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Project Description

The Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan (Master Plan or proposed project) is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides long-term recommendations to improve water quality. The Master Plan identifies locations for potential components such as tree plantings; amenities such as trash receptacles and drinking fountains; parks and programs such as playgrounds and athletic facilities; and communication improvements such as way-finding signs. The Master Plan is the result of a collaborative stakeholder effort that includes City and civic leaders, citizens, urban designers, architects, landscape architects, and economic and environmental consultants. Stakeholders were brought together in a series of meetings which culminated in the development of the Master Plan.

The Master Plan focuses at a detailed scale on the ecological, development, and circulation issues within the City of Compton. At this local scale, the Master Plan outlines opportunities and existing constraints along Compton Creek. The Master Plan identifies ten “Creek Systems” that suggest systematic improvements of typical spaces and urban types adjacent to Compton Creek. The Master Plan includes a parcel-by-parcel analysis, detailing prioritized recommendations for site-specific landscapes and amenities, channel modifications, graphics and signage, security strategies, and material and plant guidelines. The Master Plan would be implemented by the City of Compton.

Determination

This Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is the City’s intent to adopt an MND for the proposed project. This does not mean that the City’s decision regarding the proposed project is final. This MND is subject to modification based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

The City of Compton has prepared an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA). On the basis of this study, it has determined that the Proposed Project will:

1) Have no impact or a less-than-significant impact related to:

   • Scenic Vistas or Resources
   • Visual Character
   • Agriculture and Forest Resources
   • Construction and Operational Air Quality, Regional and Local
   • Endangered Species or Sensitive Habitats
   • Local Preservation Policies
   • Historic Resources
   • Seismicity and Liquefaction
   • Greenhouse Gas Emissions
   • Hazards and Hazardous Materials
   • Hydrology and Water Quality
   • Land Use and Planning
   • Mineral Resources
• Operational Noise
• Construction and Operational Vibration
• Population and Housing
• Schools, Parks, and Recreation
• Operational Traffic and Transportation
• Utilities and Service Systems
• Mandatory Findings of Significance

2) Have a less-than-significant impact on the following environmental resources after implementation of
the following mitigation measures:

Aesthetics: Light and Glare

AE1 Applicant shall ensure that all lighting be directed and/or shielded to minimize lighting spillover
effects onto adjacent and nearby properties.

AE2 Applicant shall ensure that glare effects be limited by using non-reflective building and
construction materials, such as concrete, wood, and stucco. This shall include, but not be limited
to, art installations, fencing material, and recreational equipment.

Air Quality: Operational Odors

AQ1 The City of Compton shall implement and enforce an odor control and maintenance program to
mitigate the effects of odors generated at the equestrian trail. The program shall include daily
management of solid wastes generated by the horses and the disposal of wastes off-site at least
twice weekly.

Biological Resources: Habitats and Nesting Birds

BR1 To prevent contaminated wastewater from entering downstream habitats, designated areas shall
be set aside for equipment washing and small batch mixing of concrete or other chemicals. The
set aside areas shall be lined with an impermeable liner, and all washings or residue shall be
collected and properly disposed of following construction. To prevent downstream impacts from
runoff and erosion, a complete Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be
prepared, approved, and implemented. Monitoring of the SWPPP measures shall take place
monthly during the summer and weekly during the winter. SWPPP measures shall also be
checked after each rain event. A monitoring report shall be prepared and presented bi-annually or
whenever measures are not being adequately implemented.

BR2 To prevent the disturbance of nesting native and/or migratory bird species, all clearing and
grubbing of the project site should take place between September 1 and February 14. Winter site
clearing will ensure that nesting birds are not present and impacted. If construction is scheduled
or ongoing near the perimeter of the grading footprint during bird nesting season (February 15 to
August 31), qualified biologists should survey the area within 200 feet (or up to 300 feet,
depending on topography or other factors, and 500 feet for raptors) of the construction activity to
determine if grading is disturbing nesting birds. If nesting activity is being compromised,
construction should be suspended in the vicinity of the nest until fledging is complete. This
mitigation measure will reduce the proposed project’s impacts, disturbance to, and mortality of
nesting birds. These mitigation measures should be implemented by a qualified biologist under
contract with the project applicant. The project biologist should prepare a report detailing the
results of the construction monitoring efforts. The report should be submitted to the CDFG within two months of the completion of the monitoring activities.

Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains

CR1 During excavation and grading, if archaeological resources are uncovered, all work in that area shall cease and be diverted so as to allow for a determination of the value of the resource. Construction activities in that area may commence once the uncovered resources are collected by an archaeologist and properly processed.

CR2 During excavation and grading, if paleontological resources are uncovered, all work in that area shall cease and be diverted so as to allow for a determination of the value of the resource. Construction activities in that area may commence once the uncovered resources are collected by a paleontologist and properly processed. Any paleontological remains and/or reports and surveys shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

CR3 If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

Geology and Soils: Soil Stability and Erosion

GS1 Site-specific Geotechnical Investigation Reports shall be prepared to further assess the potential geophysical hazards. The findings of these site-specific Geotechnical Investigation Reports shall be incorporated into the design of the proposed project to reduce the potential for seismic-induced damages to the satisfaction of the City of Compton Department of Building and Safety.

GS2 The Applicant shall ensure that construction and excavation activities will adhere to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) set forth by the City. Such BMPs include using plastic coverings to prevent erosion of any unprotected area, such as mounds of dirt or dumpsters, along with devices designed to intercept and safely divert runoff.

GS3 To the extent feasible, the Applicant shall ensure that grading will be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season (between November and April).

GS4 During inclement periods of the year, when rain is threatening (between November and April), the Applicant shall implement an erosion control plan that identifies BMPs to the satisfaction of the City’s Building and Safety Division to minimize potential erosion during construction. The erosion control plan shall be a condition prior to issuance of any grading permit.

GS5 The Applicant shall ensure that provisions be made for adequate surface drainage away from the areas of excavation as well as protection of excavated areas from flooding. The grading contractor shall control surface water and the transportation of silt and sediment.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Emergency Plans

HM1 An Emergency Procedures Plan shall be developed which includes notification to the City of Compton Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire of any full or partial lane closures, movement of heavy construction equipment, and construction within the adjacent street right-of-ways.

HM2 The Emergency Procedures Plan shall specify a process by which any activities in the adjacent right-of-ways shall be coordinated with the emergency requirements of the Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire.

Noise: Construction

N1 The Applicant shall ensure that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

N2 The Applicant shall ensure that the construction contractor shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment).

N3 The Applicant shall ensure that the construction contractor shall place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses.

Public Services: Fire and Police Services

PS1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for a project implemented as a part of the Master Plan, the final site plan and site circulation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Compton Fire Department to ensure conformity to their fire prevention and operational requirements.

PS2 Prior to the issuance of building permits for a project implemented as a part of the Master Plan, the final site plan and site circulation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and/or the Compton Police Department to ensure conformity to their crime prevention measures and operational requirements.

Transportation and Traffic: Emergency Access

TT1 The Compton Fire Department shall review and provide recommendations to the City related to the Master Plan for adequate safety features and emergency access.

Derek Hull
Director
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of Compton
205 South Willowbrook Avenue
Compton, CA 90220
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) analyzes the potential environmental effects of the Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan (Master Plan) adopted by the Compton City Council in 2006. The purpose of the Master Plan is to redevelop the City’s existing flood control channel and adjacent land into a safe, ecologically beneficial, multi-use, public green space and recreational park. Like many hydrological systems, Compton Creek and its watershed covers an area larger than its political boundaries. The Creek’s watershed covers 42.1 square miles, approximately 10 of which lie in the City of Compton, and the Creek itself stretches north and south beyond the City limits. The Master Plan focuses only on the area within the City of Compton.

1.2 PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan was adopted by City Council in 2006. The Plan outlines several objectives to beautify the Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides long term recommendations to improve water quality and restore natural habitat. However, before many of the long-term projects can be implemented, an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Initial Study (IS) are needed.

1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

The proposed project requires environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 15063(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the Lead Agency to prepare an Initial Study (IS) to determine if the proposed project has the potential to have a significant effect on the environment. This IS/MND provides the basis for the finding that, with the implementation of mitigation measures prescribed herein, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in a significant effect on the environment.

This document alone is a disclosure document aimed at informing all concerned parties and fostering informed discussion and decision-making regarding all aspects of the proposed project.

1.4 ACTIONS AND AGENCIES INVOLVED

This IS/MND is prepared for consideration by the City of Compton, acting as the Lead Agency in accordance with CEQA.

Discretionary Actions

Discretionary actions include those local approvals or entitlements necessary in order to implement a project. Under CEQA, there are several discretionary actions associated with approval of the proposed project. The first action will be a decision on whether or not to approve the proposed project on the part of the Lead Agency, City of Compton. Additional discretionary actions that may be required include obtaining construction permits from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) and other associated project approvals. The proposed project could also require permits from other agencies including but not limited to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP).
1.5 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan

Project Location: The project site is located along Compton Creek from El Segundo Boulevard to State Route 91

Lead Agency: City of Compton

Contact Person: Derek Hull
Director
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of Compton
205 South Willowbrook Avenue
Compton, CA 90220
Telephone: 310-605-5532

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1.0 Introduction: This section provides introductory information, including the project title, the project applicant, and the lead agency for the proposed project.

2.0 Project Description: This section provides a detailed description of the environmental setting and the proposed project, including project objectives, and an estimated time line for construction of the proposed project.

3.0 Initial Study Checklist and Evaluation: This section contains the complete IS Checklist showing the level of impact under each environmental impact category. This section also contains an assessment and discussion of the impacts associated with each environmental impact category associated with the IS Checklist. When the evaluation identifies potential significant effects, mitigation measures are provided to reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels.

4.0 List of Preparers and Persons Consulted: This section provides a list of persons and consultant team members that participated in the preparation of the IS, as well as sources consulted and cited during the preparation of the IS.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides a general description of the Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan (Master Plan or proposed project). Since the proposed project is a plan rather than an individual project, the description of potential development under the plan is programmatic. Nonetheless, the intent of the description and the following analysis is to streamline future environmental review for reasonably foreseeable development. Individual construction and other project-specific impacts will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, development that is not consistent with the assumptions contained in this document may require additional environmental review. This section identifies the proposed project objectives, the regional and project area location, existing setting, surrounding land uses, characteristics of the proposed project, and the anticipated schedule of construction activities. The Master Plan is contained in its entirety in Appendix A of this IS/MND.

2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Compton Creek is a major tributary of the Los Angeles River. The Compton Creek Watershed is located in the southern portion of the Los Angeles Basin and drains a 42.1-square-mile area, which includes portions of 14 cities. Compton Creek, 8.5 miles in length, begins just east of South Main Street between 107th and 108th Streets in the City of Los Angeles and flows into the Los Angeles River in the City of Long Beach, just south of Del Amo Boulevard and the Long Beach Freeway (I-710) (Figure 2-1). Compton Creek is federally-listed as an impaired waterway. Typical Compton Creek pollutants from stormwater and urban runoff include trash, bacteria, viruses, heavy metals, pesticides, petroleum hydrocarbons, and other organic compounds. Other sources of pollutants entering Compton Creek include leaking underground storage tanks and septic systems, contaminated groundwater, and horse stables. The Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council has identified metals, trash, and bacteria as the key pollutants of concern in Compton Creek.

In the City of Compton, there exists a deficiency of parks for the resident population per the City-specific standards. There are 13 parks within the City of Compton that comprise a total of 58.3 acres. With a population of 97,300 persons (2008 Census estimate), this translates into only 0.60 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, far below the City standard of two acres per 1,000 residents. Given the presence of two existing parks and several schools located along Compton Creek, the Master Plan seeks to capitalize on opportunities for creating an open space corridor.

Community workshops were held to determine specific locations of where community members felt improvements should occur along Compton Creek. During the community workshops, residents collaborated to develop innovative landscape strategies at key locations along Compton Creek. Based upon public input, surveys, planning initiatives, existing developments, and physical characteristics, the Master Plan outlines the opportunities and existing constraints along Compton Creek. Additionally, the community members were presented plans, renderings, signage concepts, and material studies illustrating the developing vision for a vibrant, multi-dimensional Compton Creek. Participants were able to comment on parcel-by-parcel opportunities, constraints, and recommended improvements.
As discussed in Chapter 1.0 Introduction, the City Council of the City of Compton adopted the Master Plan in 2006. The Master Plan takes into consideration the already-built multi-use trail along the east bank and the equestrian trails along the west bank of Compton Creek and includes options for modifying Compton Creek and its banks. These options ranged from placing an in-channel bicycle path to naturalizing the Creek. Although the existing bicycle and multi-use path are still considered, the channel modification options are no longer being considered as part of the Master Plan. This environmental analysis updates the potential impacts of the other elements of the Master Plan in Section 2.6 below.

### 2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Master Plan is to redevelop the City’s existing flood control channel and adjacent land into a safe, ecologically beneficial, multi-use, public greenway. The Master Plan envisions Compton Creek as a livable, walkable, urban community that is orientated to and informed by Compton Creek. Implementation of the Master Plan will result in a 3.45-mile-long park system of gardens, plazas, trails, habitats, outdoor classrooms, and promenades. The goals and objectives of the Master Plan are described in Table 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #1: Promoting Ecology and Environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;This goal recognizes the regional and local significance of Compton Creek and its importance as a defining feature for the City. New development along Compton Creek should preserve and restore the sustainability and ecology of Compton Creek.</td>
<td>• Improve Riparian Habitat Quality and Quantity&lt;br&gt;• Integrate and Recommend Watershed Best Management Practices&lt;br&gt;• Improve Water Quality&lt;br&gt;• Instill Stewardship Principles&lt;br&gt;• Create a Native Plant Landscape&lt;br&gt;• Maintain and Improve Flood Protection&lt;br&gt;• Utilize Sustainable Practices and Materials to Conserve Materials and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #2: Expanding and Enhancing Compton Creek</strong>&lt;br&gt;Compton Creek has the potential to add great value to the City and to transform the urban environment within the City. Restoration and enhancement of Compton Creek should be made so that it expands its presence within the City.</td>
<td>• Reestablish Creek Identity within the City&lt;br&gt;• Create adjacent Open Spaces and Development that Enhance the Natural Qualities of Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Increase and Improve Open Space and Recreation Opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Connect Open Space to Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Improve Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Equestrian Access and Safety&lt;br&gt;• Reinforce Visual Connections to Compton Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal #3: Improving Community and the City</strong>&lt;br&gt;In order for Compton Creek to be inseparable from the City identity, its presence should extend beyond the edges of adjacent neighborhoods and development.</td>
<td>• Implement Multi-Objective Planning Projects&lt;br&gt;• Provide a Framework for Public Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation&lt;br&gt;• Improve Environmental Awareness and Stewardship&lt;br&gt;• Improve Public Health&lt;br&gt;• Enhance Public Safety&lt;br&gt;• Extend and Relate the Fabric of the City to Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Link Natural Systems to Economic Development&lt;br&gt;• Improve Access to Public Amenities&lt;br&gt;• Reinforce and Improve East-West connections to and across Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Connect Creek-adjacent schools to Compton Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 PROJECT LOCATION

Regional Location

The Master Plan includes Compton Creek that is located within the City of Compton and the land directly adjacent to the Creek. The City of Compton is located in the central basin section of Los Angeles County, ten miles south of downtown Los Angeles (Figure 2-2). The City encompasses approximately ten square miles. The Glenn Anderson Freeway (I-105), the Harbor Freeway (I-110) and I-710 and State Route (SR) 91 outline the general boundaries of the City of Compton and provide regional access to and from the City.

The City of Compton is bordered by the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of Willowbrook on the north and northwest, the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of West Rancho Dominguez on the west, the City of Carson on the southwest, the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of Rancho Dominguez on the south, the City of Long Beach on the southeast, the City of Paramount and the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of East Compton on the east, and the City of Lynwood on the northeast.

