

1. Executive Summary

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the adoption, construction, and operation of the proposed John S. Gibson Truck & Chassis Parking Lot Project (Project). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with State and City of Los Angeles environmental policy guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Specifically, this Executive Summary has been prepared in accordance with Section 15123(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which states that an EIR should contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences and should identify: (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public; and (3) issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. Throughout this Executive Summary, references are made to various chapters and sections of this EIR where detailed information and analysis can be reviewed.

This EIR will be used to inform decision-makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives. The EIR is being circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for at least 45 days in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and Section 15105. During the public review period, the EIR will be available for public review at the Port of Los Angeles' website: (<https://www.portoflosangeles.org/ceqa>) or physically by appointment request to ceqacomment@portla.org at the following location:

Los Angeles Harbor Department
Environmental Management Division
425 S. Palos Verdes Street
San Pedro, California 90731

Written comments related to environmental issues in the EIR should be addressed to:

Director of Environmental Management
Los Angeles Harbor Department
425 S. Palos Verdes Street
San Pedro, California 90731
Email: ceqacomment@portla.org

The email subject line should be titled "John S. Gibson Truck & Chassis Parking Lot Parking".

A Notice of Availability of the EIR was published concurrently with distribution of this document. After public review of the Draft EIR and public comment, a Final EIR will be prepared, including responses to comments on the Draft EIR.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project site is located at 1599 John S. Gibson Boulevard in the community of San Pedro in the southwestern portion of the City of Los Angeles. The Project site encompasses approximately 18.63 acres and is bounded by Interstate 110 (I-110) to the north and west, John S. Gibson Boulevard to the east, and existing container terminals, a commercial office building (2001 John S. Gibson Boulevard #1), and the Harbor Community Police Station (2175 John S. Gibson Boulevard) to the south. The Project site is identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 7440-016-001, 7440-016-002, 7440-016-003, and 7412-024-007. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Long Beach Freeway (I-710), located 4.3 miles to the east, I-110, adjacent to the west boundary of the site, and San Diego Freeway (I-405) approximately 6.0 miles north. Local access to the site is provided from John S. Gibson Boulevard. The Project site and surrounding area are shown in Figure 3-1, *Regional Location*, and Figure 3-2, *Local Vicinity*.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Applicant for the Proposed Project is requesting approval from the City of Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) to develop the 18.63-acre site with a short-term truck and chassis parking facility and related site improvements. The Proposed Project includes paving of approximately 405,602 square feet (SF) of the site and striping of 393 truck and chassis stalls. The Proposed Project would be implemented in one development phase. See Figure 3-5, *Conceptual Site Plan*. The Project Applicant is requesting a Coastal Development Permit and a Port Master Plan (PMP) Amendment from LAHD (Lead Agency) to change the designation of three parcels within the Project site from Open Space to Maritime Support. In addition, the Proposed Project would require a Coastal Development Permit and additional ministerial permits from the City of Los Angeles.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The John S. Gibson Truck & Chassis Parking Lot Project site plan has been designed to meet a series of Project-specific objectives to aid decisionmakers in their review of the Proposed Project and its associated potential environmental impacts. The Project objectives are designed to ensure the Proposed Project provides a quality development. The Project objectives have been refined throughout the planning and design process for the Proposed Project, and are listed below:

- Increase the efficiency of goods movement in the POLA by providing off-terminal maritime support to help meet the demands of current and anticipated containerized cargo from the various San Pedro Bay port marine terminals;
- Provide a facility that increases the efficiency of terminal operations by providing storage and staging of trucks and chassis in the POLA;
- Provide a facility that alleviates truck traffic congestion and illegal parking by providing trailer parking; and
- To develop an underutilized property located in the vicinity of the I-110 with access to available infrastructure, including roads and utilities to accommodate the growing need for goods movement within Southern California.

1.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 7.0, *Alternatives*, of this EIR analyzes a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project, which are summarized as follows.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative consists of the Proposed Project not being approved, and the Project site remaining undeveloped.

