborne vibration impacts to the community can be assessed. For purposes of this impact assessment, a vibration velocity level of 0.2 inches per second (ips) peak particle velocity (PPV) is used as the standard for evaluating human annoyance (to perceived groundborne vibration within an occupied structure) and the potential risk for residential building damage due to "continuous" or frequently occurring groundborne vibration events (Caltrans 2021).

Groundborne vibration attenuates rapidly, even over short distances. The attenuation of groundborne vibration as it propagates from source to receptor through intervening soils and rock can be estimated with expressions found in FTA and the California Department of Transportation guidance. By way of example, for a bulldozer or grader operating as close as 90 feet to the nearest receiving residential land use during the Field Surface Replacement construction phase as shown in Table 3.13-2, the estimated vibration velocity level would be 0.013 ips per the equation as follows (FTA 2018):

$$PPV_{rcvr} = PPV_{ref} \times (25/D)^{1.5} = 0.013 \text{ ips } PPV = 0.089 \times (25/90)^{1.5}$$

In the above equation, PPVrcvr is the predicted vibration velocity at the receiver position (i.e., residence), PPVref is the reference value at 25 feet from the vibration source (the bulldozer), and D is the actual horizontal distance to the receiver from the source.

During parking lot resurfacing, operation of a vibratory roller is anticipated and could be as close as 160 feet to an existing home. Because the roller exhibits more vibration than the previous dozer or grader example, having a reference PPV (PPV_{ref}) of 0.21 ips at 25 feet, its groundborne vibration would attenuate to 0.013 ips PPV. Both predicted groundborne vibration velocity PPV values associated with project construction are well below the 0.2 ips PPV threshold for building occupant annoyance and building damage risk. Impacts during construction would be less than significant.

After completion of project construction, operation of the pump station and other project components are unlikely to cause vibration at the nearest off-site structures. Powered mechanical systems like the submersible pump are designed with reciprocating and/or rotating components that are balanced well and machined to high tolerances of precision that consequently minimize vibration and help sustain long operational life. Furthermore, vibrational energy from pump operation would be attenuated by both the pump enclosure and the surrounding soils. For this reason, project operation groundborne vibration at off-site receptors would be considered less than significant.

c) ***For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

No Impact. There are no public airports or private airfields within 2 miles of the project and the project area is far from any aviation traffic noise contour greater than 65 dBA community noise equivalent level. Construction workers and park users would not be exposed to significantly aviation noise levels. No impact would occur.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?

No Impact. Construction of the project would result in a temporary direct increase in construction jobs in the area. However, given the relatively small nature of the project construction and anticipated schedule, the demand for construction employment would likely be met within the existing and future labor market in the City and in the greater Los Angeles County area. If construction workers live outside of the City, these workers would likely commute during the temporary construction period. Operationally, the project does not contain land uses that typically result in direct population growth, such as new homes or large commercial/business centers. The project would not change the use of the existing Spane Park. Upon completion, the project would improve Spane Park to further serve the existing and anticipated future demand for recreational uses within the City. Additionally, the project is consistent with underlying land use and zoning designations. Therefore, the project would not directly result in substantial unplanned population growth in the area.

The project is located in an area served by existing roads and infrastructure. The project does not include the extension of utility infrastructure, such as sewer lines or roads, into previously undeveloped areas that may indirectly induce growth. Therefore, the project would not indirectly result in substantial unplanned population growth in the area. No impact would occur.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project site does not contain any existing housing or provide other means of housing people. The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

3.15 Public Services

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

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? Police protection? Schools? Other public facilities?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 3.14, Population and Housing, the project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. As such, construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not require new or physically altered facilities associated with fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Parks?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project is located within Spane Park and would result in physical alteration to an existing park. The total duration of project construction is anticipated to last 18 months and would require temporary closure of the park. Depending on the construction phase, affected portions of Spane Park would be temporarily closed to the public for the duration. The construction area would be fenced off for safety and security purposes and made unavailable for public use during project construction. The proposed stormwater capture and filtration facility would be located primarily underground and would not affect park use. The project would also include the replacement of the existing park infrastructure, revitalization of the existing pond and stream, new landscaping, and other improvements to park facilities as described in Section 2.2.4. Upon completion of construction, recreational use of the park would resume similar to existing conditions. As such, implementation of the project would not require the provision of new parks. Therefore, impacts to parks as a result of the project would be less then significant.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The total duration of project construction is anticipated to last 18 months and would require the temporary closure of Spane Park. As such, project construction may result in the temporary increase in use of other parks in the City. However, upon completion of construction, recreational use of the affected portion of the park would resume under existing conditions. As such, impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would include improvements to the existing Spane Park. As discussed in Section 3.16(a), the temporary closure of the park may result in an increase in use of other parks in the City. However, upon completion of construction, recreational use of the affected portion of the park would resume under existing conditions. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 3.14, implementation of the project would not induce population growth. As such, the project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the project are analyzed throughout this MND. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

