

# Section 2

## Introduction

---

### 2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan is a multi-purpose flood control program to solve the local flooding problem in the Sun Valley Watershed area while increasing water conservation, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat, and reducing stormwater pollution. Implementation of the Watershed Management Plan will include construction of various stormwater facilities within the watershed, both small and large-scale, including those for: retention and/or infiltration, conveyance, and distribution for reuse.

#### 2.1.1 Need for the Project

Sun Valley Watershed is faced with a critical need to solve its frequent flooding problems. This highly urbanized watershed, which is located in the City of Los Angeles and covers an area of approximately 4.4 square miles, is currently not served by any comprehensive underground storm drain system. During rainfall events, stormwater flows are conveyed along street surfaces, and water collects at several of the major intersections in the area, including Tuxford Street and San Fernando Road and Vineland Avenue at Burbank Airport. Even moderate rainfall causes flooding on the order of 2 to 3 feet in depth, impeding pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Major streets such as Sheldon Street, Tuxford Street, Glenoaks Boulevard, Penrose Street, Tujunga Avenue, and Cahuenga Boulevard are affected.

To alleviate the area's flooding problem, a storm drain project called Project 9250 was initially proposed in 1970 by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LACDPW), the agency with the primary responsibility for flood control within the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The project involved constructing a system of storm drains throughout the watershed so that majority of the stormwater flows would be conveyed below the streets. Project 9250 was never implemented, primarily due to lack of funding and community support.

Storm drains have been the traditional approach to urban flood control, because they quickly and efficiently convey stormwater away from people and properties. However, storm drains also convey polluted urban runoff collected from street surfaces into the rivers and the ocean. In addition, flooding in downstream communities can be aggravated when storm drains are constructed in upstream areas and convey flows more quickly to the downstream areas.

LACDPW has proposed the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan as an alternative, multipurpose approach to stormwater management that responds to the need to integrate flood control, stormwater pollution reduction, and water conservation efforts. The Watershed Management Plan also addresses additional community issues, such as the lack of recreational resources, wildlife habitat, and aesthetic amenities in the watershed.

## Section 2 - Introduction

---

### 2.1.2 Sun Valley Watershed Stakeholders Group

Public participation has been integral to the development of the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan. In 1998, LACDPW invited area residents, state and local agencies, local businesses, and environmental groups to form the Sun Valley Watershed Stakeholders Group (Stakeholders) (see **Table 2-1**). The purpose of the Stakeholders is to develop a holistic solution to the area's flooding problem that would be an alternative to using only traditional storm drains and would provide multiple benefits for the community. Since late 1999, the Stakeholders have been meeting on average once a month to explore ideas for the Watershed Management Plan, implement short-term solutions to flood-related problems, and plan public outreach activities. The group's monthly meetings are open to the public and are facilitated by LACDPW.

The mission of the Stakeholders is:

*"...to solve the local flooding problem while retaining all stormwater runoff from the watershed, increasing water conservation, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat, and reducing stormwater pollution."*

**Table 2-1  
Organizations Involved in the Sun Valley Stakeholder Process to Date**

A-Mehr, Inc.	David Evans and Associates, Inc.
American Society of Civil Engineers	Enartec, Inc.
California Coastal Coalition	Fresh Creek Technologies
California Department of Fish and Game	LA Byproducts, Inc.
California Department of Parks and Recreation	Land Design Consultants, Inc
California Department of Transportation	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
California Native Plant Society	Los Angeles Unified School District
California State Assemblymember Cindy Montañez	Los Angeles/San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council
California State Senator Richard Alarcon	Los Cerritos Wetland Stewardship, Inc.
California Wildlife Conservation Board	Lynne Dwyer & Associates
City of Burbank	MWH
City of Burbank Department of Public Works	North East Trees
City of La Cañada Flintridge	Rick Goacher Planning, Inc.
City of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Affairs	San Gabriel & Lower LA Rivers & Mount. Conservancy
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works	Southern California Association of Governments
City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks	San Gabriel Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce
City of Los Angeles Councilmember Greuel's Office	Sun Valley Neighborhood Improvement Organization
City of Los Angeles Councilmember Padilla's Office	Targhee Inc.
City of Los Angeles Councilmember Cardenas' Office	TreePeople
City of Los Angeles Councilmember LaBonge's Office	Upper Los Angeles River Area Watermaster
City of San Fernando	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Civiltec Engineering, Inc.	U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service
Congressman Brad Sherman	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Congressman Howard Berman	Vulcan Materials Company
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works	Vulcan Solution Strategies, Inc.
County of Los Angeles Sanitation Districts	
County of Los Angeles Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky	