The City of Compton has a comprehensive transportation system that has resulted in its nickname, “the Hub City.” Four regional highways (I-110 from Pasadena to San Pedro; I-710 from Alhambra to Long Beach; I-105 from El Segundo to Norwalk; and SR-91 from Redondo Beach to Riverside) form the general boundaries of the City. The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, located 8.5 miles from downtown Compton, provides access to international leisure destinations and industries. The Alameda Corridor, a rail and truck route for 25 percent of all U.S. waterborne international trade, also runs through the City. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is located approximately 11 miles from the City and, the City also has a general aviation airport, the Compton/Woodley Airport. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Blue Line light rail connects downtown Los Angeles to Long Beach and has two stops in the City of Compton, the Compton Station and the Artesia Station.

Compton Creek Master Plan Area Location

Like many hydrological systems, Compton Creek and its watershed cover an area larger than its political boundaries. The Master Plan focuses on a 3.45-mile stretch of Compton Creek that is within the City of Compton, from El Segundo Boulevard to Artesia Boulevard (Figure 2-3). In the City, Compton Creek is predominately a concrete-lined, U-shaped channel. However, from approximately Greenleaf Boulevard to the southern limit of the City, Compton Creek is earth-bottomed and naturalized, with V-shaped embankments.

2.5 OVERVIEW OF SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The area surrounding and adjacent to Compton Creek within the City of Compton is highly developed, containing land use types that range from low-density residential to heavy manufacturing. The majority of land uses surrounding Compton Creek are low- and medium-density residential, with some housing built directly adjacent to the Compton Creek right-of-way (ROW). In addition, two commercial corridors intersect Compton Creek at Compton Boulevard and Alondra Boulevard. Industrial corridors intersect Compton Creek at Rosecrans Avenue and Greenleaf Boulevard. South of Greenleaf Boulevard, and on the west side of Compton Creek, there is a large heavy-manufacturing-zoned industrial area. There are also four schools (Centennial High School, McNair Elementary School, Washington Elementary School, and Compton High School) and two parks (Gonzales and Raymond Street Parks) adjacent to Compton Creek. The existing land uses are presented in Figure 2-4.
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2.6 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides long-term recommendations to improve water quality and restore natural habitat. The Master Plan identifies locations for potential components such as tree plantings; amenities such as trash receptacles and drinking fountains; parks and programs such as playgrounds and athletic facilities; and communication improvements such as way-finding signs. The Master Plan is the result of a collaborative stakeholder effort that includes City and civic leaders, citizens, urban designers, architects, landscape architects, and economic and environmental consultants. Stakeholders were brought together in a series of meetings which culminated in the development of the Master Plan.

The Master Plan focuses at a detailed scale on the ecological, development, and circulation issues within the City of Compton. At this local scale, the Master Plan outlines opportunities and existing constraints along Compton Creek. The Master Plan identifies ten “Creek Systems” that suggest systematic improvements of typical spaces and urban types adjacent to Compton Creek. The Master Plan includes a parcel-by-parcel analysis, detailing prioritized recommendations for site-specific landscapes and amenities, channel modifications, graphics and signage, security strategies, and material and plant guidelines. The Master Plan is shown in Figures 2-5 through 2-7, which also shows all of the areas along Compton Creek that represent different possibilities for new infrastructure, programs, and amenities.

Master Plan Districts

As shown in Figures 2-5 through 2-7, the Master Plan divides the portion of Compton Creek that is located within the City of Compton into three adjacent districts:

**The Recreational Loop.** The Recreational Loop is a 1.02-mile segment of Compton Creek that contains a variety of active, existing recreational open space opportunities. These opportunities utilize the Compton Creek ROW and adjacent land as a recreational circuit. The Recreational Loop extends along Compton Creek from El Segundo Boulevard to Rosecrans Avenue.

**The Civic Parkway.** The Civic Parkway is a 1.22-mile segment of Compton Creek located a few blocks away from the City of Compton Civic Center, in the vicinity of public resources such as City Hall and the public library. The Civic Parkway extends along Compton Creek from Rosecrans Avenue to Alondra Boulevard.

**The Ecological Greenway.** The Ecological Greenway is a 1.21-mile segment of Compton Creek where it transitions from a vertical channel section to a trapezoidal banked section, with a naturalized bed. Compton Creek remains naturalized for 2.5 miles from this point until it reaches the Los Angeles River. The Ecological Greenway extends along Compton Creek from Alondra Boulevard to SR-91.
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Creek Systems

The Master Plan identifies ten Creek Systems which are systematic improvements of typical spaces and urban types along Compton Creek. The Creek Systems are site-specific and identified in Figures 2-5 through 2-7. The ten Creek Systems are summarized in Table 2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creek System</th>
<th>Purpose/Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks (4 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Offer greatest opportunities to redefine Compton Creek as a rich ecological and recreational corridor&lt;br&gt;• Offer opportunity to highlight the importance of Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Implement structural best management practices (BMPs) and other landscape features to protect and enhance Compton Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks (4 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Serve as links and buffers between the local neighborhoods and Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Help protect Compton Creek from dumping and stormwater runoff&lt;br&gt;• Become neighborhood gathering points and gateways to Compton Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-End Parks (3 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Use existing cul-de-sacs&lt;br&gt;• Establish and improve points of entry to Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Enhance neighborhoods&lt;br&gt;• Create a vital connection with the waterway and communities on the opposite bank of Compton Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Classrooms (4 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Provide opportunity to create a networked system of environmental learning through the establishment of outdoor classrooms with Creek-side adjacent schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-Use Spaces (2 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Incorporate schools’ open space to provide additional Compton Creek-adjacent public spaces.&lt;br&gt;• Enhance Compton Creek frontage.&lt;br&gt;• Utilize available joint-use grants may to beautify Compton Creek and its adjacent schools&lt;br&gt;• Reinforce schools as models of multi-program nodes that catalyze further improvements along Compton Creek&lt;br&gt;• Expand the perceived width of the Compton Creek ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bike Paths (2 Potential Locations)</td>
<td>• Extend network of safe routes (e.g. to the beach)&lt;br&gt;• Enhance the quality, character, and function of the path.&lt;br&gt;• Provide opportunity to introduce a continuous structural BMP along Compton Creek’s edge that serves to decrease direct run-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Trails</td>
<td>• Provide a softer surface, wider planting strips, and elements more conducive to passive uses&lt;br&gt;• Invoke some of the rich textures of Compton’s agrarian history&lt;br&gt;• Change the way Compton Creek looks and feels by encouraging equestrians to ride on the multi-use trail&lt;br&gt;• Provide linear structures, planting, and amenities along the existing ROW that would complement the flow of Compton Creek.&lt;br&gt;• Use native planting to enhance experience and filter polluted runoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2-2: MASTER PLAN CREEK SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creek System</th>
<th>Purpose/Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pedestrian Bridges (3 Potential Locations) | • Enhance the character and utility of Compton Creek  
• Serve as important links and landmarks  
• Provide a unique perspective of Compton Creek  
• Recognize Compton Creek as a unique landscape feature, not a dividing infrastructure  
• Utilize structural supports (abutments) of vehicular bridges that remain  
• Install with small parks, plazas, or recreation areas, especially in areas with few existing parks |
| Creek Streets (2 Potential Locations)   | • Increase awareness of Compton Creek  
• Expand Compton Creek into neighborhoods  
• Communicate how Compton streets are hydrologically linked to Compton Creek  
• Communicate how improvements to stormwater systems will improve Compton Creek water quality |
| Enhanced Crossings (3 Potential Locations) | • Create continuous trail system with direct and safe crossings  
• Provide invaluable local transportation asset  
• Allow users to experience the continuity of Compton Creek  
• Improve trail system and usage of trail system by all user groups |

**SOURCE:** Mia Lehrer & Associates, Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan, 2006.

Other Elements of the Master Plan

**Landscape.** The majority of open space within the City is dominated by traditional landscapes including large areas of turf grass, non-native trees, and non-native shrubs. The Master Plan outlines new planting requirements along Compton Creek using sustainable native plants. The benefits of this landscape strategy include restoring visual and natural identity to Compton Creek, providing habitats for migratory and indigenous wildlife, and enhancing local microclimates.

**Building Materials.** The Master Plan proposes to utilize materials that establish an attractive, cohesive, natural appearance for Compton Creek. Pedestrian trails would be paved with permeable surfaces, such as decomposed granite. Impermeable surfaces would be restricted to bikeways, vehicle access ramps, and ADA-compliant ramps. General amenities would include benches, lights, water fountains, trash receptacles, and trail markers.

**Signage and Way-Finding.** The Master Plan proposes a clear and engaging signage strategy that establishes a graphic identity for Compton Creek and directs visitors to its amenities. Interpretive signage at key locations along Compton Creek would describe the history and ecology of the waterway and the development of the region’s neighborhoods and diverse cultures. Directional, informative, and interpretive signage throughout Compton Creek would be designed to complement its character.

**Safety and Security.** The Master Plan prioritizes the implementation of mechanisms that increase public safety. Trails located alongside the channel will be ADA compliant. Bright, consistent lighting and motion-activated lights along paths and within parks would create an inviting atmosphere at night. Safe traffic crossings would link pedestrian and bike paths with equestrian trails. Other incorporated safety strategies requested by the public include installing surveillance cameras and establishing security watch groups along Compton Creek.
Recreation. The Master Plan contains a linear fitness network and a series of recreational facilities. The linear fitness network consists of measured running loops and a unique course integrated with future and existing pocket parks, street-end parks, joint-use spaces, and parks. Recreational facilities, such as sports fields, are integrated into the system to create a diverse and multi-use set of facilities.

Public Art. The Master Plan recommends a series of public art projects to enhance Compton Creek. Art work would consist of murals, custom site amenities, decorative fences, gardens, monumental sculptures, signage, and measures of physical processes within the channel (such as historic flood markers).

2.7 PHASING AND ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION TIMELINE FOR THE MASTER PLAN

The Master Plan would be completed in four separate phases (Table 2-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase #1: Reconnect and Restore (Years 1-2) | • Completion of a Multi-Use Trail  
• Regional Extension of Existing Bike Path  
• Event and public art programming  
• First stage of way-finding and interpretive signage  
• Enhanced pedestrian crossings at streets  
• Establish outdoor classroom network  
• Begin pocket parks and street end parks |
| Phase #2: Fill and Inform (Years 3-5) | • Extend Creek to School and Parks  
• First stage of target site acquisition  
• Open space public/private partnerships  
• New pedestrian bridges  
• Second stage of way-finding and interpretive signage  
• Joint-use programs with existing schools  
• BMP demonstration projects at parks and schools  
• Neighborhood scale BMPs |
| Phase #3: Connect and Extend (Years 10-15) | • Second Stage of Target Site Acquisition  
• Extend Creek into City with Arterial Greening  
• Convert Unused Streets to Park Space  
• Public Spaces Above Existing Bridge Structures  
• East Power Line Easement as Park Space  
• Local-Scale BMPs |
| Phase #4: Creek Zone Network (Years 15+) | • Greening of Neighborhood Streets  
• West Power Line Easement as Public Space  
• Regional-Scale BMPs Online |

3.0 INITIAL STUDY EVALUATION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.1 AESTHETICS (AE)

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ✓ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ✓ ] No Impact

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ✓ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ✓ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

da) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to a view of a focal point or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view consists of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. A panoramic view is generally a wide-angle view that extends into the distance. An impact to a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected. The project area is highly urbanized and predominately developed with residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. No designated scenic vista or other designated scenic resources are identified in the project area.

The Compton Creek Master Plan proposes to improve the visual character of Compton Creek. The proposed project would replace urban and industrial vistas of little aesthetic value with more natural scenic vistas that would improve aesthetic value. Natural features would include open space, native and/or ornamental vegetation and landscaping, and recreational and educational space. Urban features that would be replaced include fencing and vacant lands, which are not features of high value, such as architectural or historical structures of visual significance or prominence. The proposed project will enhance the urban landscape by creating focal views of natural elements within the urban environment. Therefore, a beneficial impact related to scenic vistas would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcrops, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan could substantially damage scenic resources within a State Highway. There are no roadways adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the project area that are designated as scenic highways.¹ The nearest State-designated scenic highway is Route 1, located approximately 12.5 miles northwest of the project area. The majority of Compton Creek in the City of Compton is a concrete-lined channel with no distinctive scenic resources. At the southern end of Compton Creek within City limits, there is natural vegetation, including trees. However, the area is not designated by the City as a scenic resource. Therefore, no impact related to scenic resources would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of a site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area.

The Master Plan area is highly urbanized and predominately developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Figure 3-1 shows a typical residential neighborhood abutting the Creek. A majority of the concrete-lined Creek is enclosed by chain-link fence with little or no scenic features on either bank. Figure 3-1 also shows that other sections of the Creek are completely blocked off from the neighborhood with fencing or concrete walls.

As mentioned above, the Master Plan proposes to improve the visual character of Compton Creek and the surrounding area by adding natural features along its banks. The proposed project would replace urban elements of low aesthetic value such as chain-link fences and concrete with more natural elements, such as parks and green corridors that would improve the visual character of the Creek and of the communities adjacent to Compton Creek. In addition to parks and green corridors, native and/or ornamental vegetation, landscaping, and recreational space would be included as part of the Master Plan. The proposed project will positively enhance the urban landscape by creating focal views of natural elements within the urban environment and improving the visual character of Compton Creek and the adjacent areas. Therefore, a beneficial impact related to the visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

---

FIGURE 3-1

View of existing Compton Creek conditions at Greenleaf Boulevard looking north.

View of Compton Creek blocked off from the neighborhood along Baron Avenue.


VISUAL CHARACTER OF EXISTING CREEK AND ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOODS
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused light and glare that would substantially alter the character of off-site areas surrounding the project area or interfered with the performance of an off-site activity. Light impacts are typically associated with the use of artificial light during the evening and nighttime hours. Glare is caused by the reflection of sunlight or artificial light from highly polished surfaces, such as window glass and reflective cladding materials, and may interfere with the safe operation of a motor vehicle on adjacent streets. Daytime glare generation is common in urban areas and is typically associated with mid- to high-rise buildings with exterior façades largely or entirely comprised of highly reflective glass or mirror-like materials. Nighttime glare is primarily associated with bright lighting that contrasts with existing low ambient light conditions.

The area surrounding Compton Creek is urbanized and predominately developed with residential, commercial, and institutional uses, where ambient nighttime light levels are low to medium. The surrounding uses typically use low levels of interior and exterior lighting for security, parking, signage, architectural highlighting, and landscaping. The streets in the area surrounding Compton Creek are lined with light fixtures, and traffic on these streets contributes to overall ambient lighting levels as well. The proposed project would include moderate levels of exterior lighting for security, walkways, bikeways, equestrian paths, landscaping, etc. Lighting would be directed and/or shielded to limit light spillover effects. As stated in the Master Plan, “All improvements shall ensure public safety in accordance with established regulations of the City of Compton and other applicable government agencies.” Given the degree of ambient lighting that currently exists in the project area, including the residential cul-de-sac streets designated for pocket parks, the proposed lighting would not substantially alter ambient night light levels.

The potential for daytime glare exists with any structure containing glass or other reflective trim or cladding materials. No buildings are proposed in the Master Plan, and most existing structures within the project area are low-scale and comprised of non-reflective materials, such as concrete, wood, and stucco. Any potential glare effects associated with building materials would be similar to those of any building in the area and would be limited and temporary, changing with the movement of the sun throughout the course of the day and the seasons of the year. Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to light or glare. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures AE1 and AE2 would reduce these significant impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

AE1 Applicant shall ensure that all lighting be directed and/or shielded to minimize lighting spillover effects onto adjacent and nearby properties.

