

## ATTACHMENT A

### DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ARROYO SECO BIKEWAY

##### I. AESTHETICS - Would the proposal:

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

**No impact.** The proposed project is not within proximity of any scenic vistas.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project does not involve any scenic resources or any State scenic highway.

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

**Less than significant impact.** The proposed project consists of constructing a bikeway along the Arroyo Seco Channel. The construction will require removal of some trees and paving the bike path. The proposed bike path will be constructed through the tunnel crossing under the Metro Gold Line. This will slightly alter the general view of the area but not significantly. Therefore, the proposed project impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings will be less than significant.

- 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.** The City of Los Angeles is proposing to improve an existing industrial park along the trail located between Pasadena Avenue and Avenue 26. The improvement will also involve installing a lighting system along this portion of the trail. This will illuminate the project area; however, it is not expected to adversely affect day or nighttime views in the vicinity due to a lack of residences and the presence of the adjacent freeway.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the proposal:**

- 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 nonagricultural use?***

**No impact.** The proposed project is located along the Arroyo Seco Channel, and the surroundings consist of developed commercial and residential areas. The project location is not used for agricultural purposes or as a farmland. Thus, the project will have no impact on farmland.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use and will have no impact.

- c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY - Would the proposal:**

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

**No impact.** Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- b) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

**Less than significant impact.** Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities would be restricted to the construction times allowed by the City of Los Angeles, except during emergency situations. Thus, the impacts would be temporary and can be considered less than significant.

- 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)?***

**No impact.** The emissions generated as a result of the proposed project will occur only during construction. These emissions would be temporary and are not expected to result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with Federal and State emission control regulations. Therefore, the proposed project construction will not lead to emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.

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

**Less than significant impact.** Sensitive receptors in the area may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emissions during the project construction. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations. The impact is considered to be less than significant since exposure would be temporary and precautions will be taken to mitigate exposure of pollutants.

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

**Less than significant impact.** Objectionable odors may be generated by diesel trucks used for the construction of the project. These types of odors will be short-term and temporary. Therefore, the impact of creating objectionable odors is considered less than significant.

#### IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:**

- 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?***

**No impact.** No sensitive or special status species, or any species identified as a candidate in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

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

**No impact.** The project would be constructed mostly within the concrete-lined channel of an existing flood control channel. Therefore, no impacts to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community would occur.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

- 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?***

**No impact.** There are no migratory wildlife corridors located at the proposed project location. Moreover, the channel is lined with concrete and is not a watercourse of any fish habitat. Therefore, there will be no impact on resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

**Less than significant impact.** No known locally-protected biological resources exist at the project site except for oak trees. The current alignment requires removal of about 75 oak trees and 57 nonoak trees for the construction of the bikeway, invert access ramps, and the tunnel crossing. Prior to construction, an oak tree permit will be obtained from the City of Los Angeles. All conditions set forth in the oak tree permit will be included in the proposed project specifications for contractor's bid. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources is considered less than significant.

- 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.** No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:**

**a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?***

**Less than significant.** The proposed project involves the construction of a bike path in the Arroyo Seco Flood Control Channel. The Channel, built prior to 1957, has been recorded and evaluated as historically significant based on its association with an important series of events in the history of water conservation and flood control in the Los Angeles Basin. The Historic Property Survey Report, prepared for the proposed Arroyo Seco Bike Path project, identified four character-defining features in the vicinity of the proposed project.

The four character-defining features that have been identified for the Channel are the sinuous path, a low-flow drain, concrete construction, and nine associated bridges. The Historic Property Survey Report concluded that the proposed project will not disrupt any of the character-defining features. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed bike path to the character-defining features of the Arroyo Seco Flood Control Channel are less than significant pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines.

**b-d) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature, or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

**No impact.** The project area is comprised of both developed and undeveloped parcels. The developed portions consist of the Channel itself, structures, and pavement while the undeveloped portions are primarily limited to the Channel embankments. An intensive field survey of the undeveloped portions of the project area failed to identify any surface evidence of archaeological resources.