### 2.1.3 Project Funding

In addition to the internal funding sources of LACDPW, various external grants and other funding opportunities will be sought to cover the cost of the project. As a multi-purpose flood control project, the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan has the potential to attract multiple funding partners, such as state and local grants that provide funding for watershed programs, water quality improvement projects, water conservation, and parks and open space. Potential sources of funding that will be available in the near future include Proposition 13 (Watershed Protection, Nonpoint Source Pollution, and Urban Water Conservation Capital Outlay); Proposition 13/CALFED Watershed Program; AB 303 Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000; 319 Program (Nonpoint Source Implementation); Proposition 40 (Murray-Hayden, Roberti-Z'berg-Harris, and Urban Park Act); Proposition 50 (Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002); and City of Los Angeles Proposition K. Additional information on project funding opportunities is available in the Funding Report. (See **Section 2.9** for availability of related documents.)

## 2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan have been developed by LACDPW based on the mission statement of the Stakeholders. The primary objective is to reduce local flooding in the project area. Secondary objectives are: increase water conservation, increase recreational opportunities, increase wildlife habitat, improve water quality, provide additional environmental benefits, and increase multiple agency participation. Each objective is described in further detail below.

### 2.2.1 Reduce Local Flooding

The primary objective of the project is to alleviate the flooding problems within the Sun Valley Watershed. Each of the objectives below is consistent with this primary objective. The short-term goal (i.e., to be implemented in 1 to 2 years) is to reduce flooding occurrences at key areas within the watershed during one-year frequency, 24-hour storms. These locations include: 1) intersection of San Fernando Road and Tuxford Street, 2) intersection of Tujunga Avenue and Strathern Street, and 3) the neighborhood south of Tujunga Avenue and Strathern Street. The long-term goal (i.e. to be implemented in 6 to 8 years) is to reduce flooding occurrences throughout the watershed to levels consistent with LACDPW standards (**see Section 4.6**).

### 2.2.2 Increase Water Conservation

Under existing conditions, much of the stormwater generated within Sun Valley Watershed is lost to the Los Angeles River as urban runoff. This is a result of the increase in impervious surfaces (e.g., roads, parking lots, and rooftops) that has accompanied the area's urbanization over the past several decades. Flood control facilities can be designed so that stormwater is captured within the watershed and utilized for water conservation. The general goal for water conservation is to retain all stormwater runoff within the watershed for rainfall events up to the 50-year frequency storm.

## **Section 2 - Introduction**

---

Potential uses of captured stormwater include: 1) groundwater recharge to augment the local water supply, and 2) replacement of existing uses that do not require potable water. The proposed project aims to infiltrate at least 1,000 acre-feet per year of stormwater to recharge groundwater. Existing water uses that do not require potable water such as gravel washing and landscape irrigation are considered for substitution with captured stormwater.

### **2.2.3 Increase Recreational Opportunities**

Increases in recreational opportunities and open space areas improve the quality of life in a community. Flood control facilities can be designed to also serve as parks or open space to provide increased recreational opportunities for the residents of the Sun Valley Watershed. The project aims to increase the acreage of parks and open space for recreation, increase public access to parks and open space, and increase the proportion of green areas within public and private properties.

### **2.2.4 Increase Wildlife Habitat**

The Sun Valley Watershed currently has very few habitat areas suitable for wildlife. Flood control facilities can be designed to also serve as wildlife habitat areas. The proposed project aims to increase and improve wildlife habitat within the watershed. Specific goals include: 1) increasing the number of species on a parcel, 2) increasing the ratio of native to non-native species on a parcel, 3) increasing the diversity of native habitat types, and 4) connecting existing adjacent significant habitat areas to allow for intermixing and increased genetic diversity.

