

- 12-2 The commenter suggests design modifications, which are not based on the need to mitigate identified project impacts. Since the purpose of this document is to address the potential environmental effects of the project, responses are not provided herein to comments on the project, or its design, as part of the MND. Project and design comments, questions and suggestions will be addressed outside the environmental process as part of the Board's project consideration. Any design comments, questions and suggestions included in the comment letter are hereby transmitted to the MRCA Board for their consideration.

Please also see Letter 4 from Oliver DelGado, Field Deputy, Office of Councilmember Eirc Garcetti, which represents that the Rosanna Street Neighborhood Alliance has "signed off" on the Rosanna entrance, whether for emergencies or public access.

- 12-3 See Response to Comment 12-2.

CEQA provides for three types of environmental documents for projects requiring a discretionary approval: Exemptions, Negative Declarations and Environmental Impact Reports. [See CEQA Guidelines Section 15002 (k)]. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the MRCA conducted an Initial Study to determine the appropriate environmental document for the project. (See determination on MND page 13). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, the MRCA determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration was the appropriate environmental document because, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by the MRCA (i.e. either design modifications or mitigation measures have been included) which avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur.

- 12-4 The writer provides no facts or reasonable assumptions predicated on facts to support the assumption that the location of parking for the park, at the end of Rosanna Street, will result in additional crime. The letter does not cite any studies, does not establish the writer's credentials, and does not cite any data to support the writer's opinions. Similarly there are no facts or reasonable assumptions predicated on facts provided for the assertion that more police presence will be needed and more street lighting will be needed. Park gates will be locked at night, except during special events. The RSNA has two options for seeking assistance in enforcing City of Los Angeles and MRCA park-related laws and rules:

MRCA Rangers and the LAPD. As explained in Checklist Judgment XII(a):

Section 3.15 of the MRCA's *Ordinance Establishing Park Rules and Regulations and Prescribing The Punishment For Violation Thereof* addresses disruptive conduct, including noise. It states: "No person shall willfully disturb another person by loud and unreasonable noise, or any other activity which maliciously and willfully disturbs the peace of another person. Violation of this section is punishable pursuant to § 5.0(a) and §6.2.1(b)(2)." Section 5.0(a) of the Ordinance provides that: "(a) Unless otherwise specified, any violation of any provision of this Ordinance shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a maximum fine of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), or imprisonment in the county jail for six months, or both such fine and imprisonment, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 5786.17." Section 6.2.1(b)(2) of the MRCA's ordinance provides additional details on misdemeanor offenses under the Ordinance. MRCA park rangers are empowered to issue citations for violations of the Ordinance.

The MRCA park rangers empowered to enforce park rules, and Mitigation Measure 12-4 requires the posting of a sign with the MRCA's phone number. In addition, as detailed in the explanation of Checklist Judgment XIV(b), The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) serves the project site from the Northeast Community Police Station, which is located at 3353 San Fernando Road.

- 12-5 Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment – only physical changes caused in turn by economic or social changes.

The writer provides no facts or reasonable assumptions predicated on facts to support the assumption that the proposed project will impact home values. In fact, the writer does not actually say that the park will impact property values, the writer says: "With increasing foreclosures and falling economy, home values downside & will be for some time and with the above two issue it will not help." (sic).

The writer's unsupported contention of a decrease in property values is in conflict with recent research, such as "The Impact of Parks on Property Values: Empirical Evidence From The Past Two Decades In the United States", by John L Crompton (Managing Leisure 10, 203-218, October 2005) which suggests a possible positive impact of passive parks on property values.

12-6 Please see MND Section VIII and Response to Comment 12-8, which address past uses on the site and the results of the environmental assessments of hazardous materials. As detailed in MND Section VIII hazardous materials-related impacts are either "Less Than Significant" or "Less Than Significant With Mitigation."

12-7 Please see Response to Comment 12-8.

12-8 The requested studies have already been conducted. Three environmental assessments have been done for the project site and provide much of substantial evidence for the conclusions in the MND that potential hazardous materials impacts are either less than significant" or can be reduced to "less than significant" through implementation of the specified mitigation measures. The three reports are:

1. A Phase I Environmental Assessment titled, Preliminary Environmental Assessment, Marsh Street Property, 2944 Gleneden Street, Los Angeles, California, prepared by CET Environmental Services, Inc., July 1998. (MND Reference 9, MND page 11). The Phase I work included:

- Reconnaissance of the site;
- Review of historical documents including previous site assessment and groundwater monitoring reports;
- Review of historical and aerial photographs;
- Review of regional geology and hydrogeology;
- Review of current and historical use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes; and,
- Review of available regulatory agency lists of regional environmental issues.

CET Environmental Services report indicates that, other than the need for further study of the potential asbestos-containing materials by a certified asbestos consultant, "evidence or indication of recognized environmental concerns and conditions have not been revealed."

2. A Phase II Environmental Assessment titled, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report 2960/2961 Marsh Street and 2940/2961

Rosanna Street, prepared by CAPE Environmental Management Inc, November 2000.