Accordingly, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines. However, since much of the project area will be subject to demolition, grading, and extensive excavation, there exists the potential for disturbance of buried archaeological components. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered as a result of construction activity, work shall be halted until the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the proposal:

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.*

**No impact.** There are no known active faults underlying the project site, and we do not anticipate a fault rupture occurring at the project site.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**No impact.** The proposed project requires excavation and grading of soil. However, the project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquakes and, therefore, the project activities are not associated with factors that are known to trigger a strong seismic ground shaking.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

**No impact.** The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction or identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

iv) *Landslides?*

**No impact.** The project location is in a residential and commercial area, consisting of relatively flat terrain; it does not contain any geologic features (i.e., hills or mountains), which may adversely cause landslides. Therefore, the project will have no impact on landslides.

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

**Less than significant impact.** Construction of the proposed project would result in the disruption, displacement, and compaction of soil. Project specifications will require the contractor to properly control erosion as well as compact dirt and dispose of any excess excavated materials. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project to the loss of the soil or erosion would be considered less than significant.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project site is not known to be on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. Thus, the project will have no impact on unstable soil or a geologic unit.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

- 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?***

**No impact.** There are no septic tanks or sewer pipes at the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems.

VII. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the proposal:**

- 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.** The proposed project consists of constructing a tunnel, which requires excavation and grading of soil at various locations. Soil contamination has been detected with Tetrachloroethene (PCE) in the soil on the private property located between Pasadena Avenue and the Pasadena Gold Line. Prior to the construction of this portion of the project, the site contamination is expected to be remediated by the present property owner. If any contamination is encountered after the property is acquired, project specifications will require the contractor to properly treat or dispose of any contaminated soil material off-site. Therefore, the impact of creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routing transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

- b-c) *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 or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

**Less than significant impact.** Combustion engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in hazardous emissions or a hazardous substance spillage, thus the project impact on the public or environment is considered to be less than significant.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on hazardous materials.

- 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.** The proposed project is not located within an airport land or within two miles of a public use airport. The proposed project will have no impact on safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

**No impact.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact relating to airstrip safety for people residing or working in the project area.



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

**No impact.** The project site is located off of public roads and the proposed construction will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

**No impact.** The proposed project site is not located within wildlands. The bike path is proposed along the Arroyo Seco Channel. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk involving wildland fires.

#### **VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the proposal:**

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

**Less than significant impact.** The proposed project involves constructing a bikeway, a portion to be within the channel and an invert access ramp. Proper measures will be taken to ensure that the project does not discharge debris into the channel area during construction. Moreover, the proposed project will be constructed in the dry season when there is little or no water in the channel. The contractor is required to implement Best Management Practices (BMP) as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to minimize construction impacts on water quality. Upon project completion, Public Works will conduct routine maintenance along the bikeway. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact on hydrology or water quality.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table. Thus, no impacts to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge are expected to occur.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in changes to existing drainage patterns of the project site. Thus, no erosion or siltation impacts are expected to occur.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in changes to existing drainage patterns of the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the rate or amount of surface runoff.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The construction of the project will not result in additional surface water runoff. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

**Less than significant impact.** During a groundwater sampling completed in September 2000, Tetrachloroethene (PCE) was detected in the monitoring wells located both on-site and off-site of the project area, including 3505 Pasadena Avenue, former Welch's Uniform Facility. This property, Parcel No. 5205 004 010, is located between Pasadena Avenue and the Pasadena Gold Line. Environmental investigation is ongoing and is regulated by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). The LARWQCB has determined that the soil and groundwater contaminated plumes have not been fully delineated. Additional subsurface investigations will be conducted in order to determine the extent of the contamination of the area. Based upon the results of the investigation, the bikeway will not extend into Parcel No. 5205 004 010 if the contaminated project area is not treated or remediated. Therefore, the proposed project impact will be considered less than significant.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood, which would impede or redirect flood flows. Though part of the Arroyo Seco Channel will be used for the bike path, it will not add any impedance or redirect flood flow in the Channel.