### **2.2.5 Improve Water Quality**

Stormwater runoff from urban land uses can contribute pollutants to downstream surface waters. The project aims to improve the water quality of the Los Angeles River through stormwater management within Sun Valley Watershed, which is a tributary of the river.

Specific goals for improving water quality include:

- Reducing the pollutant load entering the Los Angeles River by retaining all stormwater runoff within the watershed up to the 50-year frequency storm
- Improving the quality of urban runoff through the use of stormwater quality Best Management Practices
- Proactively enforcing regulations on illegal discharge by controlling pollution at its source
- Educating the public on responsible watershed management practices
- Maintaining or improving existing groundwater quality

### **2.2.6 Provide Additional Environmental Benefits**

Implementation of alternative flood control strategies can provide many environmental benefits in addition to the ones discussed above. For example, tree planting can help reduce urban runoff while providing shade for buildings, resulting in lower energy needs for air conditioning. The

proposed project aims to maximize these types of environmental benefits, including reduced energy use, improved air quality, and reduction of the solid waste stream to landfills.

### **2.2.7 Increase Multiple Agency Participation**

By promoting multi-agency participation, the proposed project aims to encourage a more involved government and community, attract multiple funding partners, work with local schools to provide aesthetic and other benefits for their campuses, increase public awareness of watershed issues, and develop a model for similar projects in the future.

## **2.3 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)**

### **2.3.1 CEQA Requirements**

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), discretionary decisions by public agencies regarding certain public and private projects are subject to environmental review. The proposed Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan (proposed project) must comply with CEQA because it is a “project” as defined by Section 15378 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

This Program Environmental Impact Report (Program EIR) has been prepared by LACDPW in compliance with the CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et. seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et. seq.*) as amended.

The purpose of this Program EIR is: 1) to fully disclose to the project’s decision-makers, responsible agencies, interested parties, and the general public the significant or potentially significant environmental effects of implementing the proposed project; 2) to identify possible ways to avoid or reduce adverse impacts; and 3) to describe reasonable alternatives to the proposed project.

### **2.3.2 Program EIR Approach**

The proposed project, the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan, is a set of policies and actions to address the community’s flooding problems and water quality issues while providing a number of additional benefits. Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, this document has been prepared as a Program EIR to consider the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives of the proposed Watershed Management Plan as a whole. This approach avoids duplication, allows the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and mitigation measures at an earlier time when there may be more flexibility to address the issues, and addresses cumulative impacts that might be overlooked in a project-level EIR.

The proposed Watershed Management Plan is comprised of multiple components. LACDPW has developed four sample alternatives of the Watershed Management Plan by combining different subsets of the plan components to form each alternative. This Program EIR includes an evaluation of each of the project components and all four alternatives, as defined by LACDPW,

## Section 2 - Introduction

---

as well as a theoretical worst-case alternative. The worst-case alternative is defined individually for each environmental topic by combining plan components in a manner that would have the maximum adverse impact with respect to that topic. For example, the theoretical worst-case alternative for air quality, noise, and traffic issues is the combination of components that would generate the greatest construction impacts, i.e. all components. The objective of this approach is to facilitate the implementation of the Watershed Management Plan by maximizing the flexibility in the future use of this document.

Because this document is a Program EIR, it generally contains less detail than typical development project EIRs. For some components of the project, LACDPW has not yet selected specific sites (i.e., Onsite BMPs, Tree Planting and Mulching, and alignment of the Street Storage component) and determined construction details, and operation plans have not been developed. The level of detail in the impact analysis reflects the level of detail in the project description itself. Project-level CEQA analysis is provided for certain components of the plan for which adequate information on facility locations, construction details, and operation plans currently exist.

In the future, as individual project components are proposed for implementation, LACDPW will evaluate whether the Program EIR adequately evaluates the environmental effects of each component. Based on the results of the evaluation, one of the following will be prepared: 1) a written checklist documenting the decision that the environmental effects of the specific project component was covered by the Program EIR, 2) an Initial Environmental Study (IES) and a Negative Declaration, or 3) a site-specific “second-tier” EIR.