This section analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed project based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), which focuses on VMT for determining the significance of transportation impacts. Pursuant to SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis changed from level of service or vehicle delay to VMT. The related updates to the CEQA Guidelines required under SB 743 were approved on December 28, 2018. This methodology was required to be used statewide beginning July 1, 2020. For the purposes of this section, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (OPR 2018) has been used.

a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City's General Plan Transportation Element contains policies to guide the ongoing development of the City's circulation system. The General Plan Transportation Element (City of Paramount 2007) includes the following overarching policies:

- The maintenance and improvement of the roadway system in the City to accommodate future traffic
- The use of innovative circulation strategies designed to create a transportation system that is sensitive to the City's aims for continued economic development
- The development of a roadway and circulation network that promotes pedestrian activity in selected areas of the City
- The efficient use of alternative forms of transportation that serve the City

Spane Park is served by multiple existing roads of the City's circulation system. Access to the park is provided via Rosecrans Avenue and Gundry Avenue. Both roadways feature pedestrian sidewalks on each side of the roadway. ~~No~~ While the Active Transportation Plan includes a bicycle project planned along Orange Avenue, no formal bicycle lanes or other facilities are presently located in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Long Beach Transit bus stops are located along Rosecrans Avenue, along the project frontage.

Construction of the project would generate temporary trips. Maintenance of the project would require nominal trips that would not cause a measurable effect to the circulation system or warrant any formal traffic analysis. Additionally, the project would not result in a permanent change to the existing or planned circulation system in the City. The project would be served by existing roadway, transit, and pedestrian facilities and would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focuses on VMT for determining the significance of transportation impacts. It is further divided into four subdivisions: (1) land use projects, (2) transportation projects, (3) qualitative analysis, and (4) methodology. The Updated CEQA Guidelines state that "generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts," and define VMT as "the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project." "Automobile" refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. The OPR has clarified in its Technical Advisory (OPR 2018) that heavy-duty truck VMT is not required to be included in the estimation of a project's VMT. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of a project on transit and non-motorized traveled.

The project is not a land use or transportation project; the project would not result in a major expansion of Spane Park such that it would induce substantial vehicle trips to and from the park. Therefore, neither Section 15064.3(b)(1) nor Section 15064.3(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines apply, as the project is not a land use or transportation project. Instead, the project would be categorized under Section 15064.3(b)(3), suitable for qualitative analysis and not subject to a quantitative threshold.

The project would involve construction that would generate temporary construction-related traffic for approximately 18 months and nominal operations traffic. Even though worker and vendor trips would

generate VMT, once construction is completed, the construction-related traffic would cease and traffic would return to pre-construction conditions. Measures to reduce the VMT generated by workers and trucks are limited, and there are no thresholds or significance criteria for temporary, construction-related VMT. The project construction would be generally consistent with construction activities in terms of the temporary nature of activities, trip generation characteristics, and the types of vehicles and equipment required. The increase in VMT associated with the projects' construction is expected to be temporary and would therefore not cause a significant VMT impact.

Once construction is complete, project operation is anticipated to entail routine maintenance activities at the stormwater capture facility performed by City staff. Activities would include removal of debris and pollutant constituents from the treatment devices, pump testing and calibration, monitoring/sampling of treatment, and cleaning the storage reservoir. Proposed park improvements would not expand the footprint of Spane Park or result in a major expansion of facilities that would induce substantial demand or park users. The operation of the project can be considered a "small project" per the City's Transportation Study Guidelines and OPR's Technical Advisory, given that it would not generate greater than 110 daily trips[13] and would therefore be presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact.