- 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.** Though part of the Arroyo Seco Channel will be used for the bike path, the proposed project will not expose people or structure to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The bikeway will be closed and off limits when it rains. A retaining wall will be constructed alongside the portion of the bike path that will be constructed on the levee to ensure stability. Therefore, the proposed project's impact will be considered less than significant.

- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

**No impact.** The proposed project will not cause any inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:**

- a) *Physically divide an established community?***

**No impact.** The project would not introduce a barrier, which would divide the physical arrangement of the established business community.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not change the designation or zoning of the project area. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project does not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. **MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:**

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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not deplete any mineral resource and would, therefore, have no impact on mineral resources.

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

**No impact.** The project site is not identified as a resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. **NOISE - Would the proposal result in:**

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

**Less than significant impact.** Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction activities. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County and the City of Los Angeles noise control ordinances. Overall, since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels; thus, the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

- b) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

**Less than significant impact.** Construction of the proposed project would require the use of equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise vibration. However, the project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project would be considered less than significant since construction would be for a short period and would not expose people to long-term excessive noise levels.

- c-d) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**Less than significant impact.** The proposed project would not result in any permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, the project vicinity could be subject to a minor increase in noise levels during construction. The periodic increase in the noise level due to trucks hauling debris will be infrequent and the impact is considered less than significant.

- e-f) ***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 or 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.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airport land or a private airstrip.

## XII. **POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the proposal:**

- a) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

**No impact.** The proposed project will not induce population growth. The proposed project will provide alternative route to the area but will not induce population growth. The surrounding area is developed already and the bikeway is not expected to alter the growth rate of the human population.

- b-c) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No impact.** The proposed project will not displace existing houses nor displace people, which may create a demand for housing. The proposed project would have a beneficial impact for the area by providing an alternative path to the communities on the north and south side of the Arroyo Seco Channel.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the proposal:**

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

**No impact.** The project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Existing services for the area will be sufficient. However, the County will coordinate with the police and fire departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays. Thus, the project will have no impact on these services.

**XIV. RECREATION - Would the proposal:**

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**Less than significant impact.** While the proposed project will provide more convenient access, it is not expected to significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood (Arroyo Seco Park and Sycamore Grove Park) or regional (Earnest E. Debs Park and Elysian Park) parks in the area.

- 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?***

**No impact.** The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the proposal:**

- a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

**Less than significant impact.** The proposed project may require disposal of excess material and transportation of construction equipment to the project site. This could minimally increase the existing traffic in the surrounding area. However, this impact is only during construction and, therefore, is temporary and short-lived.

- b) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing level of service.

- 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.** The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- 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.** The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazards. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hazards due to design features.

- e) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

**No impact.** The proposed project site is outside the public street right of way and no road closures or detours are anticipated during construction. Emergency access on the streets around the project site will be maintained at all times. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on emergency access.

- f) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

**No impact.** The proposed project site is off the public street right of way and will not result in inadequate parking capacity. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact to parking.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

**No impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the proposal:**

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

**No impact.** The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**No impact.** Though some portions of the bikeway will be within the channel, the proposed project will not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

- 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?***



**No impact.** No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

- f-g) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**Less than significant impact.** Construction of the proposed project will result in excess materials and construction debris. Any solid waste generated will be disposed of by the contractor in accordance to all Federal, State, and local regulations relating to solid waste. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on Federal, State, and local solid waste statutes or regulations is considered less than significant.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the proposal:**

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

**No impact.** Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the quality of the environment.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

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

**No impact.** The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

SM:yr

P:\PDPUB\TEMP\EP&A\EU\PROJECTS\ARROYO SECO BIKEWAY\ND\DISCUSSION.DOC