Alternative 2: No Project/Buildout of Port of Los Angeles Master Plan Designation Alternative. This alternative consists of the Project not being approved, and the Project site being fully developed based on the existing POLA Port Master Plan (PMP) Land Use designation of Open Space with the exception of APN 7440-016-001. This alternative would result in 13.25 acres of open space and would leave APN 7440-016-001 in its existing undeveloped condition. Areas planned for physical development on and off site would be less than those required for development of the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative. This alternative consists of development of the Project site in a manner similar to the Proposed Project, but with less paved acreage and parking spaces and reduced operational intensity. This alternative would develop 10 acres of the Project site with 196 parking spaces accommodating trucks and chassis with shipping containers up to 40 feet long. This alternative would require the same number of employees on site and same on-site operational equipment as the Proposed Project, but a reduced number of truck trips per day. The reduced development acreage would result in the remaining

8.63 acres of the Project site to remain in its existing vacant and undeveloped condition. This alternative would still require a PMP Amendment to amend the designation of the 10 acres being developed from Open Space to Maritime Support; however, this alternative would not require a Coastal Development Permit from the City of Los Angeles as no development would occur within the City of Los Angeles parcel.

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2), the EIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. Prior to preparation of the Draft EIR, a public scoping meeting was held on November 14, 2023, to determine the concerns of responsible and trustee agencies and the community regarding the Proposed Project. The scoping meeting was held virtually, and no oral comments were provided. In addition, Notice of Preparation (NOP) comment letters received during the review period are summarized in Chapter 2, *Introduction* (see Table 2-2, *Summary of NOP/IS Comment Letters*).

1.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

1.6.1 Impacts Considered in the EIR

Based on the NOP/IS prepared for the Proposed Project (Appendix A of this EIR), the following issues were determined to be potentially significant and are therefore evaluated in this EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Transportation

Chapter 5, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR evaluates the above topic areas.

1.6.2 Impacts Not Considered in the EIR

The scope of this EIR was established in the NOP/IS issued by LAHD on October 26, 2023 (Appendix A), and considers the comments submitted on the NOP/IS by agencies, organizations, and the public. The NOP/IS determined that certain topics would be excluded from the EIR because no potentially significant impacts would occur associated with these topics. Accordingly, this EIR does not analyze Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

1.6.3 Impacts of the Proposed Project

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of this EIR's environmental analysis. The level of significance of impacts after the proposed mitigation measures are applied are identified as significant and unavoidable, less-than-significant, or no impact. Relevant standard conditions of approval and regulatory requirements are identified, and mitigation measures are provided for all potentially significant impacts.

Unavoidable Significant Impacts

This EIR has determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

Summary of Significant Impacts that Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

This EIR has determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level related to:

- **Biological Resources (IMPACT BIO-1):** No animal species listed as State and/or federal Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate were detected on the Project site during the reconnaissance surveys. Southern California legless lizard and California overwintering populations of monarch butterfly have a low potential to occur on site. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project has the potential to impact these species. However, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (Pre-Construction Survey and Biological Monitoring) would require a pre-construction survey and biological monitoring during initial site preparation and grading. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (Pre-Construction Survey and Biological Monitoring), construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any animal species identified as a threatened, endangered, or candidate species in local or regional plans, policies, regulation or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- **Biological Resources (IMPACT BIO-4):** The Project site contains shrubs and trees that can support nesting birds and raptors protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code during the nesting season. Therefore, if vegetation is required to be removed during nesting bird season, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Nesting Bird Survey) has been included to require a nesting bird survey to be conducted three days prior to initiating vegetation clearing. If an active nest is observed, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Nesting Bird Survey) requires buffering and other adaptive mitigation techniques deemed necessary by a qualified biologist to ensure that impacts to nesting birds are avoided until the nest is no longer active. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Nesting Bird Survey), impacts related to nesting birds and any other migratory wildlife would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Cultural Resources (IMPACT CUL-2):** The Proposed Project includes excavation and grading of the Project site to depths of approximately 15 feet below the ground surface (Appendix F). Although the Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix D) determined that no significant subsurface intact resources exist, there is a potential for previously unknown archaeological resources to be below the soil surface. The potential exists that grading of the site could encounter archaeologic deposits not encountered during testing. Therefore, monitoring during ground-disturbing activities, such as grading or trenching, by a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative is included as Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan) to ensure that if buried archaeologic deposits are unearthed, they will be handled in a timely and proper manner. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan), potential impacts to archaeological resources from construction of the Proposed Project would be less-than-significant.
- **Geology & Soils (IMPACT PAL-1):** Project earthmoving activities would have the potential to disturb previously unknown paleontological resources. The majority of the Project site is overlain by non-marine terrace deposits which have a low paleontological sensitivity. However, the Paleontological Assessment (Appendix E) states that the resources have been previously found on site and within the Project vicinity and that the Project site is underlain by late to middle Pleistocene-aged shallow marine deposits, which have been recorded to be fossiliferous. Therefore, the Palos Verdes Sands on site have a high potential to yield paleontological resources. Although unique paleontological resources are not anticipated to be found within the soils on site, Mitigation Measure PAL-1 (Paleontological Monitoring) is included to require preparation of a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) and that ground disturbing activities be monitored by a qualified paleontologist to identify, salvage, and recover any potential paleontological resources, such as significant fossil remains. With implementation of Mitigation Measure PAL-1 (Paleontological Monitoring), potential impacts to paleontological resources from implementation of the Proposed Project would be less-than-significant.