Therefore, the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.3(b)(1) and 15064.3(b)(3) and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Access for construction-related traffic (workers and trucks) to the site would be from the existing driveways along Gundry Avenue. As such, passenger cars and trucks entering and exiting the project site would be able to do so safely and without causing congestion at the driveways during construction or operation of the project. Access from Gundry Avenue to the parking lot would be designed to City standards for site distance and other safety concerns, similar to the existing access point. Therefore, project would not substantially increase hazards due to a roadway design feature or introduce incompatible uses. Impact would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located in an established, developed area with ample access for emergency service providers. As discussed in Section 3.9(f), construction of the project would require the temporary partial closure of Rosecrans Avenue, which would not impede emergency response or evacuation within the City. Rosecrans Avenue would resume existing conditions upon completion of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

[13] This threshold ties directly to the OPR technical advisory and notes that CEQA provides a categorical exemption for existing facilities, including additions to existing structures of up to 10,000 square feet, so long as the project is in an area where public infrastructure is available to allow for maximum planned development and the project is not in an environmentally sensitive area (14 CCR 15301[e][2]). Typical project types for which trip generation increases relatively linearly with building footprint (i.e., general office building, single tenant office building, office park, and business park) generate or attract an additional 110-124 trips per 10,000 square feet. Therefore, absent substantial evidence otherwise, it is reasonable to conclude that the addition of 110 or fewer trips could be considered not to lead to a significant impact.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

Assembly Bill 52

AB 52 of 2014 amended PRC Section 5097.94 and added PRC Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3. AB 52 established that tribal cultural resources (TCRs) must be considered under CEQA and also provided for additional Native American consultation requirements for the lead agency. PRC Section 21074 describes a TCR as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object that is considered of cultural value to a California Native American Tribe. A TCR is either:

- On the CRHR or a local historic register
- Eligible for the CRHR or a local historic register
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1

AB 52 formalizes the lead agency–tribal consultation process, requiring the lead agency to initiate consultation with California Native American groups that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area, including tribes that may not be federally recognized. Lead agencies are required to begin consultation prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report by contacting those tribal groups who have previously provided formal written request for notification of projects under the agency's jurisdiction.

Section 1 (a)(9) of AB 52 establishes that "a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource has a significant effect on the environment." Effects on TCRs should be considered under CEQA. Section 6 of AB 52 adds Section 21080.3.2 to the PRC, which states that parties may propose mitigation measures "capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource." Further, if a California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding project alternatives, mitigation measures, or significant effects to TCRs, the consultation shall include those topics (PRC Section 21080.3.2[a]). Finally, the environmental document, for which the tribal consultation is focused, and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (where applicable), developed in consideration of information provided by tribes during the formal consultation process, shall include any mitigation measures that are adopted (PRC Section 21082.3[a]).

The project is subject to compliance with AB 52 (PRC Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to TCRs as part of the CEQA process, and that the lead agency notify California Native American tribal representatives (that have requested notification) who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. All NAHC-listed California Native American tribal representatives who requested project notification pursuant to AB 52 were sent letters from the City on February 16, 2023, via United States Postal Service mailing. The notification letters contained a project description, outline of AB 52 timing, an invitation to consult, a project site plan, and contact information for the appropriate lead agency representative. Table 3.18-1 summarizes the results of the AB 52 and consultation efforts for the project thus far.

Table 3.18-1. Assembly Bill 52 Native American Tribal Outreach Results

Native American Tribal Representatives	Consultation Record
Andrew Salas, Chairperson Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation)	**May 30, 2023** Consultation between the City of Paramount (City) and the Kizh Nation was conducted. **June 2, 2023** Email response from the Kizh Nation sent to the City following the consultation meeting. The email included explanatory text for the attached files provided by the Kizh Nation, which included snippets of maps, excerpts from literary texts, letters from technical experts, and mitigation measures. To date, no additional record of communication has been received by the City from the Kizh Nation, and the City has formally concluded consultation.
Anthony Morales, Chairperson Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians	No response has been received to date.
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson Gabrielino/Tongva Nation	No response has been received to date.
Robert Dorame, Chairperson Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council	No response has been received to date.