AE2 Applicant shall ensure that glare effects be limited by using non-reflective building and construction materials, such as concrete, wood, and stucco. This shall include, but not be limited to, art installations, fencing material, and recreational equipment.
3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES (AG)

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would convert valued farmland to non-agricultural uses. No agricultural uses or operations are present within the Master Plan area and the project area is not included in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. No agricultural lands would be modified under the Master Plan. Therefore, no impacts related to conversion of agricultural lands would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

---

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan conflicted with existing agricultural zoning or agricultural parcels enrolled under the Williamson Act. The majority of land within the City of Compton and surrounding areas is zoned for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. However, there is a residential neighborhood adjacent to the project area zoned as Residential Agriculture (Figure 3-2). This zone is established to provide for the development of large one-family home sites in a limited agricultural environment. The lots are typically 0.5- to 1-acre in size. This zone allows for commercial field crops to be grown; however, all of this land is developed with residences. No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is present within the City. Likewise, neither the project area nor any nearby lands are enrolled under the Williamson Act. Therefore, no impacts related to Williamson Act lands would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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))?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan conflicted with existing zoning for, or caused rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project area is not zoned for forestry purposes, and no timberland zoning is present in the vicinity of Compton Creek or within the City of Compton. Therefore, no impact related to forest or timber lands would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The project area and the area in the vicinity of Compton Creek are highly urbanized and do not contain forest land. Therefore, no impact related to conversion of forest land would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

---

3Forest Land defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g): “Forest land is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.”

4Timberland defined in Public Resources Code section 4526: “Timberland means land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others.”
LEGEND:

- Compton Creek
- Residential Agriculture Zone

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?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. As described in 3.2a and 3.2b, the Master Plan would not develop agricultural land or Farmland, and would not have an impact on the land zoned Residential Agriculture and, therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. As described in 3.2c and 3.2d, there is no forest land on or near the project area and, therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no impact related to agricultural, farm, forest, or timber lands would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
3.3 AIR QUALITY (AQ)

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☑
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ☐

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan. The applicable air quality plan for the project site is the 2007 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), developed by the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The SCAQMD has indicated that a project is consistent with the 2007 AQMP if the proposed project is consistent with the applicable General Plan’s land use zoning. As discussed in Section 3.10, Land Use and Planning, the project area has a variety of land uses and zoning designations within its boundaries. Implementation of the Master Plan will not conflict with these designations. In contrast to any inconsistencies with applicable plans, policies, or zoning designations, the proposed project meets several goals and policies from the Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element of the adopted General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to consistency with the AQMP.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project area. Fugitive dust emissions would primarily result from demolition and site preparation activities, and carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxide (NOₓ), and sulfur oxide (SOₓ) emissions would primarily result from the use of construction equipment. During the finishing phase, paving operations would release volatile organic compounds (VOC). The assessment of construction air quality impacts considers each of these potential sources. 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.

It is mandatory for all construction projects in the South Coast Air Basin to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 for fugitive dust. Specific Rule 403 control requirements include, but are not limited to, applying water in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, reestablishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel washing system to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas. Compliance with Rule 403 would reduce regional particulate matter 2.5 microns or smaller in size (PM₂.₅) and particulate matter 10 microns or smaller in size (PM₁₀) emissions associated with construction activities by approximately 61 percent.

URBEMIS2007 was used to estimate the majority of daily construction emissions. Fugitive dust emissions were estimated using spreadsheets used by the SCAQMD to calculate localized emissions. Detailed construction information was not available when this analysis was completed. The following conservative assumptions were used to determine maximum daily construction emissions.

- Seven pieces of equipment operating simultaneously for eight hours per day.
- 50 heavy-duty trucks per day
- 0.5 acres of land and 400 cubic yards of soil disturbed per day
- 0.25 acres paved per day

**Table 3-1** shows the estimated daily regional and localized emissions associated with each construction phase. Construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional and localized thresholds during construction activity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction emissions.
### TABLE 3-1: ESTIMATED DAILY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Construction</th>
<th>Pounds Per Day</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>SOX</td>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Emissions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Emissions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emissions</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Maximum Regional Total     | 8   | 62  | 31 | <1  | 3            | 4          |

**Regional Significance Threshold**

- VOC: 75
- NOX: 100
- CO: 550
- SOX: 150
- PM$_{2.5}$: 55
- PM$_{10}$: 150

| Exceed Threshold? | No | No | No | No | No | No |

| Maximum On-Site Total   | 6   | 31  | 17 | <1  | 2            | 2          |

**Localized Significance Threshold**

| /a/ Assumed a one-acre project site and a 25-meter (82-foot) receptor distance. |
| /b/ SCAQMD has not developed localized significance methodology for VOC or SO$_X$. |

| Exceed Threshold? | -- /b/ | 46  | 231 | -- /b/ | 3            | 4          |

| /a/ | -- /b/ | No | No | -- /b/ | No | No |

**SOURCE:** TAHA, 2010.

With regard to operational emissions, the Master Plan does not propose uses that typically increase automobile traffic. On the contrary, implementation of the Master Plan would encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, including walking and biking. The purpose of the Master Plan is to redevelop the land adjacent to Compton Creek into a safe, ecologically beneficial, multi-use, public greenway. The Master Plan envisions Compton Creek as a livable, walkable, urban community that is orientated to Compton Creek. Implementation of the Master Plan will result in a 3.45 mile-long park system of gardens, plazas, trails, habitats, outdoor classrooms, and promenades. The proposed project would not substantially increase automobile trips and would not generate substantial mobile source emissions. In addition, the proposed project would not include stationary sources (e.g., mechanical equipment) of air emissions. Operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational emissions.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Federal and State agencies have designated the South Coast Air Basin as a nonattainment area for ozone (O$_3$), PM$_{2.5}$, and PM$_{10}$. The SCAQMD’s approach for assessing cumulative air quality impacts is based on the AQMP forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards in accordance with the requirements of the federal and State CAAs. The SCQAMD has set forth regional significance thresholds designed to assist in the attainment of ambient air quality standards. The proposed project would not result in a significant PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{10}$, or ozone precursor (VOC or NO$_X$) impact during construction or operation. Therefore, the
The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of a nonattainment criteria pollutant.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

d) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would expose new or existing sensitive receptors to substantial new pollutant concentrations. The majority of land uses surrounding Compton Creek are low- and medium-density residential, a senior center, a school, a park, and a commercial development located at the southern limits of the Creek. Some housing is built directly adjacent to the Compton Creek right-of-way. These land uses do not generate toxic air contaminant emissions and would not expose people using the proposed land uses to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, implementation of the Master Plan would not include new sources of toxic air contaminant emissions (e.g., diesel trucks) that would expose existing sensitive land uses to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

e) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust and paving materials. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the project area. The proposed project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites. Additionally, the odors would be temporary, and construction activity associated with the proposed project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction odors.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies and fiberglass molding. The proposed project would include recreational land uses and not land uses that typically generate objectionable odors. However, the proposed project will also provide an equestrian trail, which would create nuisance odors. Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to operational odors. However, implementation of the Mitigation Measure AQ1 would reduce the impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**AQ1** The City of Compton shall implement and enforce an odor control and maintenance program to mitigate the effects of odors generated at the equestrian trail. The program shall include daily management of solid wastes generated by the horses and the disposal of wastes off-site at least twice weekly.
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR)

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact. A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the degradation of habitat that resulted in the loss or destruction of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact.
Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Plant and animal species are considered sensitive if they have been listed as such by federal, State, or local agencies, or by one or more special interest groups, such as the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). The CDFG publishes separate comprehensive lists for sensitive plants and animals within the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). The CNDDB database search was performed for special-status species with the South Gate, California, USGS 7.5-minute topographical quadrangle and eight surrounding quadrangles in the project vicinity, including Hollywood, Los Angeles, El Monte, Englewood, Whittier, Torrance, Long Beach, and Los Alamitos. The queries of the databases and agency lists, resulted in the determination that 71 special-status species (37 plants and 34 wildlife species) had been recorded in the nine-quadrangle vicinity of the proposed project. Additionally, one special-status bird (Cooper’s hawk) was observed during the field survey. A summary of the 71 special-status species is provided in Table 3-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CNPS/CDFG</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aphanisma blitoides</td>
<td>Aphanisma</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenaria paludicola</td>
<td>Marsh Sandwort</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus brauntonii</td>
<td>Braunton’s Milkvetch</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus pycnostachyus var. lanosissimus</td>
<td>Ventura Marsh Milkvetch</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus tener var. titi</td>
<td>Coastal Dunes Milkvetch</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex coulteri</td>
<td>Coulter’s Saltbush</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex pacifica</td>
<td>South Coast Saltscale</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex parishii</td>
<td>Parish’s Brittlebush</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atriplex serenana var. davidsonii</td>
<td>Davidson’s Saltscale</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berberis nevinii</td>
<td>Nevin’s Barberry</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California macrophylla</td>
<td>Round-Leaved Filaree</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calochortus plummerae</td>
<td>Plummer’s Mariposa Lily</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS:S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calochortus weedii var. intermedius</td>
<td>Intermediate Mariposa-Lily</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calystegia sepium ssp. binghamiae</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Morning-Glory</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camissonia lewissii</td>
<td>Lewis’ Evening-Primrose</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centromadia parryi ssp. australis</td>
<td>Southern Tarplant</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 3-2: SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OCCURRENCE POTENTIAL WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CNPS/ CDFG</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus</td>
<td>Salt Marsh Bird's-Beak</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudleya multicaulis</td>
<td>Many-STEMMED Dudleya</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus nuttallii ssp. parishii</td>
<td>Los Angeles Sunflower</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum intercedens</td>
<td>Vernal Barley</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horkelia cuneata ssp. puberula</td>
<td>Mesa Horkelia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; Marginally Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri</td>
<td>Coulter's Goldfields</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nama stenocarpum</td>
<td>Mud Nama</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasturtium gambelii</td>
<td>Gambel's Water Cress</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia fossalis</td>
<td>Moran's Nosegay</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia prostrata</td>
<td>Prostrate Navarretia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemacaulis denudata var. denudata</td>
<td>Coast Woolly-Heads</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcuttia californica</td>
<td>California Orcutt Grass</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentachaeta lyonii</td>
<td>Lyon's Pentachaeta</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phacelia stellaris</td>
<td>Brand's Star Phacelia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum</td>
<td>White Rabbit-Tobacco</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes divaricatum var. parishii</td>
<td>Parish's Gooseberry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scutellaria bolanderi ssp. austromontana</td>
<td>Southern Mountains Skullcap</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidalcea neomexicana</td>
<td>Salt Spring Checkerbloom</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suaeda esteroa</td>
<td>Estuary Seablite</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphyotrichum defoliatum</td>
<td>San Bernardino Aster</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphyotrichum greatae</td>
<td>Greta's Aster</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3-2: SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OCCURRENCE POTENTIAL WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CNPS/ CDFG</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolella busckana</td>
<td>Busck's Gallmoth</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicindela gabbii</td>
<td>Western Tidal-Flat Tiger Beetle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicindela hirticollis gravida</td>
<td>Sandy Beach Tiger Beetle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicindela latesignata latesignata</td>
<td>Western Beach Tiger Beetle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicindela senilis frosti</td>
<td>Senile Tiger Beetle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danaus plexippus</td>
<td>Monarch Butterfly</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; Species May Forage on Project Site and Could Potentially Roost Adjacent to Site in Appropriate Trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Xerces: CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siphateles bicolor mohavensis</td>
<td>Mohave Tui Chub</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spea hammondii</td>
<td>Western Spadefoot</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S IUCN: NT</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniella pulchra pulchra</td>
<td>Silvery Legless Lizard</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FS: S</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelonia mydas</td>
<td>Green Sea Turtle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN: EN</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emys marmorata</td>
<td>Western Pond Turtle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S IUCN: VU FS: S</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Not Likely to Occur; Unlikely for Individuals from Los Angeles River Watershed Populations to Migrate into Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrynosoma coronatum</td>
<td>Coast Horned Lizard</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S IUCN: LC FS: S</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter cooperii (Nesting)</td>
<td>Cooper’s Hawk</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN: LC</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Occurs; Project Site Provides Little Nesting Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agelaius tricolor</td>
<td>Tricolored Blackbird</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ABC: WL BLM: S IUCN: EN FWS: BCC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Not Likely to Occur; Marginally Suitable Habitat and Limited Foraging Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>Burrowing Owl</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S IUCN: LC FWS: BCC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo regalis</td>
<td>Ferruginous Hawk</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC FWS: BCC</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FS: S FWS: BCC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CNPS/ CDFG</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empidonax traillii extimus</strong></td>
<td>Southwestern Willow Flycatcher</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ABC: WL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passercculus sandwichensis beldingi</strong></td>
<td>Belding’s Savannah Sparrow</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</strong></td>
<td>California Brown Pelican</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polioptila californica californica</strong></td>
<td>Coastal California Gnatcatcher</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ABC: WL</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sterna (Sturnella) antillarum browni</strong></td>
<td>California Least Tern</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ABC: WL</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vireo bellii pusillus</strong></td>
<td>Least Bell’s Vireo</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ABC: WL, IUCN: NT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Likely to Occur; Marginally Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antrozous pallidus</strong></td>
<td>Pallid Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S IUCN: LC FS: S WBWG: H</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eumops perotis californicus</strong></td>
<td>Western Mastiff Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BLM: S WBWG: H</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; Project Area Lacks Roosting Habitat; Species May Forage Over Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lasionycteris noctivagans</strong></td>
<td>Silver-Haired Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC WBWG: M</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; Project Area Lacks Roosting Habitat; Species May Forage Over Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lasiurus cinereus</strong></td>
<td>Hoary Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC WBWG: M</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Absent; Project Area Lacks Roosting Habitat; Species May Forage Over Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lasiurus xanthinus</strong></td>
<td>Western Yellow Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC WBWG:H</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; Project Area Lacks Roosting Habitat; Species May Forage Over Project Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microtus californicus stephensi</strong></td>
<td>South Coast Marsh Vole</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nyctinomops femorosaccus</strong></td>
<td>Pocketed Free-Tailed Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC, WBWG:M</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nyctinomops macrotis</strong></td>
<td>Big Free-Tailed Bat</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC, WBWG:MH</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perognathus longimembris pacificus</strong></td>
<td>Pacific Pocket Mouse</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxidea taxus</strong></td>
<td>American Badger</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>IUCN:LC</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Absent; No Suitable Habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3-2: SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OCCURRENCE POTENTIAL WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CNPS/CDFG</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Federal Status – The Federal Endangered Species Act is administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries (NOAA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Endangered: Species is in immediate danger of extinction or from existing pressures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Threatened: Species is not presently in eminent danger of extinction but is likely to become an Endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of special protection and management efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Candidate: Candidate species are plants and animals for which the Service has sufficient information on their biological status and threats to propose them as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act, but for which development of a listing regulation is precluded by other higher priority listing activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Delisted: Species is no longer in immediate danger of extinction nor is it likely to reach this status in the foreseeable future. Delisted species are monitored according to a post-delisting monitoring plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Status – The California Endangered Species Act of 1980 (CESA) (Fish and Game Code §§2050, et seq.) and the Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (NPAA) (Fish and Game Code §§1900-1913) generally parallel the main provisions of the Federal Endangered Species Act and are administered by the California Department of Fish and Game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Endangered: a species of plant, fish, or wildlife which is &quot;in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion of its range.&quot; This designation is limited to species or subspecies native to California. (CESA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Threatened: a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile or plant that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of management and protection efforts. (CESA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Rare: (applies to plants only) a species, subspecies, or variety is rare when, although not presently threatened with extinction, it is in such small numbers throughout its range that it may become endangered if its present environment worsens. (This designation was replaced by &quot;threatened&quot; for all animal species in 1985) (NPAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– The Wildlife Branch, Nongame Wildlife Program is responsible for producing and updating SSC publications for mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. The Fisheries Branch is responsible for updates to the Fish Species of Special Concern document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC: Species of Special Concern; native species not having state or federal Threatened or Endangered Species status, but thought to warrant monitoring due to declining population numbers. (Includes those species tracked in the CNDDDB but not given any other special status.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP: Fully Protected; The classification of Fully Protected was the State’s initial effort to identify and provide additional protection to those animals that were rare or faced possible extinction. Lists were created for fish, amphibians and reptiles, birds and mammals. Most of the species on these lists have subsequently been listed under the state and/or federal endangered species acts. The Fish and Game Code section dealing with Fully Protected species is deleted with state that these species “...may not be taken or possessed at any time and no provision of this code or any other law shall be construed to authorize the issuance of permits or licenses to take any fully protected species, although take may be authorized for necessary scientific research. This language arguably makes the “Fully Protected” designation the strongest and most restrictive regarding the “take” of these species. In 2003 the code sections dealing with fully protected species were amended to allow the Department to authorize take resulting from recovery activities for state-listed species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– The California Native Plant Society tracks the conservation status of hundreds of plant species and maintains the CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California. The CNPS Rare Plant Program’s data are widely accepted as the standard for information on the rarity and endangerment status of the California flora.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A CNPS Priority List 1A: plant presumed extinct in CA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B CNPS Priority List 1B: plant Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in CA and elsewhere; eligible for state listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CNPS Priority List 2: plant rare, threatened, or Endangered in CA, but more common elsewhere; eligible for state listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CNPS Priority List 3: more information is needed about this species; some eligible for state listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CNPS Priority List 4: on watch list for plants of interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CNPS Threat Rank is an extension added onto the CNPS List and designates the level of endangerment by a 1 to 3 ranking as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 - Seriously threatened in California (high degree/immediacy of threat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 - Fairly threatened in California (moderate degree/immediacy of threat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 - Not very threatened in California (low degree/immediacy of threats or no current threats known)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC: WL - The United States WatchList is a joint project between the American Bird Conservancy and the National Audubon Society. It reflects a comprehensive analysis of all the bird species in the United States. It reveals those in greatest need of immediate conservation attention to survive a convergence of environmental challenges, including habitat loss, invasive species, and global warming. The list builds on the species assessments conducted for many years by Partners in Flight (PIF) for land birds. It uses those same PIF standards but it is expanded to cover all bird species, not just land birds. The list is based on the latest available research and assessments from the bird conservation community, along with data from the Christmas Bird Count and Breeding Bird Survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM: S - Bureau of Land Management Sensitive. BLM Manual 6840 defines sensitive species as “...those species that are (1) under status review by the FWS/NMFS; or (2) whose numbers are declining so rapidly that Federal listing my become necessary, or (3) with typically small and widely dispersed populations; or (4) those inhabiting ecological refugia or other specialized or unique habitats.” Existing California-BLM policy concerning the designation of sensitive species identifies two conditions that must be met before a species may be considered as BLM sensitive: (1) a significant population of the species must occur on BLM-administered lands, and (2) the potential must exist for improvement of the species’ condition through BLM management. The “Sensitive Species” designation is not meant in include federally listed species, proposed species, candidate species or State listed species. It is BLM policy to provide sensitive species with the same level of protection that is given federal candidate species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS: S – Forest Service: Sensitive: The USDA Forest Service defines sensitive species as those plant and animal species identified by a regional forester that are not listed or proposed for listing by the federal Endangered Species Act for which population viability is a concern, as evidenced by significant current or predicted downward trends in habitat capability that would reduce a species’ existing distribution. FS: BCC - Fish and Wildlife Service: Species of Conservation Concern: The goal of the Birds of Conservation Concern 2002 report is to accurately identify the migratory and non-migratory bird species (beyond those already designated as federally threatened or endangered) that represent our highest conservation priorities and draw attention to species in need of conservation action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3-2: SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT AND WILDLIFE SPECIES OCCURRENCE POTENTIAL WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CNPS/ CDFG</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUCN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Data Deficient: inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment of its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Endangered: faces very high risk of extinction in the wild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Least Concern: does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR/LC</td>
<td>Lower Risk: has been evaluated and does not satisfy the criteria for any of the categories Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable. Subcategory: Least Concern (taxa which do not qualify for Conservation Dependent or Near Threatened).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR/NT</td>
<td>Lower Risk: has been evaluated and does not satisfy the criteria for any of the categories Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable. Subcategory: Near Threatened (taxa which do not qualify for Conservation Dependent, but which are close to qualifying for Vulnerable).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Near Threatened: is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU</td>
<td>Vulnerable: faces high risk of extinction in the wild.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBGW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xerces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled: At very high risk of extinction due to extreme rarity (often 5 or fewer populations), very steep declines, or other factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the field survey, habitats capable of supporting special-status plant and wildlife species were evaluated within the project area. All 37 plant species and 34 wildlife species were eliminated from further consideration because there are no records of these species within five miles (ten miles for butterfly, bird, and bat species) of the project area and habitat within the project area was determined to be to be marginal, limited, or otherwise unfavorable; or the site does not likely provide suitable habitat for a sustaining population of this species.