Summary of Less-than-Significant Impacts

The EIR determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the issues of:

- **Aesthetics:** Substantially degrading the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings; conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
- **Air Quality:** Emissions that exceed a South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) threshold of significance in Tables 5.2-4 or 5.2-5; ambient air pollutant concentrations that exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards or California Ambient Air Quality Standards or exceed an SCAQMD localized significance thresholds (LST) emissions threshold; exposure of sensitive receptors to significant levels of toxic air contaminants per SCAQMD thresholds; conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.
- **Biological Resources:** Substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); Substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- **Cultural Resources:** Impacts on built environmental historic resources; disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
- **Energy:** Result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Proposed Project construction or operation; conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
- **Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions:** Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly that would exceed the SCAQMD 10,000 metric tons per year carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) threshold; conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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; located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- **Land Use and Planning:** 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.
- **Noise:** Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- **Transportation:** Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance

Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
5.1 Aesthetics			
Impact AE-3: In non-urbanized areas, would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points). If the Project is in an urbanized area, would the Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
5.2 Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact AQ-2: Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact AQ-3: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the Project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
5.3 Biological Resources			
IMPACT BIO-1: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Pre-Construction Survey and Biological Monitoring.	Less-than-significant
IMPACT BIO-2: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact

Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
IMPACT BIO-3: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
IMPACT BIO-4: Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Nesting Bird Survey.	Less-than-significant
IMPACT BIO-5: Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Pre-Construction Survey and Biological Monitoring and Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Nesting Bird Survey.	Less-than-significant
5.4 Cultural Resources			
Impact CUL-1: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact CUL-2: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan.	Less-than-significant
Impact CUL-3: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan.	Less-than-significant
5.5 Energy			
Impact E-1: Would the Project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact E-2: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant

Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
5.6 Geology and Soils			
Impact PAL-1: Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure PAL-1: Paleontological Monitoring.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure PAL-1: Paleontological Monitoring.	Less-than-significant
5.7 Greenhouse Gases			
Impact GHG-1: Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, in a way that would have a significant impact on the environment?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact GHG-2: Would the Project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
IMPACT HAZ-1: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
IMPACT HAZ-2: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
IMPACT HAZ-4: Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 that could cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
5.9 Land Use and Planning			
Impact LU-2: Would the Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant

Impact	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
5.10 Noise			
Impact NOI-1: Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact NOI-2: Would the Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
5.11 Transportation			
Impact TR-1: Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Impact TR-3: Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant
Cumulative	Less-than-significant	No mitigation is required.	Less-than-significant