Table 3.18-1. Assembly Bill 52 Native American Tribal Outreach Results

Native American Tribal Representatives	Consultation Record
Christina Conley, Tribal Consultant and Administrator Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council	No response has been received to date.
Charles Alvarez Gabrielino/Tongva Tribe	No response has been received to date.
Lovina Redner, Tribal Chair Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians	No response has been received to date.
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	No response has been received to date.
Isaiah Vivanco, Chairperson Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	No response has been received to date.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, no previously recorded archaeological resources of Native American origin or tribal cultural resources listed in the CRHR or a local register were identified within the project site as a result of the SCCIC records, NAHC SLF search, or as a result of information provided from consulting tribes. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect TCRs that are listed or eligible for listing in a state or local register. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project is subject to compliance with AB 52 (PRC Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to TCRs as part of the CEQA process, and requires lead agencies to provide notification of proposed projects to California Native American tribal representatives who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project area and who have requested such notifications. As a result of the City's AB 52 notification efforts, one tribal organization responded requesting to engage in formal consultation on the project: the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation.

Following a consultation call between the City and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation (Tribe) on May 30, 2023, the Tribe provided an email follow-up on June 2, 2023, that included a number of attachments. Attachments included ethnohistoric and historical archival research pertaining to traditional use of the area, letters from technical experts and the NAHC, and recommended mitigation measures. The Tribe further indicated that the project falls within and around the sacred community of *Nakaugna*. At the request of the Tribe, specific information related to TCRs will be maintained as confidential; this information is appended to this document (Confidential Appendix F), but is only available for review by eligible individuals. Among other specific details pertaining to these management strategies, recommended mitigation provided by the Tribe includes the retention of a Native American monitor during ground-disturbing activities who is designated or approved by the Tribe, and actions to be taken in the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains and/or funerary objects.

Although strong evidence of traditional Native American use of this broader area has been provided through review of archival documentation, a specific known TCR, meeting definitions provided in CEQA, does not appear to have been identified through consultation. However, despite the current disturbed state of the project site, there remains the potential to encounter previously unknown and unanticipated TCRs during ground-disturbing activities resulting from the project, if approved. The City, having considered these factors and in an abundance of caution, has determined that management strategies relative to the protection of TCRs will be required. In the event that unknown TCR~~RC~~s are encountered during project implementation, impacts to these resources are potentially significant and mitigation would be required.

TCRs are most commonly cultural resources and/or human remains of Native American origin. As such, implementation of previously identified MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 are appropriate management strategies to be applied to TCRs.

TCRs also constitute a separate resource category under CEQA. Tribes, through the government-to-government consultation process, are provided the opportunity to identify TCRs that may be affected by a project and to interpret the significance of such resources. Having reviewed and considered all information provided through this process, the ultimate responsibility to determine the appropriate management approach is the lead agency for compliance with CEQA. To appropriately reflect this process and provide for the inadvertent discovery of TCRs during project activities, a separate TCRs mitigation measure is provided below. Specific mitigation requirements, developed in coordination with the Tribe, are provided as MM-TCR-1. Therefore, in addition to the cultural resources mitigation measures (MM-CUL-1, MM-CUL-2, and MM-CUL-3), implementation of MM-TCR-1 would include the requirement for a Native American monitor to be invited to be present. Therefore, impacts to unknown TCRs as a result of ground-disturbing activities conducted for the project would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

MM-TCR-1 Retention of a Native American Monitor and Inadvertent Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources. Prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, the project applicant/lead agency shall retain a Native American monitor from or approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation (Tribe). The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity for the subject project at all project locations (i.e., on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). Ground-disturbing activities shall include, but are not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring,

grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the lead agency prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

Although no tribal cultural resources (TCRs) have been identified that may be affected by the project, the following approach for the unanticipated discovery of TCRs has been prepared to reduce potential impacts to unanticipated resources. Management strategies stipulated in Mitigation Measure (MM) CUL-1 through MM-CUL-3 and existing state and local regulations, including California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and the California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 15064.5(e), shall be implemented in the event that project activities encounter cultural resources or human remains.

Upon discovery of any TCRs, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Native American monitor. The Tribe shall recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, in the Tribe's sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural, and/or historical purposes. However, this does not include human remains; the protocols to be followed in the event of a discovery of human remains is covered in MM-CUL-3.