One special-status bird species (Cooper’s hawk) that was observed during the field survey was assessed as “present” or “may occur” within the project area due to the presence of suitable habitat and recent local records in the project area. Nesting Cooper’s hawks (Accipiter cooperi) are a California State Species of Special Concern. This species typically specializes on hunting small birds and rodents in dense woodlands, but has become increasingly common in urban parks and residential areas in recent years. They are a common resident of suburban areas and riparian woodlands in Los Angeles County. Preferred nesting habitats include oak and riparian woodlands that include sycamore and willow trees. The project area and surrounding areas provide little nesting opportunities for the species, and though the species may forage within the project area, it is not expected to nest there. Therefore, no impacts related to the loss or destruction of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS would occur.

---

5SWCA Environmental Consultants, Biological Resource Assessment for the Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan, 2010.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. A significant impact could occur if any riparian habitat or natural community were lost or destroyed as a result of implementation of the Master Plan. A sensitive habitat is one that is considered rare within the region, supports sensitive plants or animals, or provides connectivity between sensitive habitats.

As previously mentioned, Compton Creek is a federally-listed impaired waterway with metals, trash, and bacteria identified as the key pollutants of concern. The majority of Compton Creek is characterized by a concrete-lined, U-shaped channel, with an earthen-bottom channel from approximately Greenleaf Boulevard to the southern limit of the City (Figure 3-3). The vegetation within the earthen-bottom channel is dominated by nonnative, ruderal (growth in human-disturbed areas) vegetation. The earthen-bottom portion of Compton Creek is periodically graded and/or compacted in order to reduce the threat of flooding, which results in the loss of vegetation and prevents the establishment of mature vegetation communities. Trash is also abundant in the earthen-bottom channel. No sensitive habitats were observed within the project area. The proposed project would not modify the channel of Compton Creek. No impacts related to the loss of riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact could occur if federally protected wetlands were modified or removed as a result of implementation of the Master Plan. Wetlands and other waters are protected under a number of laws and regulations. At the federal level, the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1344) is the primary law regulating wetlands and waters. CWA regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. Waters of the United States include navigable waters, interstate waters, territorial seas, and other waters that may be used in interstate or foreign commerce. To classify wetlands for the purposes of the CWA, a three-parameter approach is used that includes the presence of hydrophytic (water-loving) vegetation, wetland hydrology, and hydric soils (soils subject to saturation/inundation). All three parameters must be present, under normal circumstances, for an area to be designated as a jurisdictional wetland under the CWA. Section 404 of the CWA establishes a regulatory program that provides that no discharge of dredged or fill material can be permitted if a practicable alternative exists that is less damaging to the aquatic environment or if the nation’s waters would be significantly degraded. The Section 404 permit program is run by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) with oversight by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
View of typical channelized segment of Compton Creek.

View of earth-bottom segment of Compton Creek.

The implementation of the Master Plan could result in indirect impacts to jurisdictional waters by on-site construction and the resulting use of a project site within the project area after implementation of the Master Plan, both of which could produce by-products that would eventually impact the Los Angeles River. The result of this could be a significant, but temporary alteration of the biochemistry of the Creek, possibly resulting in a degradation of the watershed’s ability to support sensitive and non-sensitive plants and animals. Construction activities could present several potential sources for water quality degradation in the stream, including the following:

- Construction activities, especially those involving the mixing of mortar and concrete, often result in the production of substantial quantities of sullied wastewater which would seriously pollute the Creek if it were to be deposited there.
- Other construction activities that expose the earth and remove vegetation have the potential to increase erosion. Erosion may result in the degradation of downstream water quality, increased siltation, and turbidity.

Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to the loss or destruction of any riparian habitat or natural community. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure BR1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BR1** To prevent contaminated wastewater from entering downstream habitats, designated areas shall be set aside for equipment washing and small batch mixing of concrete or other chemicals. The set aside areas shall be lined with an impermeable liner, and all washings or residue shall be collected and properly disposed of following construction. To prevent downstream impacts from runoff and erosion, a complete Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared, approved, and implemented. Monitoring of the SWPPP measures shall take place monthly during the summer and weekly during the winter. SWPPP measures shall also be checked after each rain event. A monitoring report shall be prepared and presented bi-annually or whenever measures are not being adequately implemented.

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?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.** A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Master Plan interfered substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Implementation of the Master Plan would provide habitats for migratory and indigenous wildlife, and enhance local microclimates because the Master Plan includes a planting plan that uses sustainable native plant associations. The use of native vegetation helps enhance and expand the visual character of the project area and promotes natural ecologies. The benefits of this vegetation strategy include restoring visual and natural identity to the site, providing habitats for migratory and indigenous wildlife, and enhancing local microclimates. Once properly established, natural rainfall will sustain these native plantings, thus reducing long-term maintenance costs, as well as water, nutrient, and pesticide usage. This restoration will replace the on-site degraded ruderal habitats. If land-clearing or grubbing were to take place during resident or migratory bird nesting season, some of these bird species would be subject to direct mortality of young or eggs. Project-related disturbances that cause the failure of nests these species during active nesting would be a
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violation of the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to the loss or destruction of any native and/or migratory species nesting sites. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure BR2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BR2**

To prevent the disturbance of nesting native and/or migratory bird species, all clearing and grubbing of the project site should take place between September 1 and February 14. Winter site clearing will ensure that nesting birds are not present and impacted. If construction is scheduled or ongoing near the perimeter of the grading footprint during bird nesting season (February 15 to August 31), qualified biologists should survey the area within 200 feet (or up to 300 feet, depending on topography or other factors, and 500 feet for raptors) of the construction activity to determine if grading is disturbing nesting birds. If nesting activity is being compromised, construction should be suspended in the vicinity of the nest until fledging is complete. This mitigation measure will reduce the proposed project’s impacts, disturbance to, and mortality of nesting birds to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures should be implemented by a qualified biologist under contract with the project applicant. The project biologist should prepare a report detailing the results of the construction monitoring efforts. The report should be submitted to the CDFG within two months of the completion of the monitoring activities.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?

**No impact.** A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Master Plan conflicted with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides recommendations to improve water quality. The Master Plan would not conflict with the General Plan Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element. Therefore, no impact related to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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?

**No impact.** A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Master Plan were inconsistent with any adopted habitat conservation plan. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides recommendations to improve water quality. The City of Compton does not have a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, no impact related to habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES (CR)

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA §15064.5?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Master Plan substantially altered the environmental context or removed identified historical resources. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines generally defines historical significance as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural or cultural annals of California. Historical resources are further defined as being associated with significant events, important persons, or distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; representing the work of an important creative individual; or possessing high artistic values.

A review of the National Register of Historic Places identified a single notable site in the City of Compton. The site is referred to as the Dominguez Ranch and is located at 18127 South Alameda Street approximately 500 feet from Compton Creek. The central portion of the Dominguez Ranch House was built in 1826 by Manuel Dominguez. The battle of Dominguez Ranch was fought here on October 8 and 9, 1946. During the battle Californians led by José Antonio Carrillo repelled United States forces under Captain William Mervine, U.S. Navy, in an attempt to recapture the Pueblo of Los Angeles.

The Dominguez Ranch is also listed as a California Landmark (No. 152). In addition to the Dominguez Ranch, a second historically significant site is designated California Historical Landmark (No. 664) and is referred to as the “Heritage House.” The Heritage House is located at the northwest corner of Willowbrook Avenue and Myrrh Street, approximately 0.5 miles from Compton Creek. The Heritage

---


House was originally constructed in 1869 by A. R. Loomis and is generally considered to be the oldest house in the City.

Neither the Dominguez Ranch nor the Heritage House would be altered, demolished, destroyed, or relocated as a result of the Master Plan. Furthermore, implementation of the Master Plan could have a positive effect as it would increase community access to and understanding of these historic resources. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to altering or removing historical resources.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA §15064.5?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in a known or unknown archaeological resource being removed, altered, or destroyed as a result of the proposed development. Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources, which meet the criteria for historical resources, or resources which constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant impact could occur if the proposed project would adversely affect archaeological resources, which fall under either of these categories.

Compton Creek’s valuable water resources and fertile adjacent land made this waterway the focal point of agricultural settlements dating back to the 1784 Spanish Land Grant of Juan Jose Dominguez. Any surficial archaeological resources that may have existed in the surrounding area are likely to have been previously disturbed or removed. As previously mentioned, no new buildings or structures are proposed as a part of the Master Plan that would require grading and excavation for structural footings. Nonetheless, since unknown resources could be altered or destroyed by even minor site excavation or other construction activities, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to archaeological resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

CR1 During excavation and grading, if archaeological resources are uncovered, all work in that area shall cease and be diverted so as to allow for a determination of the value of the resource. Construction activities in that area may commence once the uncovered resources are collected by an archaeologist and properly processed.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in excavation or construction activities that disturbed paleontological or unique geological features. Paleontological resources are not known to have previously been discovered in or adjacent to the project area. Although the possibility of discovering paleontological resources in the project site remains low, the potential for accidental discovery during grading and excavation activities

---

always exists that excavation may uncover vertebrate or invertebrate fossils. Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to paleontological resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**CR2**  During excavation and grading, if paleontological resources are uncovered, all work in that area shall cease and be diverted so as to allow for a determination of the value of the resource. Construction activities in that area may commence once the uncovered resources are collected by a paleontologist and properly processed. Any paleontological remains and/or reports and surveys shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in previously interred human remains being disturbed during excavation. The project area is not part of a formal cemetery and, therefore, it is highly unlikely that human remains exist on or in the vicinity of the project area. Nevertheless, unknown human remains could be potentially encountered during construction activities (e.g. excavation, grading, etc.). Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to human remains. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR3 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

**CR3**  If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.
### 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS (GS)

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ☐ ✓ ☐

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ✓ ☐ ☐

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

iv) Landslides?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ✓ ☐ ☐

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ✓ ☐ ☐

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

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ✓ ☐ ☐

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?

   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - No Impact

   ☐ ☐ ☐ ✓
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by 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.

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of a fault rupture occurring along the project area. According to General Plan Safety Element, the project area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Fault Zone, and no known active faults are mapped as crossing or projecting towards the project area. Nevertheless, the project area is located in seismically-active Southern California, characterized by major faults and fault zones. Seismic activity occurring along a number of active faults in the region, including the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Whittier-Elsinore, Newport-Inglewood, San Fernando, and Sierra Madre faults would affect the project area (Figure 3-4).10

The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides long-term recommendations to improve water quality. The Master Plan identifies locations for potential components such as tree plantings; amenities such as trash receptacles and drinking fountains; parks and programs such as playgrounds and athletic facilities; and communication improvements such as way-finding signs. In addition, the Master Plan includes the construction of several pedestrian bridges across the Creek. When specific projects are implemented they will be designed to reduce the potential for exposure of people to seismic risks through modern construction techniques. Specifically, future proposed projects would comply with the requirements of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations Compliance to reduce impacts attributable to fault rupture to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, future proposed projects would comply with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (1997), which provides guidance for the evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with the seismic safety requirements in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and Compton Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

---
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ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused personal injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of seismic ground shaking. The project area, as is all of Southern California is located within a seismically active area and strong ground shaking due to seismic activity could occur within the project area. Numerous regional and local faults are capable of producing severe earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater. As noted above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Nevertheless, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to strong seismic ground shaking. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure GS1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

GS1 Site-specific Geotechnical Investigation Reports shall be prepared to further assess the potential geophysical hazards. The findings of these site-specific Geotechnical Investigation Reports shall be incorporated into the design of the proposed project to reduce the potential for seismic-induced damages to the satisfaction of the City of Compton Department of Building and Safety.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused injury or death or resulted in property damage as a result of liquefaction or other ground failure caused by ground shaking. Soil liquefaction occurs when loose, saturated, granular soils lose their inherent shear strength due to excess water pressure that builds up during repeated movement from seismic activity. Factors that contribute to the potential for liquefaction include a low relative density of granular materials, a shallow groundwater table, and a long duration and high acceleration of seismic shaking. Liquefaction usually results in horizontal and vertical movements from lateral spreading of liquefied materials and post-earthquake settlement of liquefied materials. Liquefaction potential is greatest where the groundwater level is shallow, and submerged loose, fine sands occur within a depth of approximately 50 feet or less. According to the General Plan Safety Element, “the water table underlying most of Compton is at least 100 feet underground. Consequently, liquefaction potential in the City is generally low, with the exception of the central eastern area of the City where the groundwater level is higher.” The project area is located in an area identified as having low liquefaction potential. Therefore, no impact related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Master Plan were implemented on a site that would be located in a hillside area with unstable geological conditions or soil types that would be susceptible to failure when saturated. The project area is not located on or adjacent to a hillside area and, therefore, would not be impacted by landslides. No impact related to landslides would occur.