- CAPE conducted a soil gas survey consisting of 12 points on the Marsh Street properties and 12 points on the Rosanna Street properties. The samples were analyzed for aromatic hydrocarbons, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes (BTEX), methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), and chlorinated compounds. None of the analyzed compounds were detected in any of the 24 soil samples.
- CAPE also conducted a soil-sampling program at the two properties, including: sampling adjacent to the concrete pad where an electrical transformer was formerly located (no PCBs were detected); boring in six locations, including areas of patched asphalt and the former location of an underground storage tank (UST) and former location of a two-stage clarifier. The results of the soil-sampling program found no significant environmental impact in the shallow subsurface soils at the site. Low concentrations of TPH-cc in the motor oil range were detected in two of the soil samples collected, but at levels below cleanup standards normally applied by regulatory agencies. One of the samples with the elevated TPH-cc concentrations was from the former location of an UST on the Rosanna Street property. Based on the information from the tank report, the two soil gas-sampling points and the two soil borings drilled at the former UST location, CAPE concluded that no additional assessment was required of the former UST area.
- CAPE inspected the hazardous materials storage and disposal practices of the Janel Glass Company. Hazardous materials use is limited to glass coolant, waste oil, compressed cylinders of propane, oxygen, sulfur dioxide and a product called Syntilo 9930. CAPE found that all of these materials appeared to be stored and used in a proper fashion.
- CAPE collected and analyzed the water in Janel's sump system and determined based on the test results that sampling of the soils adjacent to the sumps was not necessary.
- CAPE reviewed the Los Angeles City Building Department records for the properties and documented the prior uses on the site.

- CAPE performed a pre-demolition hazardous building material survey of the two buildings located on the Marsh Street property. This was updated by SCA Environmental in 2010.
3. Summary Report: Pre-Demolition Bulk Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint Survey, Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority – Gleneden Property, 2944 Gleneden Street, Los Angeles, CA 90039, prepared by SCA Environmental, Inc., September 2010. (MND Reference 7, MND page 11).

This report fulfills CET Environmental Services recommendation for further study of the potential asbestos-containing materials by a certified asbestos consultant for the buildings to be demolished. The results of this study are detailed in VIII(b) of the Checklist Judgments (see pages 35-37 of the MND). Mitigation Measures 7-1 to 7-6 contain the report's recommended measures for ensuring impacts are less than significant.

As noted on MND page 12, copies of the information sources listed on page 11 of the MND, including the hazardous materials reports, "are available for review in the offices of the MRCA, at the L.A. River Center & Gardens, 570 West Avenue 26, Suite 100, Los Angeles, California 90065 or at the web addresses provided."

RSNA is correct: one 5,000-gallon underground storage tank (UST), formerly containing gasoline, was once located on the site. It was removed by Whitaker Concrete Corporation in March of 1989. At that time soil samples were collected from below the tank invert. The samples detected low concentrations of TRPH by U.S. EPA Method 418.1 at concentrations below 100 mg/kg. Based on the information from the tank report, the two soil gas-sampling points, and two soil borings drilled at the former UST location, the Phase II Environmental Assessment by CAPE concluded that no additional assessment was required. (Phase II Environmental Assessment at page 7).

A State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor hazardous materials database search was also conducted as part of the preparation of the MND. No leaking underground storage tanks (LUFTs) are reported in the site vicinity in the EnviroStor Database.

- 12-9 Please see Response to Comment 12-8. The MRCA notes Field Deputy DelGado's representation that "residents have accepted and 'signed off' on the Rosanna entrance whether it be for emergencies and/or public access" contained in Letter 4. Please see Response to Comment 12-3, which explains why the MRCA prepared an MND rather than an EIR for the project.

12-10 The site does not have access from Ripple Place. Please see MND Figures 2, 5 and 6.

12-11 Comment noted.

12-12 As detailed in the MND, the proposed park uses would not result in a significant impact on the local street system (see MND Appendix C and MND pages 53-62). The proposed park is anticipated to generate approximately 9 daily trips during the week (3 during the a.m. peak hour and 3 during the p.m. peak hour). On weekends, assuming use of the picnic shelter for a special event, the proposed park would generate a total of 284 total daily trips (120 inbound and 17 outbound during the midday peak hour). The traffic analysis was conducted using a worst-case trip generation of 284 weekend daily trips, which includes an estimated 48 weekend day non-event park trips, and 236 trips associated with picnic shelter use for a special event. The total number of trips used in the analysis is an overestimate because it does not take account of the MRCA's requirement that events of more than 50 persons at this park during normal park hours, or events outside of normal park hours, have an Event Permit. (See MND pages 9-10). As part of the Event Permit, a Parking Management Plan will be required to ensure that the event will result in no more cars, than available parking. This requirement essentially limits event parking, and event-related trips, to parking capacity. The proposed park will therefore generate a limited number of daily and weekend vehicle trips of the project traveling along the two streets with project access: Rosanna and Gleneden Streets.

The MRCA will provide for trash pickup on the park site.

Please see Responses to Comment 12-4 regarding crime and 12-5 regarding property values.