The Native American monitor shall complete daily monitoring logs that provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, the locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitoring logs shall identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including, but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, and places of significance (collectively, tribal cultural resources), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and/or burial goods. Copies of monitoring logs shall be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe.

On-site Native American monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Tribe from a designated point of contact for the project applicant/lead agency that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete, or (2) a determination and written notification by the Tribe to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned, and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact TCRs.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) ***Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project includes the construction of a stormwater capture and filtration facility and improvements to the existing Spane Park. The proposed stormwater facility would intercept stormwater from the existing storm drain channel within Rosecrans Avenue and route it into the filtration facility, where it would be allowed to ~~before discharges~~ it ~~into the storm drain channel or~~ infiltrate~~s~~ into underlying soils or it would be treated and discharged back into the storm drain channel. The proposed pump associated with the treatment facility would be electrically powered, thus requiring an additional connection to the electrical power that currently serve the park's lights and irrigation system. Connection to these existing distribution facilities would be sufficient for providing power to the project and would not require any other relocation or construction of electrical power facilities. The project would also require reconstruction of minor existing water infrastructure in the removal and replacement of the existing irrigation pipes and sprinkler heads. These minor improvements are features of the project that would be

subject to engineering design to ensure adjacent facilities and users are not negatively affected. Any relocation of existing facilities would not be substantial enough to result in a significant impact pursuant to CEQA. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Project construction would temporarily require a minor amount of water primarily associated with site watering in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions from construction activities. Once construction is complete, operational changes in water use would include the minor irrigation changes and the replacement restroom facility (which would contain modern water-efficient fixtures). Other existing components of the park that require water would not change their existing usage. As such, operation of the project would not demand additional water use. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

No Impact. Construction and operation of the project would not generate wastewater demand. The proposed restroom would replace the existing facility. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less-than-Significant Impact. During construction, the project would generate solid waste such as residual wastes, plastics, and soils. Construction-generated solid waste would be temporary and would cease once construction is completed. Solid waste generated by project construction would be properly disposed of at designated landfill facilities. Operation of the project would not generate any additional solid waste beyond current park conditions. The project would be served by Paramount Resource Recycling (7230 Petterson Lane), approximately 0.32 miles north of the project site. Solid waste generated by the project would not exceed state or local standards or the capacity of local infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 3.19(d), construction-generated solid waste would be temporary, and operation of the project would not generate solid waste. Solid waste generated by the project construction would be disposed of at designated landfill facilities under federal, state, and local regulation. Additionally, the project would be required to adhere to City and County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, no impacts related to state and local statutes governing solid waste are anticipated.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) ***Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer, the project is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2022). The City has prepared a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. The hazard mitigation plan contains information to assist in planning for natural and human-made hazards; it contains action items that address multiple hazards including earthquakes, floods, hazardous materials, severe weather, and wildfires (City of Paramount 2021). Construction of the project would require the temporary partial closure of Rosecrans Avenue to access the existing box culvert. The temporary partial closure of Rosecrans Avenue would not impede emergency response or evacuation within the City. Rosecrans Avenue would resume existing conditions upon completion of the project. As the project would be uninhabited, future emergency response and evacuation planning would not change from current conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) ***Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the project would comply with Chapter 8.08 of the City's Municipal Code, which adopts the CFC by reference. Chapter 33 of the CFC outlines general fire safety precautions during construction and demolition that are intended to maintain minimum levels of fire protection and limit the spread of fire (City of Paramount 2020). The project would not include structures intended for long-term occupancy. Furthermore, the project site is relatively flat and would not influence prevailing winds or other factors that could exacerbate wildfire risk. As such, the project would not

exacerbate wildfire risks such that project users would be exposed to pollutants concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) ***Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed previously, the project overall would not exacerbate fire risk. Construction would comply with CFC requirements to manage and minimize fire risk during construction. Operation of the project would not contain potential sources for fire risk. As such, the project would not result in installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) ***Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. For reasons described previously in Sections 3.9(g) and 3.20(a), (b), and (c), the project would not pose a substantial risk for wildfire. The project would be located on relatively flat land within Spane Park. As such, implementation of the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**.** Potential impacts related to sensitive and special-status habitat, wildlife species, and plant species are discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources. As discussed in Section 3.4, all potentially significant impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a level below significance with incorporation of mitigation measures. The proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or impact fish or wildlife species or plant communities. As discussed in Section 3.5, potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to a level below significance with incorporation of mitigation measures. The proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Overall, impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures.