1.6.4 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be required for the Proposed Project:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Pre-Construction Survey and Biological Monitoring. To avoid impacts to special-status animal species, the Applicant must conduct pre-construction biological surveys prior to initiating vegetation removal/clearing. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days of vegetation removal. Should the qualified biologist find any special-status species, they shall be relocated to nearby open space (i.e., Palos Verdes peninsula) or shall be allowed to leave the site on their own. In addition, the qualified biologist shall be present for initial site preparation and grading to ensure that special-status animal species do not repopulate the site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Nesting Bird Survey. Vegetation removal should occur outside of the nesting bird season (generally between February 1 and September 15). If vegetation removal is required during the nesting bird season, the Applicant must conduct take avoidance surveys for nesting birds prior to initiating vegetation removal/clearing. Surveys will be conducted by a qualified biologist(s) within three days of vegetation removal. If active nests are observed, a qualified biologist will determine appropriate minimum disturbance buffers and other adaptive mitigation techniques (e.g., biological monitoring of active nests during construction-related activities, staggered schedules, etc.) to ensure that impacts to nesting birds are avoided until the nest is no longer active. At a minimum, construction activities will stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nests. For raptor species, the buffer is to be expanded to 500 feet. The approved buffer zone shall be marked in the field with construction fencing, within which no vegetation clearing or ground disturbance shall commence until the qualified biologist verifies that the nests are no longer occupied, and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities may occur.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan for the Proposed Project shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Planning Department. This plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions:

- Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall provide written verification to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department in the form of a letter from the qualified archaeologist to the lead agency stating that a qualified archaeologist has been retained to implement the monitoring program.
- If required by Native American consultation, the Project Applicant shall provide Native American monitoring during grading. The Native American monitor shall work in concert with the archaeological monitor to observe ground disturbances and search for cultural materials.
- The certified archaeologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.
- During ground disturbing activity of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor shall be on-site, to perform full-time inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend upon the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to modify the monitoring program if the potential for cultural resources appears to be less than anticipated.
- Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and collected, as determined by the qualified archaeologist, so the monitored grading can proceed.
- In the event that previously unidentified intact cultural resources are discovered, the qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of the discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The

qualified archaeologist shall contact the lead agency at the time of discovery. The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The lead agency must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist and approved by the lead agency before being carried out using professional archaeological methods. If any human bones are discovered, the county coroner and lead agency shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the most likely descendant, as identified by the NAHC, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

- Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered, and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The qualified archaeologist shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.
- All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
- A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the lead agency prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.
- A monitoring report shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist upon completion of grading and submitted prior to the issuance of any building permit(s).

MM PAL-1: Paleontological Monitoring. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall provide a letter to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, or designee, from a professional paleontologist, stating that a qualified paleontologist (who meets the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's (SVP, 2010) definition for qualified profession paleontologist) has been retained to provide services for the Project. The paleontologist shall develop a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP), consistent with the provisions of CEQA, LAHD Guidelines, and SVP Guidelines, to mitigate the potential impacts to unknown buried paleontological resources that may exist onsite. The PRIMP shall be provided to the City for review and approval. The PRIMP shall require that the paleontologist be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance and provide worker training regarding paleontological monitoring. The PRIMP shall also require full-time paleontological monitoring by a qualified paleontological monitor starting at the ground surface (below any disturbed/artificial fill deposits) during grading, excavation, or utility trenching activities.

In the event paleontological resources are encountered, ground disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area shall cease. The paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered pursuant to the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP, 2010).

Criteria for discarding specific fossil specimens shall be made explicit in the PRIMP. If the qualified paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by Project construction, then recovery techniques may be applied as identified within the PRIMP. Actions include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction, monitoring construction activities and halting construction if significant fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging specimens for curation and research purposes. Recovery, salvage, and treatment shall be done at the Applicant's expense. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the paleontologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The paleontologist shall have a repository agreement

in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource. If no institution accepts the fossil(s), they shall be donated to a local school in the area for educational purposes. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository and/or school. A report documenting the results of the monitoring, including any salvage activities and the significance of any fossils, will be prepared and submitted to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, or designee.

Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, or designee, shall verify that all Project grading and construction plans specify the requirements herein related to the PRIMP and the unanticipated discovery of paleontological resources.

1.7 REFERENCES

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP). (2010). *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*. Retrieved October 28, 2024, from https://vertpaleo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SVP_Impact_Mitigation_Guidelines-1.pdf