As described in **Section 2.1.3**, one of the potential funding sources for the proposed project is the Proposition 13/CALFED Watershed Program. The CALFED Record of Decision requires that environmental review of actions funded with money designated for meeting CALFED purposes tier off of the CALFED Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) (CALFED Bay-Delta Program, 2000). Based on a review of the CALFED EIR/EIS, no significant adverse cumulative impacts were found to occur with the proposed project. The proposed project is consistent with several CALFED programs, including water quality, water use efficiency, and watershed management.

## 2.4 AGENCIES AND APPROVALS

### 2.4.1 Lead Agency

LACDPW is the lead agency pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15367 for this Program EIR. A lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project subject to CEQA. The lead agency is responsible for preparing the environmental documents on a project according to the full disclosure requirements of CEQA.

LACDPW is a public agency responsible for the design, construction, operation, maintenance, and repair of roads, bridges, airports, sewers, water supply, flood control, and water conservation facilities. In August 2000, a new Watershed Management Division was created within LACDPW to integrate and coordinate activities that affect the natural resources and water

quality of the watersheds within the county. Services that were brought together under the Watershed Management Division include flood protection, water conservation, preserving and creating open space for recreation and habitat, and reducing pollution of water resources.

**2.4.2 Responsible Agencies and Approvals**

Under CEQA, a responsible agency is a public agency, other than the lead agency, which has responsibility for implementing or approving a project. A responsible agency typically has permitting authority or approval over some aspect of a proposed project. The responsible agency relies on the lead agency’s environmental document in acting on whatever aspect of the project requires its approval. The lead agency is required to consult with responsible agencies and solicit comments from them regarding the choice and content of the environmental document.

Responsible agencies expected to review the Program EIR and issue permits or approvals for individual component of the Program are summarized in **Table 2-2**.

**Table 2-2  
List of Potential Permits and Approvals**

Agency	Potential Permits/Approvals/Reviews (Relevant Project Components)
<b>Federal Agencies</b>	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit for Tujunga Wash Diversion and maintenance of created wetlands</li> </ul>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding source</li> </ul>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Endangered Species Act Section 10(a) coordination, if threatened or endangered species are found during future onsite biological resources survey at New Park on Wentworth, Cal Mat Pit, Sheldon Pit, or Strathern Pit, or if created wetlands attract threatened or endangered species to specific project components after project implementation</li> </ul>
<b>State Agencies</b>	
California Department of Fish and Game	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Endangered Species Act coordination, if threatened or endangered species are found during future onsite biological resources survey at New Park on Wentworth, Cal Mat Pit, Sheldon Pit, or Strathern Pit, or if created wetlands attract threatened or endangered species to specific project components after project implementation</li> </ul>
California Department of Health Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project review</li> </ul>
California Department of Parks and Recreation, Los Angeles District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding source</li> </ul>
California Department of Transportation, District 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encroachment permit or easement for Tuxford Green</li> <li>• Transportation permit for transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways</li> </ul>
California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of designs of bermed retention basins (Cal Mat Pit, Sheldon Pit, Strathern Pit, Vulcan Gravel Processing Plant, Valley Steam Plant, and Power Line Easement)</li> </ul>
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, related to Section 404 Permit for Tujunga Wash Diversion</li> <li>• NPDES permits or waste discharge requirements for dewatering during construction, if applicable</li> <li>• NPDES permit for construction sites over 1 acre</li> </ul>