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.)***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As indicated in the analysis presented throughout Chapter 3, Initial Study Checklist, of this MND, the proposed project would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts in any issue area. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

Cumulative projects in the City include the North Paramount Gateway Specific Plan, as well as various other small, individual development projects occurring in the vicinity such as the UMC mixed-use senior assisted living facility, Go Store It self-storage, AltAir/World Energy Conversion project, a KFC restaurant, and digital billboard project. The project is not located in the immediate vicinity of any large cumulative projects whose construction phase would overlap to create cumulative impacts. The proposed project, as with potential cumulative projects, would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce impacts, as applicable, particularly during construction. Upon completion of construction, the proposed project would have no potential to contribute to a cumulative impact. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings was considered throughout Chapter 3 of this MND. Based on this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that construction or operation of the project with the proposed mitigation measures incorporated would result in a substantial adverse effect on human beings. Impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures.

4 References and Preparers

4.1 References

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2022. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Accessed October 2022. https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2021. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed September 2022. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

Caltrans. 2022. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed June 2022. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

CAPCOA (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association). 2008. CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. January 2008. Accessed January 2023. http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf.

CAPCOA. 2021. User's Guide for CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0. Available: http://www.aqmd.gov/caleemod/user's-guide. Accessed January 2023.

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. November 2017. Accessed January 2023. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.

CARB. 2019. "Maps of State and Federal Area Designations." Accessed January 2023. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations.

CARB. 2021. "Common Air Pollutants." https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/common-air-pollutants.

CARB. 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. November 16, 2022. Accessed January 2023. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp.pdf.

CDFW (California Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2019. "California Natural Community Conservation Plans." April 2019. Accessed September 2022. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline.

CDFW. 2022a. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). RareFind 5.0 (Commercial Subscription). Sacramento, California: CDFW, Biogeographic Data Branch. Accessed September 2022. https://nrmsecure.dfg.ca.gov/cnddb/Default.aspx.

CDFW. 2022b. Biogeographic Information and Observation System; online database viewer. Accessed September 2022. https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS.

CEC (California Energy Commission). 2022. "Electricity Consumption by Entity" [database]. http://www.ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbyutil.aspx.

City of Bellflower & City of Paramount. 2019. Bellflower-Paramount Active Transportation Plan. June 2019. https://issuu.com/ktua/docs/bellflower-paramount_atp

City of Paramount. 2007. City of Paramount General Plan. August 2007. Accessed November 2022. https://www.paramountcity.com/home/showpublisheddocument/8143/637847729654300000.

City of Paramount. 2020. Paramount Municipal Code. November 17, 2020. https://library.qcode.us/lib/paramount_ca/pub/municipal_code

City of Paramount. 2021. City of Paramount Climate Action Plan. July 2021. Accessed January 2023. https://www.paramountcity.com/home/showpublisheddocument/7154.

City of Paramount. 2022. Zoning Map. https://www.paramountcity.com/home/showpublisheddocument/8487/637921133797130000.

CNPS (California Native Plant Society). 2022. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v8-03). Accessed September 2022. www.rareplants.cnps.org.

CNRA (California Natural Resources Agency). 2009. Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action: Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to SB 97. Accessed January 2023. http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/Final_Statement_of_Reasons.pdf.

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2018. Earthquake Fault Zones: A Guide for Government Agencies, Property Owners/Developers, and Geoscience Practitioners for Assessing Fault Rupture Hazards in California. Accessed September 2022. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Special-Publications/SP_042.pdf.

DOC. 2022. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed June 2022. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/.

DOC. 2023. California Tsunami Hazard Area Map Application. Accessed December 2023. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/ts_evacuation/.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. EnviroStor Database. Accessed October 2022. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2021. "EPA Region 9 Air Quality Maps and Geographic Information." Accessed January 2023. https://www3.epa.gov/region9/air/maps/index.html#cal.