---

Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.** A significant impact would occur if construction activities or future uses proposed as a part of the Master Plan resulted in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Excavation activities would be required when specific components of the Master Plan are implemented. Construction activities would expose soils to wind and rainfall, and they would be subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Permit. Compliance with the NPDES permit includes the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), some of which are specifically intended to reduce soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Applicable BMPs include scheduling excavation and grading activities during dry weather, as feasible and covering stockpiles of excavated soils with tarps or plastic sheeting to reduce soil erosion. Nevertheless, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures GS2 through GS5 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of applicable BMPs and compliance with the standard construction and erosion control practices, as described in Section 3.9.a Hydrology and Water Quality, would help reduce impacts related to erosion. In addition, the following mitigation measures would further reduce significant impacts related to erosion.

**GS2** The Applicant shall ensure that construction and excavation activities will adhere to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) set forth by the City. Such BMPs include using plastic coverings to prevent erosion of any unprotected area, such as mounds of dirt or dumpsters, along with devices designed to intercept and safely divert runoff.

**GS3** To the extent feasible, the Applicant shall ensure that grading will be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season (between November and April).

**GS4** During inclement periods of the year, when rain is threatening (between November and April), the Applicant shall implement an erosion control plan that identifies BMPs to the satisfaction of the City’s Building and Safety Division to minimize potential erosion during construction. The erosion control plan shall be a condition prior to issuance of any grading permit.

**GS5** The Applicant shall ensure that provisions be made for adequate surface drainage away from the areas of excavation as well as protection of excavated areas from flooding. The grading contractor shall control surface water and the transportation of silt and sediment.

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 landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.** A significant impact would occur if the Master Plan were implemented on a site that is located on soil in unstable geological conditions that would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, on- or off-site landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The majority of Compton Creek in the City of Compton is a concrete-lined channel which is marked by steep walls. The Master Plan proposes to improve the visual character of
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Compton Creek without channel modifications. As specific projects and improvements are developed as a part of the Master Plan, they will conform to and be developed under guidance of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the California Department of Conservation, CDMG Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (1997), which provides guidance for earthquake induced landslide hazards, and the safety requirements in the UBC and Compton Municipal Code would ensure that none of the proposed improvements would cause landsliding liquefaction, seismically-induced settlement, or other adverse conditions. Nevertheless, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to unstable soil. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure GS1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure GS1 in Section 3.6 (a)(ii).

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in development on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for proposed project buildings, thus, posing a hazard to life and property. The Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek through parks and trails, and no new buildings are proposed. Several pedestrian bridges are included as part of the Master Plan and, therefore, potential construction sites along Compton Creek could be located on expansive soils. Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to expansive soils. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure GS1 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure GS1 in Section 3.6 (a)(ii).

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in inadequate wastewater disposal. The Master Plan proposes to improve the visual character of Compton Creek and no new buildings or major structures are proposed that could support the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. In addition, the project area is located in an urbanized area that is already extensively served by existing sewer infrastructure. As a result, septic tanks and other alternative wastewater disposal systems are not required or necessary for the Master Plan to be implemented. Therefore, no impact related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (GHG)

Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact  
---|---|---|---  
☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

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

Potentially Significant Impact | Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less-Than-Significant Impact | No Impact  
---|---|---|---  
☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

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

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. GHG emissions refer to a group of emissions that are generally believed to affect global climate conditions. The greenhouse effect compares the Earth and the atmosphere surrounding it to a greenhouse with glass panes. The glass panes in a greenhouse let heat from sunlight in and reduce the amount of heat that escapes. GHGs, such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O), keep the average surface temperature of the Earth close to 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Of all the GHGs, CO₂ is the most abundant pollutant that contributes to climate change through fossil fuel combustion. Other GHGs are less abundant but have higher global warming potential than CO₂. To account for this higher potential, emissions of other GHGs are frequently expressed in the equivalent mass of CO₂, denoted as CO₂e.

**Thresholds of Significance**

The SCAQMQ has adopted GHG significance thresholds for projects where the SCAQMD is lead agency but not for general development. Therefore, the significance threshold is based on the methodologies recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change white paper. CAPCOA conducted an analysis of various approaches and significance thresholds, ranging from a zero threshold (all projects are cumulatively considerable) to a high of 40,000 to 50,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year. For example, an approach assuming a zero threshold and compliance with AB 32 2020 targets would require all discretionary projects to achieve a 33 percent reduction from projected “business-as-usual” emissions to be considered less than significant. A zero threshold approach could be considered on the basis that climate change is a global phenomenon, and not controlling small source emissions would potentially neglect a major portion of the GHG inventory. However, the CEQA Guidelines also recognize that there may be a point where a project’s contribution, although above zero, would not be a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (a)). Therefore, a threshold of greater than zero is considered more appropriate for the analysis of GHG emissions under CEQA.

Another method would use a quantitative threshold of greater than 900 metric tons CO₂e per year based on a market capture approach that requires mitigation for greater than 90 percent of likely future discretionary development. This threshold would generally correspond to office projects of approximately 35,000 square feet, retail projects of approximately 11,000 square feet, or supermarket space of approximately 6,300 square feet. Another potential threshold would be the 10,000 metric tons
standard used by the Market Advisory Committee for inclusion in a GHG Cap and Trade System in California. A 10,000 metric ton significance threshold would correspond to the GHG emissions of approximately 550 residential units, 400,000 square feet of office space, 120,000 square feet of retail, and 70,000 square feet of supermarket space. This threshold would capture roughly half of new residential or commercial development. The basic concepts for the various approaches suggested by CAPCOA are used herein to determine whether or not the proposed project’s GHG emissions are “cumulatively considerable.”

The most conservative (i.e., lowest) thresholds, suggested by CAPCOA, would not be appropriate for the proposed project given that it is located in a community that is highly urbanized. Similarly, the 900-ton threshold was also determined to be too conservative for general development in the South Coast Air Basin. Consequently, the threshold of 10,000 metric tons CO₂e is used as a quantitative benchmark for significance. A project’s contribution to cumulative impacts to global climatic change is considered cumulatively considerable if the proposed project would generate 10,000 metric tons CO₂e per year.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Master Plan does not propose uses that typically increase automobile traffic. To the contrary, implementation of the Master Plan would encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, including walking, biking, and horseback riding. In addition, the proposed project would not include stationary sources of GHG emissions (e.g., mechanical equipment). GHG emissions would result from construction activity. Based on SCAQMD guidance, construction GHG emissions amortized over a 30-year span to obtain annual emissions. URBMEIS2007 indicated that one year of construction activity utilizing the worst-case assumption would generate approximately 1,298 metric tons per year of GHG emissions. This would be less than the 10,000-metric-ton significance threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. In response to growing scientific and political concern with global climate change, California has recently adopted a series of laws to reduce emissions of GHGs into the atmosphere. In September 2002, Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 was enacted, requiring the development and adoption of regulations to achieve “the maximum feasible reduction of greenhouse gases” emitted by noncommercial passenger vehicles, light-duty trucks, and other vehicles used primarily for personal transportation in the State. California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced, on June 1, 2005, through Executive Order S-3-05, the following GHG emission reduction targets: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

The Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency created the Climate Action Team (CAT), which, in March 2006, published the Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature (2006 CAT Report). The 2006 CAT Report identifies a recommended list of strategies that the State could pursue to reduce climate change GHG emissions. These are strategies that could be implemented by various State agencies to ensure that the Governor’s targets are met and can be met with existing authority of the State agencies.
In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as AB 32, into law. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions in California, and requires the CARB to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020. To achieve this goal, AB 32 mandates that the CARB establish a quantified emissions cap, institute a schedule to meet the cap, implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources, and develop tracking, reporting, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that reductions are achieved. Because the intent of AB 32 is to limit 2020 emissions to the equivalent of 1990, and the present year (2010) is near the midpoint of this timeframe, it is expected that the regulations would affect many existing sources of GHG emissions and not just new general development projects. Senate Bill (SB) 1368, a companion bill to AB 32, requires the California Public Utilities Commission and the California Energy Commission to establish GHG emission performance standards for the generation of electricity. These standards will also apply to power that is generated outside of California and imported into the State.

AB 32 charges the CARB with the responsibility to monitor and regulate sources of GHG emissions in order to reduce those emissions. On June 1, 2007, the CARB adopted three discrete early action measures to reduce GHG emissions. These measures involved complying with a low carbon fuel standard, reducing refrigerant loss from motor vehicle air conditioning maintenance, and increasing methane capture from landfills. On October 25, 2007, the CARB tripled the set of previously approved early action measures. The approved measures include improving truck efficiency (i.e., reducing aerodynamic drag), electrifying port equipment, reducing perfluorocarbons from the semiconductor industry, reducing propellants in consumer products, promoting proper tire inflation in vehicles, and reducing sulfur hexafluoride emission from the non-electricity sector. The CARB has determined that the total statewide aggregated greenhouse gas 1990 emissions level and 2020 emissions limit is 427 million metric tons of CO₂e. The 2020 target reductions are currently estimated to be 174 million metric tons of CO₂e.

The CARB AB 32 Scoping Plan contains the main strategies to achieve the 2020 emissions cap. The Scoping Plan was developed by the CARB with input from the Climate Action Team and proposes a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall carbon emissions in California, improve the environment, reduce oil dependency, diversify energy sources, and enhance public health while creating new jobs and improving the State economy. The GHG reduction strategies contained in the Scoping Plan include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system. The Scoping Plan contains broad emission reduction measures that do not generally apply on a project level. However, the Scoping Plan does include a measure that requires the development of regional transportation-related GHG targets. The Scoping Plan further states that regions should work to integrate development patterns and transportation network in a way that reduces GHG emissions while meeting regional planning objectives.

The California Attorney General has prepared a fact sheet listing various mitigation measures that local agencies may consider to offset or reduce global warming impacts and ensure compliance with AB 32. As appropriate, the measures can be included as design features of a project, required as changes to the project, or imposed as mitigation (whether undertaken directly by the proposed project proponent or funded by mitigation fees). Relevant mitigation measures include:

- Preserve and create open space and parks. Preserve existing trees, and plant replacement trees at a set ratio;
- Include pedestrian and bicycle facilities within projects and ensure that existing non-motorized routes are maintained and enhanced;
- Promote “least polluting” ways to connect people and goods to their destinations; and
• Connect parks and open space through shared pedestrian/bike paths and trails to encourage walking and bicycling. Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points.

The purpose of the Master Plan is to redevelop the City’s existing flood control channel and adjacent land into a safe, ecologically beneficial, multi-use, public greenway. The Master Plan envisions Compton Creek as a livable, walkable, urban community that is orientated to and informed by Compton Creek. Implementation of the Master Plan will result in a 3.45-mile-long park system of gardens, plazas, trails, habitats, outdoor classrooms, and promenades. The Master Plan would encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, including walking and biking. The proposed project would not substantially increase automobile trips. Based on this discussion, the proposed project would be consistent with GHG reduction plans. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to conflicting with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
### 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (HM)

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would require the transfer, use, or disposal of hazardous materials such that it would create a significant hazard to the public. Implementation of the Master Plan will include construction of individual projects which may involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Other occasional-used hazardous materials include limited quantities of lubricating products, paints, solvents, and custodial products (mainly cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No industrial uses or activities are proposed as a part of the Master Plan that would result in the generation, use, or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal of these materials. Use and transport of hazardous materials would be regulated by the County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), and all hazardous materials would be required to be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations, and would not pose significant hazards to the public or the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan created a significant hazard to the public or environment due to a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. The existing Compton Creek is an impaired waterway that contains pollutants from stormwater and urban runoff that includes trash, bacteria, viruses, heavy metals, pesticides, petroleum hydrocarbons, and other organic compounds. Other sources of pollutants entering Compton Creek include leaking underground storage tanks and septic systems, contaminated groundwater, and horse stables. The Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council has identified metals, trash, and bacteria as the key pollutants of concern in Compton Creek. One of the objectives of the Master Plan is to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. In addition, the Master Plan provides recommendations to improve water quality by integrating watershed management practices, promoting open space, and supporting sustainable activities and recreational amenities. It is expected that as a result of the Master Plan, hazards and hazardous materials in Compton Creek will be reduced. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to a significant hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

---

c) 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. A potentially significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the release of hazardous materials within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school. The Compton Unified School District provides public education for grades K-12. The district is comprised of 24 elementary schools, eight middle schools, three high schools, one adult school, and five alternative learning schools. There are ten public schools that are located within one-quarter mile of Compton Creek, these schools include: Centennial High School, McNair Elementary School, Washington Elementary School, Davis Middle School, Tibby Elementary School, Laurel Elementary School, Compton High School, Kennedy Elementary School, and Compton Community College. The objective of the Master Plan is to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, community gardens, public art, and landscaping and to create a network of environmental learning through the establishment of outdoor classrooms with Creek-adjacent schools. In addition, the Master Plan provides recommendations to improve water quality by integrating watershed management practices, promoting open space, and supporting sustainable activities and recreational amenities. It is expected that as a result of the Master Plan, hazards and hazardous materials in Compton Creek will be reduced. However, as described above, implementation of the Master Plan will include construction of individual projects which may involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Other occasionally-used hazardous materials include limited quantities of lubricating products, paints, solvents, and custodial products (mainly cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No industrial uses or activities are proposed as a part of the Master Plan that would result in the generation, use, or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials. As described above, the uses on site would be required to comply with all existing State, Federal and local laws and regulations that deal with hazardous materials use and transport such as CAL/OSHA. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the release of hazardous material near schools.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur the Master Plan was implemented on a site that is listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. A search was conducted using the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database\(^\text{13}\) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database to identify any potential risk related to exposure from known hazardous materials sites.\(^\text{14}\) A search of the DTSC Envirostor database revealed that the closest hazardous material cleanup site to the project area is the Ujima Village Apartments voluntary cleanup site, which is approximately 1,000 feet away from Compton Creek (Figure 3-5).

\(^{13}\)California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor website, \url{http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov}, accessed August 3, 2010.
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SOURCE: California Department of Toxic Substances Control, State Water Resources Control Board, TAHA, 2011.
A review of the DTSC Envirostor database also revealed four “tiered permit” sites within 1,000 feet of Compton Creek. The four tiered permit sites are:

- Appliance Recycling Center of America located approximately 400 feet from Compton Creek
- Superior Chrome Plating Company located approximately 1,000 feet from Compton Creek
- Accurate Anodizing Inc. located approximately 700 feet from Compton Creek
- Sandk Industries Inc. located approximately 700 feet from Compton Creek

A search of the SWRCB GeoTracker database revealed seven hazardous material cleanup sites within 1,000 feet of Compton Creek. The seven sites are:

- The G&M Oil Company leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup site located approximately 400 feet from Compton Creek
- The Brown-Ferris IND LUST cleanup site located approximately 600 feet from Compton Creek
- The Arco #1691 LUST cleanup located approximately 1,000 feet from Compton Creek
- The Compton Community Development LUST cleanup site located approximately 500 feet from Compton Creek
- The Barkens Hard Chrome Inc cleanup program located approximately 1,000 feet from Compton Creek
- The UltraMax LUST cleanup site located approximately 500 feet from Compton Creek
- The Shell LUST cleanup site located approximately 700 feet from Compton Creek

There are no sites that are identified as a part of the Master Plan that are listed on any of the regulatory databases. Consequently, the proposed project would not be developed on a site that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, no impact related to listed hazardous sites would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exposed persons residing or working in the project area to risks associated with the proximity of an airport. The Compton/Woodley Airport, a general aviation airport, is located approximately 0.6 miles to the west of Compton Creek. The nearest regional airport, Los Angeles International (LAX), is located approximately 13 miles northwest of Compton Creek. There are no portions of the project area that are within an airport land use plan. The City of Compton is a highly urbanized area and the Master Plan does not propose any new development that would contrast in size or scale to the surrounding land uses. As such, the Master Plan would not result in safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area or the surrounding area. Therefore, no impact related to airport activity would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?