## Section 2 - Introduction

**Table 2-2 (Continued)  
List of Potential Permits and Approvals**

Agency	Potential Permits/Approvals/Reviews (Relevant Project Components)
<b>Regional Agencies</b>	
South Coast Air Quality Management District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permits for temporary electric generation at construction sites, if applicable</li> <li>• Potential funding source</li> </ul>
Upper Los Angeles River Area Watermaster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project review</li> </ul>
Los Angeles Unified School District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of project components involving LAUSD school sites (Roscoe Elementary School, Stonehurst Elementary School, and Sun Valley Middle School)</li> </ul>
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right-of-way engineer review if storm drain installation would impact SCRRA right-of-way. If new storm drains or other drainage structures cross under the railroad, construction of such structures would require a Right-of-Entry Agreement and license agreements from MTA (SCRRA member agency).</li> <li>• Approval from Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) for projects affecting their property along the SCRRA right-of-way on the Ventura County Line</li> </ul>
<b>County and City Agencies</b>	
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of relocation of MTA bus stop (potentially a part of Tuxford Green component)</li> </ul>
City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation and maintenance of new parks created under the proposed project (Cal Mat Pit, Sheldon Pit, Strathern Pit, New Park on Wentworth, and Power Line Easement)</li> <li>• Approval of modification to Stonehurst Park (Stonehurst Park)</li> </ul>
City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easement or other approval for modifications to LADWP properties (Valley Steam Plant and Power Line Easement)</li> <li>• Permission to route stormwater from surrounding industrial/commercial area onto the Valley Steam Plant property</li> <li>• Encroachment of power line right-of-ways</li> </ul>
City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easements for use of City property (Tuxford Green)</li> <li>• Potential funding source</li> <li>• Joint construction of components</li> </ul>
City of Los Angeles, Department of Environmental Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of Solid Waste Facilities Permit for Cal Mat Pit</li> </ul>
City of Los Angeles, Departments of Planning and Building and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of amendment to mine reclamation plans (Sheldon Pit and Cal Mat Pit)</li> </ul>

## 2.5 EIR PROCESS

### 2.5.1 Initial Environmental Study and Notice of Preparation

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and IES for this Program EIR was filed by LACDPW with the State Clearinghouse in November 2002, and were distributed to responsible agencies and interested parties for a 30-day review and comment period ending December 11, 2002. Copies of the NOP and IES are included as **Appendix B**.

LACDPW received 13 comment letters on the NOP. CEQA related comments were also received during the CEQA scoping meeting held on November 20, 2002. The written comments submitted on the NOP and comments provided at the CEQA scoping meeting are presented in **Appendix B**. The comments received included issues related to groundwater quality impacts from stormwater infiltration, construction impacts on utilities, traffic/transportation facilities, air quality, and schools, and impact on public health (creation of mosquito habitat).

### 2.5.2 Draft and Final Program EIR

The Draft Program EIR for the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan was issued for public review on October 24, 2003. The Notice of Availability (NOA) and the Draft Program EIR were mailed to a total of 65 agencies, organizations, and interested individuals. In addition, the NOA was mailed to 10 regional Native American Tribal representatives and over 2,400 property owners in the project area. The NOA was filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk for public posting, and the Notice of Completion, NOA, and the Draft Program EIR were submitted to the State Clearinghouse. Copies of the Draft Program EIR were made available for public review at the LACDPW office in Alhambra, 10 local and area libraries, and on the Sun Valley Watershed website. The public review and comment period lasted for 45 days from October 24 through December 8, 2003. In addition, LACDPW held a public meeting on the Draft Program EIR on October 29, 2003 at Sun Valley Middle School. Comments were received in English and Spanish (with a simultaneous interpreter) during the public meeting.

This Final Program EIR presents agency and public comments received on the Draft Program EIR, as well as responses to these comments (see **Appendix H**). Following publication, the Final Program EIR will be certified by the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors along with the adoption of the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

### 2.5.3 Environmental Review Subsequent to the Program EIR

In the future, as individual project components are proposed for implementation, LACDPW will evaluate whether the Program EIR adequately evaluates the environmental effects of that component. If LACDPW determines that the environmental effects of the project component were covered in the Program EIR, a written checklist will be used to document the decision, and no additional CEQA documents would be required for that project component. As required by CEQA, if a project component is determined to have new effects that were not covered by the Program EIR, an IES and a Negative Declaration or a site-specific “second-tier” EIR will be prepared. The Program EIR will serve as the foundation for any future Negative Declarations or second-tier EIRs.

## 2.6 SCOPE OF THE EIR

Based on the preliminary findings of and comments to the IES, LACDPW concluded that preparation of an EIR is required because the proposed project has the potential to have significant environmental impacts on the following environmental issues:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

## Section 2 - Introduction

---

Based on the results of the IES, LACDPW determined that the proposed project would have no impact or less than significant impact with respect to the environmental issues listed below. Therefore, these environmental issues have been excluded from analysis in this Program EIR.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources\*
- Population and Housing

\* The IES indicated that impacts on mineral resources related to the use of Boulevard Pit, the only actively mined gravel pit considered for use by the project, are potentially significant. However, since the publication of the IES, Boulevard Pit was excluded from the list of proposed project components. Therefore, issues related to mineral resources have been excluded from the analysis presented in Section 4 of this Program EIR. Potential impacts on mineral resources related to the use of Boulevard Pit are discussed in **Section 7, Alternatives**.

