CHAPTER 2. SUMMARY

The Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation (Foundation) proposes a redevelopment, or "reimagining," of the 13-acre La Brea Tar Pits project site. The proposed project is the *La Brea Tar Pits Loops and Lenses, Master Plan and Concept Design*, prepared for the Foundation and the County and referred to as the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan (Master Plan, Weiss/Manfredi 2023). The Master Plan is included in Appendix B.

The project site is located at 5801 Wilshire Boulevard in Los Angeles and is on property owned by the County of Los Angeles (County). La Brea Tar Pits, the George C. Page Museum (Page Museum), and associated facilities, are owned by the County but are managed by the Foundation. The Foundation's role is to carry out all County services including public access and programming, administration, and operation for the County of Los Angeles Museum of Natural History (Museum of Natural History),[1] including La Brea Tar Pits and the Page Museum. The County is the Lead Agency under CEQA for this EIR; the Museum of Natural History is a County departmental unit.

The County has prepared this EIR to assess the environmental impacts of the project. The State CEQA Guidelines identify the Lead Agency as the public agency with the principal responsibility for conducting or approving a project (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15367). The County is the CEQA Lead Agency for the project because the project is on County-owned land. The County is responsible for the coordination and direct oversight of the environmental review process and the Board, as governing body of the County, will exercise independent judgment and analysis should it certify the EIR.

This EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA (as amended), codified as California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines in the Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3. The basic purposes of CEQA are to: 1) inform decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities, 2) identify the ways that environmental effects can be avoided or significantly reduced, 3) prevent significant, avoidable environmental effects by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when feasible, and 4) disclose to the public the reasons an implementing agency may approve a project even if significant unavoidable environmental effects are involved.

This chapter includes the following information:

- The purpose of the EIR
- A brief description of the project location
- A summary of the project background and the objectives of the project that were established by the Foundation and the Museum of Natural History
- A summary of impacts and mitigation measures associated with the project
- A summary of the known areas of controversy
- A summary of issues to be resolved
- A summary of project alternatives

[1] In accordance with Chapter 2.94 of the Los Angeles County Code and various other operating agreements, the County Museum of Natural History is a department of the County and has administrative charge and control over all County matters relating to history and science, and shall also include the administration of Hancock Park (except that area of said park devoted to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art [LACMA]), and the care, safeguarding, and maintenance of all exhibits, equipment, and structural improvements directly relating to exhibits, the administration and maintenance of LACMA, and other property hereafter acquired for or devoted to history and science.

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The County, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, has prepared this EIR to assess the environmental impacts that would result from the approval of the proposed project. This EIR will serve as a public information document to be used by the general public, responsible and trustee agencies, and decision-making bodies to review and evaluate the environmental effects associated with the project, potential mitigation measures recommended to address or minimize those effects, and reasonable alternatives to the project. The review process provides both agencies and individuals an opportunity to share their expertise, discuss agency analyses, check for accuracy, detect omissions, discover public concerns, and solicit mitigation measures and alternatives capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of the project while still attaining most of the basic objectives of the project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The 13-acre La Brea Tar Pits site is located within the eastern and northwestern portions of the 23-acre Hancock Park (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 5508-016-902) at 5801 Wilshire Boulevard. The project site includes 13 acres of the eastern and northwestern portions of Hancock Park and is directly adjacent to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA). Both LACMA and the Museum of Natural History ~~Museum~~ are responsible for managing separate and distinct portions of the 23 acres in Hancock Park, with the Museum of Natural History ~~Museum~~ responsible for the 13-acre project site and LACMA responsible for the remainder of Hancock Park to the south and west of the project boundaries. LACMA's facilities are not included in the project.

The project site is located approximately 5.5 miles west of downtown Los Angeles and approximately 8.6 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. It is bounded by West 6th Street to the north (an approximately 1,200-foot-long frontage), South Curson Avenue to the east (an approximately 830-foot-long frontage), Wilshire Boulevard to the south (an approximately 500-foot-long frontage), and LACMA to the west (an approximately 250-foot-long frontage). The area is known as the Miracle Mile neighborhood of the city of Los Angeles.