No Impact. A potentially significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exposed persons residing or working in the area to risks associated with the proximity of a private airstrip. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact related to private airport activity would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan impaired the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan or blockage of an emergency route. According to the City of Compton General Plan Safety Element, three emergency evacuation routes, Central Avenue, Wilmington Avenue and Willowbrook Avenue cross Compton Creek vertically, while four streets, El Segundo Boulevard, Rosecrans Avenue, Redondo Beach Boulevard, and Alondra Boulevard cross Compton Creek horizontally. Disaster routes function as primary and thoroughfares for the movement of emergency response traffic and access to critical facilities. The Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire are responsible for the implementation of the Safety Element and the coordination of emergency response and evacuation.

Implementation of the Master Plan may require construction of projects that require street and sidewalk improvements and the potential improvement of water, wastewater, and other underground utility lines in an identified emergency evacuation route right-of-way. Although short-term, the proposed project’s construction activities within the right-of-way could potentially impact the use of those streets during an emergency response or evacuation. Any lane closures, movement of heavy construction equipment, or any construction in, or use of, the street right-of-ways would be coordinated with the Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire. If required, a department may designate an alternative evacuation route during short-term street construction. Nevertheless, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures HM1 and HM2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

HM1 An Emergency Procedures Plan shall be developed which includes notification to the City of Compton Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire of any full or partial lane closures, movement of heavy construction equipment, and construction within the adjacent street right-of-ways.

HM2 The Emergency Procedures Plan shall specify a process by which any activities in the adjacent right-of-ways shall be coordinated with the emergency requirements of the Departments of Public Works, Police, and Fire.
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exposed people and/or structures to a high risk of wildfire. The project area is located in the City of Compton and surrounded by a built urban environment. The project area is not located near any potential wildland fire areas. Therefore, no impact related to exposure of persons and property to wildfire would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

---

15City of Compton, General Plan Public Safety Element, 1991.
3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (HW)

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project:

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  


j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?


a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the discharge of water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. The proposed project would not modify the channel of Compton Creek. However, construction of parks and associated structures (benches, lighting fixtures) would disrupt soils on the banks of Compton Creek. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations regarding surface water quality as governed by the Regional Water Resources Control Board (RWQCB). These regulations include compliance with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts. The proposed project would also need to comply with the requirements of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit issued by the RWQCB. The NPDES Permit requires that all developers of land where construction activities will occur over more than one acre develop and implement a SWPPP, which specifies BMPs that will reduce pollution in stormwater discharges to the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable/Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology standards and eliminate or reduce non-stormwater discharges to storm sewer systems and other waters of the nation. The SWPPP typically includes minimization of erosion during construction, stabilization of construction areas, sediment control, control of pollutants from construction materials, as well as post-construction stormwater management (e.g., the minimization of impervious surfaces, treatment of stormwater runoff, etc). The SWPPP also must include a discussion of the program to inspect and maintain all BMPs. In addition, the SWPPP would require implementation of an erosion control plan to reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion during the construction process. No continued erosion potential would exist after completion of construction.

The SUSMP requires developers to mitigate (infiltrate or treat) the stormwater runoff (volume or flow rate) generated from 0.75 inches of rainfall over 24 hours. The proposed project’s SUSMP would be reviewed and revised over time to ensure that BMPs are functioning properly and are effective at treating runoff from the site throughout the life of the proposed project. The proposed project would also incorporate BMPs that would detain surface water runoff as well as treating these waters, either actively or passively, before discharging these waters to the local storm drain system. Through the incorporation of the requisite BMPs, development of the proposed project is anticipated to improve the quality of the water discharged from the site, compared to existing conditions. Compliance with the aforementioned standard construction and erosion control practices would ensure that the construction or operation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan substantially depletes groundwater or interferes with groundwater discharge. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. Implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase in pervious surfaces which will permit more percolation of water into the ground. This is consistent with the General Plan Safety Element, which calls for “large areas of unpaved land…to permit more percolation of water into the ground.” Water supply in the City is supplied by the Compton Municipal Water Department (CMWD). The CMWD gets its water from two sources: from local groundwater wells operated and maintained by the CMWD and the Metropolitan Water District, which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. The project area is located within the Central Groundwater Basin. This basin is adjudicated and is therefore regulated by a Watermaster, the California Department of Water Resources, Southern District. The Watermaster Program ensures that water is allocated by established rights and that only safe yields are produced from the basin. This guarantees that the groundwater levels will not be depleted. Non-potable components of the Master Plan would use reclaimed water, which the City uses via a partnership with the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and the Century and the Rio Hondo Water Reclamation Programs. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to groundwater supply and groundwater recharge.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan altered the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river so that erosion or siltation would result. The Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek through parks and trails, and no channel modifications to Compton Creek are being considered as part of the Master Plan. The banks of Compton Creek would be modified, but the existing drainage patterns would be conserved. Stormwater and irrigation runoff would be directed into existing storm drains. In addition, implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase in pervious surfaces which will permit more percolation of water into the ground. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

---

16 City of Compton, General Plan Public Safety Element, 1991.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan substantially altered the drainage pattern of an existing stream or river so that flooding would result. The Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek through parks and trails, and no channel modifications to Compton Creek are being considered as part of the Master Plan. The banks of Compton Creek would be modified, but the existing drainage patterns would be conserved. Stormwater and irrigation runoff would be directed into existing storm drains. In addition, implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase in pervious surfaces which will permit more percolation of water into the ground. Consequently, alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. Although the project area is located within a 100-year flood zone hazard, none of the proposed project components would involve elements that could change or increase the risk of flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to altering the existing drainage pattern or substantially increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in runoff water that exceeded the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems serving the project area. A project-related significant adverse effect could also occur if a project could substantially increase sources of polluted runoff. The proposed project would involve building parks and open space adjacent to Compton Creek which would increase the amount of permeable surfaces and percolation of water. Therefore, runoff from the proposed project would be less than the existing runoff. The proposed project would implement a SWPPP during construction and a SUSMP during project operations in order to reduce the potential for additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to surface runoff.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan substantially degraded water quality. The Master Plan provides recommendations to improve water quality by placing parks and open space next to Compton Creek. Construction and operation of the Master Plan would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations in order prevent violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to water quality.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the implementation of the Master Plan were to locate housing within a 100-year floodplain. The primary source of significant flood hazard to the City would be a flood event caused by overflow of the Los Angeles River Channel, which passes along the City’s eastern boundary. If this were to occur, the eastern two thirds of the City would be subject to shallow flooding; this includes the southernmost 0.75-miles of the Master Plan Area, which has existing housing. This area of the City is between the limits of a 100-year and 500-year flood event (Figure 3-6). The Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek by adding parks and open space on its banks, and no new housing or new buildings are being proposed as a part of the Master Plan. Therefore, no impact related to placing new housing within a 100-year flood plain would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would impede or redirect flood flows. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. The Master Plan identifies locations for potential components such as tree plantings; amenities such as trash receptacles and drinking fountains; parks and programs such as playgrounds and athletic facilities; and communication improvements such as way-finding signs. As mentioned above, there is no 100-year floodplain within the Master Plan area (Figure 3-6). The structures that are proposed as a part of the Master Plan (benches, pedestrian bridges, lighting fixtures) would not change, impede, or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to flooding.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

---

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if the Master Plan was implemented on a site that is located within an area susceptible to flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. As mentioned above, flooding potential within the City is between a 100-year and 500-year event and covers the eastern two thirds of the City of Compton, including the southernmost 0.75 miles of the Master Plan area.¹⁹ The Master Plan proposes to improve the Compton Creek by adding parks and open space on its banks, and no new residences or buildings are proposed as a part of the Master Plan. The structures proposed under the Master Plan (benches, pedestrian bridges, lighting fixtures) would not be exposed to significant risks of flooding. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exposed persons or structures to an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, or lake. A tsunami is a great sea wave produced by a significant undersea disturbance. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The City of Compton is located inland, more than eight miles from the Pacific Ocean and thus the project area would not be exposed to the effects of a tsunami. Similarly, damage to the project area due to a seiche is not likely because no large bodies of water are present near the project area. Furthermore, the project area is not located within a hillside area or positioned downslope from any unprotected slopes or landslide areas; as a result, the project area is not positioned in an area of potential mudflow. Therefore no impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

---

¹⁹City of Compton, General Plan Safety Element, 1991.
3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING (LU)

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☑
- ☐

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
- Less-Than-Significant Impact
- No Impact

- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☑

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan were sufficiently large or configured in such a way so as to create a physical barrier within an established community. Compton Creek is a natural physical barrier that already serves as a dividing line between existing communities. The Master Plan includes features that would increase community connectivity, such as a 3.75-mile continuous park system of gardens, plazas, trails, habitats, outdoor classrooms, and promenades. The proposed project would increase connectivity in the area through improved walkways, bikeways, equestrian paths, and pedestrian crosswalks across Compton Creek. Therefore, no impact related to division of an established community would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused inconsistencies with applicable plans, policies, and zoning designations. At the local level, the City of Compton General Plan implements land use policies for the project area and vicinity. At a regional level, the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) “serves as an advisory document to local agencies in the Southern California region for their information and voluntary use for preparing local plans and handling local issues of regional significance.”

The project area has a variety of land uses and zoning designations within its boundaries. Implementation of the Master Plan will not conflict with these designations, and instead would meet several goals and policies from the Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element of the adopted General Plan:

----

Policy 1.4: Encourage neighborhood parks close to concentrations of residents to encourage pedestrian travel to public recreation facilities.
Policy 1.6: Encourage bike paths and lanes to reduce vehicular travel and air pollution…Cooperate and coordinate such efforts with the property owners and responsible jurisdictions.
Goal 4.0: Develop and maintain a balanced system of open space, public parks, and recreational facilities.
Policy 4.1: Provide active and passive park and recreational facilities, based on the distribution of population within the City, to serve the needs of residents of all ages, economic levels, and physical conditions.
Policy 4.3: Upgrade existing park facilities to improve park use and appearance.
Policy 4.4: Create opportunities for joint use of public facilities for recreational purposes, such as schools, utility easements, and abandoned railroad rights-of-way.
Policy 4.5: Pursue opportunities for the creation of additional open space and parkland whenever available.
Policy 4.8: Develop and maintain a public parkland master plan which identifies City open space and recreational needs.
Policy 4.9: Increase access to all City open space and recreational areas, including for the disabled and those who depend on public transit.

The Master Plan also meets a goal and policy from the Land Use Element of the adopted General Plan:

Goal 2.0: Maintain a balanced and diversified distribution of land use in Compton.
Policy 2.7: Provide and maintain sufficient park land and open space resources to meet the community’s diverse needs.

The Master Plan also meets several goals of the Open Space and Habitat chapter of the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) 2008 RCP.21

Ensure a sustainable ecology by protecting and enhancing the region’s open space infrastructure and mitigate growth and transportation related impacts to natural lands by:
- Conserving natural lands that are necessary to preserve the ecological function and value of the region’s ecosystems; and
- Conserving wildlife linkages as critical components of the region’s open space infrastructure;

Enhance the region’s parks, trails, and community open space infrastructure to support the aesthetic, recreational and quality-of-life needs, providing the highest level of service to our growing region by:
- Creating new community open space that is interconnected, accessible, equitably distributed, provides public health benefits, and meets the changing and diverse needs of communities; and
- Improving existing community open space through urban forestry and other programs that provide environmental benefits.

In accordance with the above mentioned policies, the proposed project will provide many benefits to the area, including improved riparian habitat quality and quantity, improved water quality, creation of adjacent open spaces and development that enhances the natural qualities of Compton Creek, increased and improved open space and recreation opportunities, as well as improved pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian access and safety.

---
The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. To the contrary, it is in accordance with goals and policies of the adopted General Plan and the SCAG 2008 RCP. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to applicable land use plan and policies.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Master Plan were located within an area governed by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). The area surrounding the project area is highly urbanized. Currently, there is no HCP or NCCP applicable to the project area. Therefore, no impact related to any HCP or NCCP would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
### 3.11 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **Result in the loss or non-availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would result in the loss of the availability of known mineral resources of regional value. The Dominguez Oil Field lies underneath the southern portion of the Master Plan. However, there are no active drilling or pumping practices taking place within the project area. There are six oil and gas wells within 0.5-mile of Compton Creek, but each has been plugged or buried and none of them are currently active (Figure 3-7). The Master Plan would not prohibit drilling activities and, therefore, would not result in the loss or non-availability of any known, regionally valuable mineral resource. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the loss of a known mineral resource.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of local value. The City’s General Plan does not conserve, protect, or discuss any locally-important mineral resources. Likewise, no specific plan or other land use plan covers a locally-important mineral resource. The proposed project would not result in the loss or non-availability of any known, locally valuable mineral resource. Therefore, no impact related to loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

---


24 Ibid.
LEGEND:

- Compton Creek Master Plan
- City Boundaries
- Approximate Oil and Gas Well Locations

SOURCE: California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, TAH, 2011.

FIGURE 3-7
OIL AND GAS WELL LOCATIONS
3.12 NOISE (N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Expose persons to or generate noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose persons to or generate noise in levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. This noise analysis discusses sound levels in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Equivalent Noise Level ($L_{eq}$). CNEL is an average sound level during a 24-hour day. CNEL is a noise measurement scale, which accounts for noise source, distance, single event duration, single event occurrence, frequency, and time of day. The CNEL is obtained by adding an additional five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and ten decibels (dBA) to sound levels in the night before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m. Because CNEL accounts for human sensitivity to sound, the CNEL 24-hour figure is always a higher number than the actual 24-hour average. $L_{eq}$ is the average noise level on an energy basis for any specific time period. The $L_{eq}$ for one hour is the energy average noise level during the hour. The average noise level is based on the energy content (acoustic energy) of the sound. $L_{eq}$ can be thought of as the level of a continuous noise that has the same energy content as the fluctuating noise level.
City of Compton Noise Regulations

The Noise Element of the General Plan is a comprehensive program for including noise control in the planning process. It is a tool for achieving and maintaining environmental noise levels compatible with land use. The Noise Element includes a noise/land use compatibility matrix that states that park land uses are clearly compatible with noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL. The Noise Element also includes the State of California Recommended Land Use Compatibility Standards included in Table 3-3. The exterior standard for open space is reiterated as 65 dBA CNEL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-3: STATE OF CALIFORNIA RECOMMENDED LAND USE COMPATIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Categories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Categories</strong></th>
<th><strong>Usages</strong></th>
<th><strong>CNEL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearly Compatible</strong></td>
<td>Ambient noise levels are not significant enough to require special construction and/or mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normally Compatible</strong></td>
<td>Most land uses will not be affected by ambient noise. Some form of design measures and/or mitigation may be required for noise sensitive land uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearly Incompatible</strong></td>
<td>Noise sensitive land uses should not be located in these areas unless mitigation is employed to reduce interior noise levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normally Incompatible</strong></td>
<td>Noise sensitive land uses should not be located in these areas due to excessive and continuous high ambient noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** City of Compton, Draft General Plan 2030, January 2011.