EPA. 2022. Monitor Values Report. Accessed January 2023. https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data/monitor-values-report.

FTA (Federal Transit Administration). 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. FTA Report No. 0123. John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. September 2018.. Accessed April 5, 2022. https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf.

Google Earth. 2022. Google Earth desktop application; centered on the project site. Accessed September 2022.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. IPCC Fourth Assessment Synthesis of Scientific-Technical Information Relevant to Interpreting Article 2 of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. Geneva, Switzerland: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Accessed January 2023. https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr.pdf.

Miller, R. 1994. Update of Mineral Land Classification of Portland Cement Concrete Aggregate in Ventura, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties, California, Part II – Los Angeles County.

NETR (Nationwide Environmental Title Research). 2022. Historic Aerials, online viewer. Accessed September 2022. https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2015. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines: Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. Accessed January 2023. https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf.

OPR (California Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 2018. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. December 2018. Accessed November 2022. http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2016. 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Adopted April 2016. Accessed January 2023. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/f2016rtpscs.pdf?1606005557.

SCAG. 2020. Connect SoCal: The 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy of the Southern California Association of Governments. September 2020. Accessed January 2023. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocal-plan_0.pdf?1606001176.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

SCAQMD. 2003a. White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution. August 2003. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Environmental-Justice/cumulative-impacts-working-group/cumulative-impacts-white-paper.pdf.

SCAQMD. 2003b. Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis. August 2003. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis.

SCAQMD. 2008a. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. Revised July 2008. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf.

SCAQMD. 2008b. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. December 5, 2008. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgboardsynopsis.pdf?sfvrsn=2.

SCAQMD. 2010. Greenhouse Gas CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #15. September 28. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/

greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-main-presentation.pdf?sfvrsn=2.

SCAQMD. 2017a. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan*. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=15.

SCAQMD. 2017b. Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401, 1401.1, and 212. September 1, 2017. Accessed February 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/permitting/rule-1401-risk-assessment/riskassessproc-v8-1.pdf.

SCAQMD. 2019. "SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds." Originally published in CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Table A9-11-A. Revised April 2019. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2.

SCAQMD. 2023. South Coast AQMD Modeling Guidance for AERMOD. Accessed January 2023. http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/meteorological-data/modeling-guidance.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2022. GeoTracker Database. Accessed October 2022. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

The Climate Registry. 2021. "2021 Default Emission Factors." May 2021. Accessed March 2022. https://www.theclimateregistry.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2021-Default-Emission-Factor-Document.pdf.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2020. "Quick Facts, City of Paramount, California." Accessed August 2022. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/paramountcitycalifornia/PST045221#PST045221.

USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture). 2019. Urban Soil Fact Sheet. May 2019. Accessed September 2022. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2022-11/Urban-Soils-Fact-Sheet.pdf.

USDA. 2022. Web Soil Survey. Accessed March 2022. https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2022a. Information, Planning, and Conservation System (IPaC). Accessed September 2022. https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/.

USFWS. 2022b. Wetlands Mapper. Accessed September 2022. https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 2022. Mineral Resources Online Spatial Data. Accessed September 2022. https://mrdata.usgs.gov/general/map-us.html.

4.2 List of Preparers

City of Paramount

Adriana Figueroa, Public Works Director
John Carver, Planning Director
John King, AICP, Assistant Planning Director

Dudek

Alex Hardy, Senior Project Manager
Sarah Halterman, Air Quality Specialist
Tracy Park, Biologist
Linda Kry, Archaeologist
Ashley Vu, Acoustician
Jason Greenstein, GIS Specialist
Hannah Wertheimer-Roberts, Technical Editor
Lis Varela, Formatting Specialist

Craftwater Engineering Inc.

Courtney Semlow, PE, CFM, ENV SP, Civil Design Manager

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 1 Project Location

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 2 Project Site and Existing Features

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 3 Proposed Stormwater Capture and Treatment System

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 4 Proposed Park Improvements

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 5 Existing Vegetation Communities

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix A

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Modeling

Appendix B
Biological Resources Species Lists

Appendix C

Cultural Resources Records Search Results (Confidential)

Appendix D
Geotechnical Evaluation

Appendix E
Noise Assessment Data

Appendix F

Tribal Cultural Resources Consultation Materials (Confidential)