### 2.7 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

In the course of preparation of the Watershed Management Plan and the Program EIR, the following issues of controversy have been identified:

- Proposed infiltration of stormwater may potentially have adverse impacts on the groundwater quality of the San Fernando Basin.
- Due to site access issues, field surveys for biological and cultural resources could not be completed for the Cal Mat Pit, Sheldon Pit, and Strathern Pit components within the timeframe of Program EIR preparation. Therefore, project impacts related to biological and cultural resources could not be fully evaluated for these project components.

These issues are addressed in detail in this document.

### 2.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM EIR

The Program EIR is organized into the following major sections.

#### Table of Contents

**Section 1 – Summary.** A summary of the contents of the Program EIR

**Section 2 – Introduction.** Background, project objectives, lead agency identification, the purpose and overview of the Program EIR process, scope of the Program EIR, responsible agencies and approvals, and areas of known controversy

**Section 3 – Project Description.** Project location, detailed description of the project components and final four alternatives, project implementation, and project monitoring plan

**Section 4 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.** Description of the environmental setting, criteria for determining impact significance, analysis of project-related impacts, and description of mitigation measures for each environmental topic. This section includes analyses of each project component individually, the four County-defined Watershed Management Plan alternatives, and the theoretical worst-case alternative for each topic

**Section 5 – Cumulative Impacts.** A discussion of past, present and reasonably anticipated future activities that could have additive impacts with those of the proposed project

**Section 6 – Additional CEQA Analysis.** Additional analyses required by CEQA, including irreversible environmental changes, unavoidable environmental impacts, growth inducing impacts, and consistency with regional and local planning

**Section 7 – Alternatives.** A discussion of the impacts of project alternatives as required by CEQA. Alternatives evaluated include the No Project Alternative, the Project 9250 alternative, and the Boulevard Pit alternative. Analyses of the four County-defined Watershed Management Plan alternatives and the theoretical worst-case alternative are discussed in Section 4 above

**Appendices.** List of references, acronyms and abbreviations used, organizations and persons consulted, preparers of the Program EIR, Notice of Preparation and comments received, and technical materials and data supporting the analysis or contents of this Program EIR

### 2.9 RELATED DOCUMENTS

The Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan and the following documents prepared in the process of developing the Watershed Management Plan are available for public review during regular office hours at the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803; Mr. Vik Bapna; Phone 626-458-4363).

- **Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan.** Presents the Watershed Management Plan, and summarizes the contents of the six technical memoranda and Phase 1 project concept reports. (May, 2004)
- **Phase 1 Project Concept Reports.** Includes the concept designs for the following five Phase 1 projects:
  - Cal Mat Pit (October, 2002)
  - LADWP Valley Steam Plant (October, 2002)
  - Tuxford Green (October, 2002)
  - Vulcan Gravel Processing Plant (October, 2002)
  - Sun Valley Middle School (October, 2002)
- **Monitoring Plan for the Sun Valley Watershed Pilot Program.** Presents the water quality and flood control/water conservation monitoring program for the five Phase 1 projects identified above. (September, 2002)
- **Technical Memorandum No. 1.** Project Objectives, Best Management Practices Evaluation, and Opportunities and Constraints Analysis. (April, 2002)

## Section 2 - Introduction

---

- **Technical Memorandum No. 2.** Hydrology Model Modifications, Results and Linkages. (March, 2002 - Draft)
- **Technical Memorandum No. 3.** Development and Evaluation of Initial 22 Alternatives. (August, 2002)
- **Technical Memorandum No. 4.** Development and Evaluation of Six Alternatives. (January, 2002)
- **Technical Memorandum No. 5.** Development and Evaluation of Final Four Alternatives. (April, 2003)
- **Technical Memorandum No. 6.** Agencies Coordination, Policy or Regulatory Changes and Recommendations. (*In progress*)
- **Funding Report.** Identifies federal, state, regional and local funding sources that may help supplement existing County revenue streams to support implementation of the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan. (May, 2003)