The City has adopted a noise ordinance to support the Noise Element. The Noise Ordinance states that it is the policy of the City to prohibit unnecessary, excessive and annoying noises from all sources subject to its police power. Relevant sections of the code refer to sensitive receptor exposure, operational noise, and construction activity. Section 7-12.9 (Schools, Hospitals and Churches) of the Ordinance states that it is unlawful for any person to create any noise on any street, sidewalk or public place adjacent to any school, institution of learning or church while the same is in use or adjacent to any hospital, which noise unreasonably interferes with the workings of such institution or which disturbs or unduly annoys patients in the hospital, provided conspicuous signs are displayed in such streets, sidewalk or public place indicating the presence of a school, church or hospital.

Section 7-12.11 (Machinery, Equipment, Fans and Air Conditioning) of the Ordinance states that it is unlawful for any person to operate any machinery, equipment, pump, fan, air conditioning apparatus or

---

similar mechanical device in any manner so as to create any noise which would cause the noise level at the property line of any property to exceed the ambient noise level by more than five decibels.

Section 7-12.22 (Construction or Repairing of Buildings, Pile Drivers, Hoists, and Steam Shovels) of the Ordinance states that no person shall cause or permit any work to be done or do any work on the erection (including excavation), or use any pile driver, steam shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, steam or electric hoist, unless the noise caused thereby is confined within a building, other than between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Saturday, except in cases of urgent necessity in the interest of public health and safety and then only with a permit from the Building Official. No such permit shall be granted for a period of more than three days, but may be renewed from time to time so long as the emergency exists.

**Sensitive Receptors**

Noise-sensitive land uses are locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could adversely affect the use of the land. Residences, schools, hospitals, guest lodging, libraries, and some passive recreation areas would each be considered noise-sensitive and may warrant unique measures for protection from intruding noise. Numerous sensitive receptors are located along Compton Creek. These include residences, schools (e.g., Compton High School), and parks (e.g., Raymond Street Park).

**Existing Ambient Noise Levels**

The existing noise environment of the project area is characterized by vehicular traffic and noises typical to a dense urban area (e.g., sirens, horns, helicopters, etc.). Sound measurements were taken using a SoundPro DL Sound Level Meter between 9:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. on October 26, 2010 to determine existing ambient daytime noise levels in the project vicinity. The existing ambient sound levels range between 52.0 and 56.4 dBA Leq.

**Construction Noise**

Construction activity would include the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. The Master Plan would be completed in following four separate phases:

- Phase #1: Reconnect and Restore (Years 1-2)
- Phase #2: Fill and Inform (Years 3-5)
- Phase #3: Connect and Extend (Years 10-15)
- Phase #4: Creek Zone Network (Years 15+)

Construction activities require the use of noise-generating equipment, such as trucks, loaders, and jackhammers. Typical noise levels from various types of equipment that may be used during construction are listed in Table 3-4. The table shows noise levels at distances of 50 and 100 feet from the construction noise source. Construction equipment typically generates a noise level with an Leq in the high 80s.
TABLE 3-4: MAXIMUM NOISE LEVELS OF COMMON CONSTRUCTION MACHINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Source</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>50 Feet</th>
<th>100 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Loader</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (derrick)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Hoe</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper/Grader</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Pile Driving</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger Drilling</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The City does not have specific limitation on construction noise levels. Instead, construction noise is regulated by limiting construction activity to the less noise sensitive daytime hours. The Noise Ordinance requires construction to be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Construction activity would occur within the time confines set forth within the Noise Ordinance and construction activity would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance. However, construction activity would increase noise levels at sensitive receptors, including residences and schools and, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to construction noise. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures N1 through N3 would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Operational Noise

The proposed project would generate operational noise associated with the multi-use trail, outdoor classrooms, and small parks. Operational activity would not include substantial sources of stationary noise and the proposed project would be consistent with Section 7-12.11 (Machinery, Equipment, Fans and Air Conditioning) of the Noise Ordinance. Users of the multi-use trail (e.g., bicyclists) and small parks would generate neighborhood-type noise levels that are compatible with the sensitive receptors located along Compton Creek. In addition, equestrian activity would not generate noise levels that are incompatible with residential and other sensitive land uses. Outdoor classrooms would be located adjacent to existing schools, and would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. Operational activity would not generate mechanical noise, and would be compatible with existing land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational noise.

Mitigation Measures

N1 The Applicant shall ensure that all construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

N2 The Applicant shall ensure that the construction contractor shall use quieter equipment as opposed to noisier equipment (such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment).

N3 The Applicant shall ensure that the construction contractor shall place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses.
b) Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. High levels of vibration may cause physical personal injury or damage to buildings. Groundborne vibration levels rarely affect human health. Instead, most people consider groundborne vibration to be an annoyance that may affect concentration or disturb sleep. In addition, high levels of groundborne vibration may damage fragile buildings or interfere with equipment that is highly sensitive to groundborne vibration (e.g., electron microscopes). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has indicated that non-engineered timber and masonry buildings can be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of 0.2 inches per second without experiencing structural damage.26

Construction

The operation of heavy-duty construction equipment (e.g., a large bulldozer) generates vibration levels of 0.089 inches per second at a distance of 25 feet.27 Construction activity would generally be at least 25 feet from heavy-duty construction equipment. The vibration exposure level at this distance would be 0.1 inches per second. This would be less than the 0.2 inches per second FTA limit for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction vibration.

Operations

The proposed project would not include significant sources of operational groundborne vibration. Operational ground-borne vibration in the project vicinity would be generated by vehicular travel on the local roadways. However, the FTA has stated that rubber-tired vehicles do not typically generate perceptible groundborne vibration. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to operational vibration.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would cause a substantial permanent (operational) increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question 3.12.a, the proposed project would not permanently increase ambient noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to a substantial permanent (operational) increase in noise levels.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would cause a substantial temporary (construction) increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. As discussed in Response to Checklist Question 3.12.a, the proposed project would not temporarily increase ambient noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to a substantial temporary (construction) increase in noise levels.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the vicinity of a public airport to excessive noise levels. A segment of the project site is located approximately 0.25 miles east of the Compton Airport. The Noise Element of the General Plan states that land uses designated as parks are clearly compatible with noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL.\(^{28}\) The project site is not located within the 65 dBA CNEL airport contour.\(^{29}\) The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to the operation of a public airport. Therefore, no impact related to public airport noise exposure would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**No Impact.** A significant impact could occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels. The project site is not located within at least five miles of a private airstrip. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to the operation of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact related to private airstrip noise exposure would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.


\(^{29}\)Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Compton Airport Influence Area*, May 13, 2003.
3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING (PH)

Would the project:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
  - No Impact
  - A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan induced substantial population growth that would not have, otherwise, occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The proposed project consists of the development of new park land and improved bikeways and equestrian paths, which does not typically induce substantial population growth. The Master Plan does not involve the construction of new residences and, consequently, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Therefore, no impact related to population growth would occur.
  - Mitigation Measures
    - None required.

- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
  - No Impact
  - A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan displaced a substantial quantity of existing residences. As stated above, the proposed project consists of the development of new park land and improved bikeways and equestrian paths. Figures 3-8, 3-9, and 3-10 show the parcels that could be impacted by the Master Plan. No housing would be displaced as a result of implementation of the Master Plan. Therefore, no impact related to housing displacement would occur.
  - Mitigation Measures
    - None required.

- Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
  - No Impact
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FIGURE 3-10
DISPLACED PARCELS BETWEEN ALONDRA AND ARTEZIA BOULEVARDS
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan displaced a substantial number of people. As stated above, the proposed project consists of developing new park land and improving bikeways and equestrian paths, primarily within the existing Compton Creek right-of-way. While there are whole and partial parcels that would be acquired for implementation of the Master Plan (Figures 3-8, 3-9, and 3-10), no housing units will be displaced. Therefore, no impact related to population displacement would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.
3.14 PUBLIC SERVICES (PS)

Would the project:

a) 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:

i) Fire protection?

□ □ ❑ □ □

ii) Police protection?

□ □ ❑ □ □

iii) Schools?

□ □ □ ❑ □

iv) Parks?

□ □ □ ❑ □

v) Other public facilities (including roads)?

□ □ □ ❑ □

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:

(i) Fire protection?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would necessitate a new or physically altered fire station. Fire services for the City are provided by the City of Compton Fire Department (CFD). The CFD has 84 sworn employees and five civilian employees. Its resources include four fire stations and nine front-line emergency vehicles comprised of four fire engines, one truck, two paramedic squads, and two basic life support transport ambulances. The stations located in the City include the following: Fire Station #1 located at 201 South Acacia Avenue 0.6 miles from Compton Creek; Fire Station #2 located at 1320 East Palmer Street two miles to Compton Creek; Fire Station #3 located at 1133 West Rosecrans Avenue 0.1 miles to Compton Creek; and Fire Station #4 located at 950 West Walnut Street 1.2 miles to Compton Creek (Figure 3-11).
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The CFD ranks among the five busiest departments in California, responding to an average of 10,000 emergency calls per year. Approximately 75 percent of the calls are for Emergency Medical Services. The CFD’s average response time is 4.5 minutes. The project area is located in an urbanized area and is not designated by the City of Compton General Plan as a high fire hazard area.

The Master Plan proposes to improve the visual character of Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. No new buildings or large structures are proposed a part of the Master Plan. In addition, the Master Plan would not directly generate population growth because it does not include any housing which typically increases the need for fire protection services. Nevertheless, mitigation is proposed to ensure that the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to fire protection. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS1 would further reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

PS1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for a project implemented as a part of the Master Plan, the final site plan and site circulation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Compton Fire Department to ensure conformity to their fire prevention and operational requirements.

(ii) Police protection?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation. Police protection services to the City are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD). A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in the LACSD not adequately being able to serve the proposed project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. The Compton Sheriff’s Station is located at 301 S. Willowbrook Avenue, approximately 0.5 miles from Compton Creek (Figure 3-11).

No new buildings are being proposed as a part of the Master Plan. In addition, the Master Plan would not directly generate population growth since it does not include any housing which typically increases the need for police protection. As specific projects are proposed as a part of the Master Plan they will be designed with bright, consistent lighting and motion-activated lights along paths and within parks as well as installing surveillance cameras and establishing security watch groups along Compton Creek. Nevertheless, mitigation is proposed to ensure that the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to police protection. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PS2 would further reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

PS2 Prior to the issuance of building permits for a project implemented as a part of the Master Plan, the final site plan and site circulation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department to ensure conformity to their crime prevention measures and operational requirements.

(iii) Schools?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that

---

would exceed the capacity of the Compton Unified School District (CUSD). The Compton Unified School District provides public education for grades K-12. The district is comprised of 24 elementary schools, eight middle schools, three high schools, one adult school, and five alternative learning schools. There are ten public schools that are located within one-quarter mile of Compton Creek (Figure 3-12). These schools include: Centennial High School, McNair Elementary School, Washington Elementary School, Davis Middle School, Tibby Elementary School, Laurel Elementary School, Compton High School, Kennedy Elementary School, and Compton Community College. The Master Plan would not directly generate population growth since it does not include any housing and, consequently, the proposed project would not generate new students and no additional schools would be required. However, one objective of the Master Plan is to connect Creek-adjacent schools to Compton Creek and to create a networked system of environmental learning through the establishment of outdoor classrooms with Creek-side adjacent schools. Therefore, beneficial impacts related to schools would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**iv) Parks?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exceeded the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project. The local park system is managed by the City of Compton Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR). Within the City of Compton, there is a deficiency of parks for the resident population per the City-specific standards. There are 20 parks within the City of Compton that comprise a total of 74.6 acres (Figure 3-13). With a population of 97,300 (2008 Census estimate), there currently exist approximately 0.77 acres of open space per 1,000 residents, far below the City preferred standard of two acres per 1,000 residents. In order to alleviate the park deficiency, the Master Plan intends to improve the area surrounding Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. It is expected that as a result of the implementation of the Master Plan, access to parks and open space would increase. This is consistent with the General Plan Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element Goal which is to “develop and maintain a balanced system of open space, public parks, and recreational facilities.”

According to the General Plan Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element, parks can be classified into three groups: mini parks, neighborhood parks, and community parks. A “Mini Park” includes parks up to one acre in size with a service radius of one-quarter-mile. Mini Parks include such standards as providing playgrounds, picnic areas, and passive areas. A “Neighborhood Park” includes parks that are 5-20 acres in size with a service radius of one-half-mile. Neighborhood Parks include such standards as providing playgrounds, picnic areas, and passive areas, with the choice of also providing restrooms and athletic facilities. A “Community Park” includes parks that are 20 to 40 acres in size with a service radius of two miles. Community Parks include such standards as providing playgrounds, picnic areas, passive areas, restrooms, and athletic facilities with the choice of also providing additional athletic facilities, a community center or swimming area.31

---
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Parks and Recreational Facilities

Parks Adjacent to Compton Creek
1. Gonzales Park & Recreational Facilities
2. Raymond Street Park
3. Oleander/Tichenor Pocket Park

Other Parks (Distance to Compton Creek)
4. Sibrie Park (0.19)
5. Fig/Oleander Park (0.71)
6. Oaks Park (1.66)
7. Lueders Park (1.98)
8. Burrell-MacDonald Park (1.52)
9. Tragniew Park (1.17)
10. 156th/Dwight Pocket Park (0.55)
11. Wilmington/Cypress Pocket Park (0.33)
12. Walter R. Tucker Park (0.12)
13. Compton/Culver Pocket Park (0.60)
14. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial (0.60)
15. Wilson Park (1.02)
16. Compton Par Three Golf Course (2.75)
17. Ellerman Park (0.18)
18. South Park (0.68)
19. Kelly Park (1.66)
20. Olympic Park (0.07)

The Master Plan identifies “Creek Systems” which are systematic improvements of typical spaces and urban types along Compton Creek. The Creek Systems identify various types of parks including parks, pocket parks, and street-end parks. Table 3-5 classifies the different categories of parks that are proposed as a part of the Master Plan and places them in the context of the General Plan Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element park classification system. The Creek Systems that are proposed as a part of the Master Plan are site-specific and are identified in Figures 2-4 through 2-6 in Section 2.0 Project Description.