Primary regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 10, which runs east-west less than 2 miles south of the project site. The major arterials providing regional and subregional access to the project site vicinity include Wilshire Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, and Fairfax Avenue.

2.3 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The project would result in a reimagined site design, expansion, and upgrades for the Tar Pits complex, including renovations to the Page Museum and development of a new museum building. Table 2-1 provides a summary of the project components; some additional detail on the project components is provided following the table. See Chapter 3, Project Description, for a detailed description of the proposed project.

Table 2-1. Project Components Summary

Project Component	Description
Page Museum Renovations	Renovate existing building within the same footprint (approximately 63,200 square feet).
New Museum Building	Construct a new two-story, 40,000-gross-square-foot (gsf) museum building northwest of the Page Museum, including two new theaters. The construction of the new museum building would require the removal of vegetation in the footprint of the new building.
Wilshire Gateway	Renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue with shaded canopy and new welcome pavilion.
6th Street Gateway	Renovate the existing entrance at the northwest corner of West 6th Street and the entrance to the LACMA service drive with shaded canopy and new welcome pavilion.
Tar Pits (Pits 3, 4, 9, 13, 61, 67, and 91; Project 23)	Renovate the existing facilities at all the tar pits in the northwestern portion of the project site. These renovations would require the removal and replacement of some vegetation, although the exact amount and nature of the vegetation removal and enhancements have not been determined at the time of this report.
Pedestrian Path and Recreation Areas	Reconfigure the existing pedestrian pathways on-site into a continuous paved path linking existing features on the project site. Provide improvements to the Central Green. Establish a children's play area, picnic areas, and a possible future small dog park.
Circulation and Parking	Relocate the parking lot approximately 50 to 70 feet to the north. The size of the parking lot (63,000 square feet) and the number of parking spaces would not change. The shifting of the parking lot on the northern side of the project site may require removal or relocation of the trees between the existing parking lot and West 6th Street. If these trees need to be removed or relocated, they would be either moved to another location within the 13-acre project site or replaced elsewhere within the project site. Add new landscaping and vehicle access lanes to the parking lot. Establish a new school drop-off/loading area approximately 215 to 230 feet long on South Curson Avenue adjacent to the Wilshire Gateway picnic area.
Landscaping Concept Plan	Establish three distinct landscaping zones encircled by a looping pedestrian path. More than 330 trees are currently on the project site. The project would require removal and replacement and/or relocation of between 150 and 200 trees. The planting strategy includes the introduction or relocation of a similar number of trees as would be removed. It is ~~preliminarily~~ estimated that up to 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced. Create three biofiltration areas for stormwater management.

2.3.1 Page Museum Renovations

The project would renovate the existing Page Museum within the same footprint as the existing building (currently approximately 63,200 square feet) to allow for an enlarged exhibition space, additional collections storage, a ground floor café, and retail space. The central atrium would be renovated to provide additional exhibitions, an additional classroom, and visible laboratory space. A sloped green roof would be installed north of the Page Museum and would curve to the west. The project would add several sustainability features to the Page Museum. The features include enhanced daylighting, rainwater collection leading to bioswales, a sloped green roof, and rooftop solar photovoltaic panels.

2.3.2 New Museum Building

A two-story museum building would be constructed northwest of the Page Museum. The building would be approximately 40,000 gross square feet (gsf) and would increase the total museum square footage to

104,000 gsf. The new museum building would include an extended central lobby, exhibit spaces, two theaters, research and collections laboratories, administration spaces, and a loading dock.

The Page Museum and new museum building would be continuously connected on the first floor. The first-floor central lobby would face southwest toward the Central Green and branch off into the Page Museum to the east and the new museum building to the west. The Page Museum and the new museum building would be disconnected on the second floor, which would rise above the earthen berm. The separated facilities would be accessible through sloped outdoor walkways from the Central Green or through the interior in the new museum building. There would be pedestrian entrances leading into the central lobby from the Central Green and parking lot.