A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan were to include substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand that exceeds the capacity or capability of the local park system to serve the proposed project necessitating new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. As previously mentioned, the Master Plan would not directly generate population growth since it does not include any housing. It is expected that as a result of the implementation of the Master Plan, access to parks and open space would actually increase. This is consistent with the General Plan Conservation/Open Space/Parks and Recreation Element Goal which is to “develop and maintain a balanced system of open space, public parks and recreational facilities.” Therefore, a beneficial impact related to parks would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

v) Other public facilities?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan were to include substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities (such as libraries, and other general public facilities), which exceed the capacity available to serve the project area, necessitating new or physically altered public facility, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. The Master Plan would not directly generate population growth since it does not include any housing. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to other public facilities.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
### TABLE 3-5: PARK CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan Creek System Classification</th>
<th>Purpose/Goals</th>
<th>Estimated Size</th>
<th>General Plan Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Parks** (4 Potential Locations)      | • Diversify the recreational activities supported by different areas within each park.  
• Integrate BMPs, nature gardens, and educational zones in the parks with Compton Creek.  
• Enhance trails on both sides of Compton Creek with richer plantings and other interesting features adjacent to the parks.  
• Distinguish specific places with landscape features targeted to children (i.e. groves, gardens, mounds).  
• Create amenities such as playgrounds and kiddie pools, that will benefit the entire City.  
• Establish community gardens to foster interaction amongst neighbors and to cultivate awareness of agricultural heritage.  
• Provide parks with unique identities through the installation of site specific and context responsive public art.  
• Provide visual and physical access to Creek bottom. | Less than 10 acres | Neighborhood Park |
| **Pocket Parks** (4 Potential Locations) | • Provide gateways to Compton Creek that provide an intimate connection between neighborhoods and Compton Creek.  
• Buffer against exotic plant species by planting self-propagating native riparian vegetation - seeds blown into the Creek flow downstream to establish new colonies in naturalized sections of Compton Creek.  
• Integrate bioswales and other BMPs that treat localized stormwater runoff into a demonstration garden in pocket parks.  
• Encourage community stewardship of the parks and involvement in creation and design.  
• Enrich the learning experience of Compton Creek by integrating signage into park features.  
• Establish a unique identity for the Compton Creek and enliven the park with public art.  
• Deter dumping not only through the design of anti-dumping features but by creating a place that encourages pedestrian traffic.  
• Construct park amenities that are less susceptible to vandalism and theft (i.e. fixed & consolidated amenities). | Less than 1 acre | Mini Park |
| **Street-End Parks** (24 Potential Locations) | • Highlight access to Compton Creek with neighborhood gateways located in the Street-End cul-de-sacs.  
• Supplement and reinforce the network of Street-End Parks with Green Streets that extend Creek presence into surrounding neighborhoods.  
• Enhance neighborhood character through involving the community in planning their Street-End parks.  
• Create a garden setting and raise awareness of the importance of improving the Compton Creek water quality with Street-End BMPs.  
• Create informal spaces that are adaptable to a variety of neighborhood activities.  
• Unify neighborhoods that are split by the Creek with bold visual connections. | Less than 1 acre | Mini Park |

**SOURCE:** Mia Lehrer & Associates, Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan, 2006.
3.15 RECREATION (RC)

Would the project:

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) **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.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused a substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The objective of the Master Plan is to improve the visual character of Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. As discussed above in Section 3.14(iv) Parks, implementation of the Master Plan would result in the development of four Neighborhood Parks, four Pocket Parks, and 28 Mini-Parks. It is expected that the Master Plan will provide a beneficial effect on recreation in the City by increasing access and availability to parks, open space, and recreational facilities. In addition, the Master Plan proposes to improve and rehabilitate existing park facilities by adding new amenities such as trash containers, drinking fountains, bike racks, playground and athletic facilities, benches, picnic areas, way-finding signs, and public restrooms. Implementation of the Master Plan would increase the use and availability of parks and other recreational facilities but would not result in the deterioration of any park or recreational facility. To the contrary, implementation of the Master Plan would provide a beneficial effect on recreational facilities by increasing access and availability of parks, open space and recreational facilities and providing new amenities to existing park facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

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.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan necessitated construction activities, which would adversely impact the environment, or require the expansion or development of parks or other recreational facilities. As discussed above, the objective of the Master Plan is to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. As such, the Master Plan includes new recreational facilities
that are described in Table 3-6 below. Section 3.14(iv) Parks discusses new park systems that are proposed as a part of the Master Plan.

**TABLE 3-6: PROPOSED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan Element</th>
<th>Description/Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Athletic Facility**                   | • Diversify the recreational activities supported by different areas within each park.  
                                           | • Athletic facilities include new baseball fields, basketball courts, soccer fields, or volleyball courts                                                                                                      |
| (4 Potential Locations)                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **Fitness Course**                      | • A linear fitness network and a series of recreational facilities. The linear fitness network consists of measured running loops and a unique course integrated with future and existing pocket parks, street-end parks, joint-use spaces, and parks. Recreational facilities, such as sports fields, are integrated into the system to create a diverse and multi-use set of facilities. |
| (Throughout the Project Area)          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **Enhanced Bike Paths**                 | • Extends network of safe routes (e.g. to the beach)  
                                           | • Enhances the quality, character, and function of the path.  
                                           | • Provides opportunity to introduce a continuous structural BMP along Compton Creek’s edge that serves to decrease direct run-off                                                                 |
| (2 Potential Locations)                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **Multi-Use Trails**                    | • Popularize horseback riding along Compton Creek and enhance the character of the City and the Creek Corridor.  
                                           | • Increase open space access to surrounding communities by improving regional connections to the Los Angeles River and other bikepaths.  
                                           | • Create a place that allows people to enjoy a unique opportunity take nature hikes in an urban area.  
                                           | • Construct a long, continuous, and safe route for pedestrians and equestrians that will encourage people to get out and exercise.  
                                           | • Trail-side plantings treat localized stormwater runoff, including water tainted by horse manure, and give the trails a distinctive naturalized character. |
| (Throughout the Project Area)          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **Enhanced Crossings**                  | • Creates continuous trail system with direct and safe crossings  
                                           | • Provides invaluable local transportation asset  
                                           | • Allows users to experience the continuity of Compton Creek  
                                           | • Improves trail system and usage of trail system by all user groups                                                                                                                                         |
| (3 Potential Locations)                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |

**SOURCE:** Mia Lehrer & Associates, *Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan*, 2006.

Implementation of the Master Plan would not necessitate or require the expansion or development of new recreational facilities. To the contrary, implementation of the Master Plan would actually increase access and availability of parks, open space and recreational facilities and would provide new recreation amenities such as athletic facilities, a fitness course and enhanced bike trails. Therefore, a beneficial impact related to recreational facilities would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.
3.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (TT)

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan increased traffic above the existing traffic load of the street system. The Master Plan does not propose uses that typically increase traffic loads. On the contrary, implementation of the Master Plan would encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, including walking, biking, and horseback riding. It would accomplish this by improving access to walkways, bike paths, and equestrian paths, creating new...
parks and pathways, enhancing existing ones, creating community gardens, and creating plazas and outdoor classrooms. Also, construction activities will take place within the Compton Creek right-of-way and would not disrupt mass transit. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing the performance of the circulation system.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan individually or cumulatively exceeded the service standards of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (Metro) Congestion Management Plan (CMP). The CMP is a State-mandated program designed to address the impact urban congestion has on local communities and the region as a whole. The CMP provides an analytical basis for the transportation decisions contained in the State Transportation Improvement Project (STIP). The CMP guidelines specify that all freeway segments where a project could add 150 or more trips in each direction during the peak hours be evaluated. The guidelines also require evaluation of all designated CMP roadway intersections where a project could add 50 or more trips during either peak hour. A substantial change in freeway conditions is defined as an increase or decrease of 0.10 in the demand to capacity ratio and a change in the Level of Service (LOS).

The Master Plan is not expected to increase peak hour trips over existing conditions, because it will not generate employment or housing. Implementation of the Master Plan will result in recreational and passive enjoyment of the Creek system by the surrounding neighborhoods. It is anticipated that most users of the amenities developed under the Master Plan would walk or bicycle to the project area. Therefore, the Master Plan peak hour traffic volume would not exceed 50 peak hour trips or 150 peak hour trips to a freeway segment. Consequently, the proposed project would not exceed CMP requirements for further study, and as such, would not exceed, or cumulatively contribute to, an exceedance of a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to a CMP.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan caused a change in air traffic patterns that would result in a substantial safety risk. At the closest point, Compton Creek is 0.25-miles east of the Compton Airport. The tallest features of the Master Plan would be new trees and lighting fixtures, but these would not be tall enough so as to require a change in air traffic patterns. Also, implementation of the Master Plan will not include uses that generate air traffic. Therefore, no impacts related to a change in air traffic patterns would occur.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan substantially increased an existing hazardous design feature or introduced incompatible uses to the existing traffic pattern. The Master Plan would create natural park land along Compton Creek, and would not modify the existing channel. The Master Plan would not introduce any design features or incompatible uses to the area that would affect the geometry of traffic lanes. Therefore, no impact related to increased hazards would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact after Mitigation Incorporated.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would not satisfy emergency access requirements of the Compton Fire Department or in any other way threaten the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project area or adjacent uses. The Compton Fire Department would need to review the Master Plan to ensure that required fire protection safety features, including adequate emergency access, are implemented.

In addition, construction related to the Master Plan may require street and sidewalk improvements. These sidewalk improvements could potentially affect access by emergency service providers. Therefore, without mitigation, the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to adequate emergency access. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure TT1 would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

**TT1** The Compton Fire Department shall review and provide recommendations to the City related to the Master Plan for adequate safety features and emergency access.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan conflicted with programs supporting alternative transportation. The Master Plan aims to emphasize a livable, walkable, urban community. In this way, the Master Plan would not conflict with, but actually encourage, alternative transportation through improved walking, biking, and equestrian pathways. Therefore, no impact related to adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would occur.

---

Mitigation Measures

None required.

g) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would result in an inadequate parking supply. Implementing the Master Plan would not be expected to increase parking demand within the project area. Many of the Master Plan’s elements are designed to encourage alternative transportation, such as walking, biking, and horseback riding. In addition, the street end parks and pocket parks in the Master Plan are designed to be used by the local residents and are not intended as destination uses and would not generate a parking demand greater than current uses. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to parking.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
3.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (US)

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**No Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan exceeded wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The City of Compton Public Works Department, in coordination with the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, maintains and operates the sewer system in the City in accordance with the requirements of the RWQCB. The City is served by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District Nos. 1, 2, and 8. Sewer lines are maintained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County operate ten water reclamation plants and one ocean discharge facility, the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). The closest plant to the City is the JWPCP located in the City of Carson. This wastewater treatment plant provides treatment for 350 million gallons of wastewater per day serving a population of approximately 3.5 million people. Currently, the JWPCP has a design capacity of 400 million gallons per day (mgd) and an average flow of 281 mgd. Wastewater treated at JWPCP is
disinfected and sent out into the Pacific Ocean through a network of ocean outfalls that extend two miles off the coast of the Palos Verdes Peninsula at a depth of 200 feet. This ocean outfall produces a safe dilution level in excess of 100 parts seawater to one part wastewater.33

The Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek and no new buildings or major structures are proposed. Consequently, implementation of the Master Plan would not result in an increase in wastewater discharge that could create unforeseen capacity concerns at the JWPCP. Therefore, no impact related to wastewater treatment would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project area would be exceeded. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide to improve Compton Creek with the creation of parks, pocket parks, community gardens, public art, landscaping, and trails. The Master Plan also identifies locations for potential components such as tree plantings; amenities such as trash receptacles and drinking fountains; and parks and programs such as playgrounds and athletic facilities. Implementation of the Master Plan would increase the use and availability of parks, open space, and landscape elements which would increase water demand. However, to reduce water demand the Master Plan outlines new planting requirements which use sustainable native plants. Once properly established, natural rainfall will sustain these native plantings, thus reducing long-term maintenance costs as well as water, nutrient, and pesticide usage. Also, plant acquisition and practices would have to conform to the standards outlined in the Los Angeles River Master Plan Landscaping Guidelines and Plant Palettes (January 2004). Lastly, the City participates with other communities in the Century and Rio Hondo Water Reclamation Projects which delivers 22,000 acre-feet of reclaimed water per year to the Los Angeles Central Basin; the Master Plan “encourages the use of reclaimed water for irrigation, centralized controllers, and subsurface irrigation.”34

As described above, water usage associated with the proposed project would be minimal and, therefore, no new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing treatment facilities would be required. Implementation of the Master Plan would include all necessary water pipe improvements and connections to adequately link the proposed project to the existing City water system. The design of these connections would be developed by a registered civil engineer and approved by the Department of Public Works. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

34Mia Lehrer & Associates, Compton Creek Regional Garden Park Master Plan, 2006.
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would increase surface water runoff, resulting in the need for expanded off-site stormwater drainage facilities. Under the proposed project, stormwater or any runoff irrigation waters would be directed into existing storm drains that receive surface water runoff under existing conditions. Implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase in pervious surfaces which will permit more percolation of water into the ground, and stormwater runoff would not increase. Consequently, alterations to existing drainage patterns within the site and surrounding area would not occur. In addition, as discussed above in Response to Checklist Question 3.9.a Hydrology and Water Quality, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of a NPDES Permit issued by the RWQCB and effectively capture, retain, and disperse stormwater runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to construction or expansion of stormwater treatment facilities.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan were to increase water consumption to such a degree that new water sources would need to be identified or that existing resources would be consumed at a greater pace than planned by purveyors, distributors, and service providers. The City is served by the CMWD, which derives its supply from local groundwater wells and imported water through the Metropolitan Water District. The City’s long-range water demand and availability program is expressed in the City of Compton Urban Water Management Plan, which addresses available supply and entitlements, and system infrastructure, on the basis of the General Plan buildout. Development consistent with the General Plan is taken into consideration in system planning. Since the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan’s designated land use and the entitled land use under the existing zoning, it is expected that sufficient water would be available to the CMWD, under existing entitlements, to serve the proposed project.

Water would be used in the short-term during construction for grading, dust suppression, the mixing and pouring of concrete, and other construction-related activities. Water usage for such purposes would be intermittent throughout construction and temporary in nature and would not exceed that of the completed development. As such, construction activities would require minimal water and demand is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on the available water supply or the existing water distribution system.

Implementation of the Master Plan would increase the use and availability of parks, open space, and landscape elements which would increase water demand. However, to reduce water demand the Master Plan outlines new planting requirements which use sustainable native plants. Once properly established, natural rainfall will sustain these native plantings, thus reducing long-term maintenance costs as well as water, nutrient, and pesticide usage. Also, plant acquisition and practices would have to conform to the standards outlined in the Los Angeles River Master Plan Landscaping Guidelines and Plant Palettes (January 2004). In addition, the City participates with other communities in the Century and Rio Hondo Water Reclamation Projects which delivers 22,000 acre-feet of reclaimed water per year to the Los Angeles Central Basin; the Master Plan “encourages the use of reclaimed water for irrigation, centralized
controllers, and subsurface irrigation.” 35 Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to water demand.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

e) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would increase wastewater generation to the degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. As described in Response to Checklist Question 3.17.a, the Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek and no new buildings or major structures are proposed which could result in an increase in wastewater generation. Therefore, no impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would occur.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

f) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan resulted in solid waste generation that exceeded the capacity of permitted landfills. The Solid Waste Management Department of the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (SWMD) operates three county landfills: Calabasas, Puente Hills and Scholl Canyon. In addition, the SWMD operates three regional Materials Recovery and Transfer stations and a recycling center. The Puente Hills landfill located at 2800 South Workman Mill Road, Whittier, California is the closest open landfill to the City.

The total remaining permitted inert waste capacity in Los Angeles County is estimated to be approximately 69.94 million tons, a capacity that could be exhausted in approximately 60 years. Since there is no anticipated shortfall in disposal capacity for inert waste within the County, any construction related activities that could occur as a result of the Master Plan would have a less-than-significant impact on solid waste disposal. The amount of project-related waste disposed of at area landfills would be reduced through recycling and waste diversion programs.

As previously mentioned, the Master Plan proposes to improve Compton Creek and no new buildings or major structures are proposed which would result in additional solid waste on-site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to landfill capacity.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.

---

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan were in non-compliance with any federal, State, or local statutes related to solid waste. Solid waste management is guided by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 that emphasizes resource conservation through reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste. The Act requires that localities conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study (SWGS) and develop a Source Reduction Recycling Element (SRRE). The solid waste generated during the construction and operation of the Master Plan would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and conservation measures regarding solid waste. The landfills which would serve the proposed project would have the capacity to accept the amount of non-recyclable solid waste that is generated by the proposed project both during construction and operation. Therefore, no impact related to solid waste services would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Does the project:

a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ✓
   - No Impact: ☐

b) Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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) Have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

   - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: ☐
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact: ☐
   - No Impact: ✓

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan would degrade the quality of the environment, natural habitat or eliminate important examples of California history. The preceding analyses concluded that no significant unmitigated impacts to the environment would occur. Based on these findings, the proposed Master Plan is not expected to degrade the quality of the environment. Rather, implementation of the Master Plan would provide many benefits to the area, including improved riparian habitat quality and quantity, improved water quality, creation of adjacent open spaces, and development that enhances the natural qualities of Compton Creek, increased and improved open space and recreation opportunities, as well as improved pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian access and safety. Implementation of the Master Plan would likely benefit fish and wildlife and incrementally reverse the overall cumulative effects that have previously occurred along Compton Creek. Furthermore, as discussed in Response to Checklist Question 3.5.b, potential impacts to archeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to degradation of natural habitat and California history.
Mitigation Measures

None required.

b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan, in conjunction with the related projects, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but significant when viewed together. Although related projects may be constructed in the project vicinity, the cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would contribute would be less than significant as all potential impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the previous sections. None of these potential impacts are considered cumulatively considerable, and implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this initial study would ensure that no cumulative impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulatively considerable impacts.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Master Plan has the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the Master Plan have been identified, and mitigation measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures, the Master Plan would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore no impact related to substantial adverse effects on human beings would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None required.
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