2.3.3 Tar Pits

The project would renovate the existing facilities at all the tar pits in the western portion of the project site. The existing fencing around Pit 9, Pit 13, and Pits 3, 4, 61, and 67 would be removed. The project would construct clearly defined viewing areas around each of the tar pits, with improved pit protection zones and fencing, seating, and interpretive signage.

The project would relocate the wooden fossil boxes, research facilities, and ongoing excavation associated with Project 23[2] to space within and adjacent to the new museum building. The temporary storage and research buildings adjacent to Project 23 would be demolished or repurposed within the project site.

Pit 91 would continue to be a key research and interpretation destination in the park. The project includes the demolition of the current viewing station overlooking Pit 91. In addition, a shaded outdoor classroom, a canopy, built-in seating, and a possible support structure would be constructed. While excavation at Pit 91 could be completed in a few years, the site would be maintained and enhanced to support future excavation and educational opportunities. The new support facilities at Pit 91 would continue to support temporary excavation sites at adjacent Pit 10 or other future field sites.

2.3.4 Entrance Renovation and Other Internal Improvements

The project would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits located at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza – the Wilshire Gateway. This gateway would provide orientation, spaces for gathering and queuing, and restrooms. A picnic area would also be located under the shaded canopy.

A pedestrian bridge and walking path would be constructed over the Lake Pit. Directly to the east of the Lake Pit, a new garden bioswale would be installed to manage stormwater and would include vegetation related to the relocated mammoths and mastodon sculptures.

A school drop-off area on South Curson Avenue would lead directly to the educational group and tour entrance, enabling the choreography of student tour check-in processes that are distinct from general museum visitors and other tour groups.

[2] Project 23 is an active fossil recovery site. In 2006, the LACMA began work on a new underground parking garage. During the course of construction, 16 new fossil deposits were discovered, including an almost-complete skeleton of an adult mammoth. Construction was halted, and 23 large wooden boxes were built around each fossil deposit (hence the short-hand descriptor, "Project 23"). These boxes and numerous buckets of fossil material were moved to the Project 23 current location for recovery. Adjacent covered research and storage areas support the ongoing fossil recovery.

The project would renovate the existing entrance at the northwest corner of Hancock Park at West 6th Street and the entrance to the LACMA parking garage. Similar to the Wilshire Gateway, a shaded canopy and welcome pavilion would provide orientation, legibility, and amenities. As a visible point of arrival from the residential communities to the north, this new entry would welcome visitors to a shaded park space where community park and recreational needs are balanced with the research activities. Under the canopy of shade trees, visitors would find diverse destinations, including play areas, picnic areas, seating and interpretation zones at the protected tar seeps, gentle topography and bioswales along Oil Creek, and the revitalized destinations of the Dorothy Brown Amphitheater, Observation Pit, and Pit 91. Along the south edge of the loop path, connections would allow access to other Hancock Park programs and transportation connections.

2.3.5 Landscaping

The planting and landscaping concept for La Brea Tar Pits would be divided into three distinct zones encircled by the looping path system. Each loop of the pedestrian path would have a theme that represents different geologic epochs—Pleistocene in the southeastern loop, Holocene in the northwestern loop, and Anthropocene in the central loop. The Pleistocene Garden, located directly east of the Lake Pit, would be approximately 10,000 to 11,000 square feet in size, and incorporate a biofiltration area to help manage stormwater. It would be planted with herbaceous and woody species and the mammoth and mastodon sculptures currently located in the Lake Pit would be relocated there. The western loop would consist of a Holocene landscape with climate-appropriate native plantings to ease water consumption, ensure appropriate maintenance, and promote sustainable growth. A forested woodland consisting of Torrey pine and coast live oak would be planted with the intention of providing a focal area and shade. The western loop also contains Oil Creek, which would be developed into a biofiltration zone for stormwater management and would be planted with sequoia and Monterey pine trees in wetter pockets.

The woodland forest zone of the western loop would be extended along the park's peripheral edges (northern, southern, eastern, and western) to provide shade to the picnic areas and the parking lot to the north. Tree species are expected to include Torrey pine, coast live oak, western sycamore, and valley oak and would support the development of a unified canopy across the site. A 6,000 to 7,000-square-foot biofiltration area would be located within the center of the vehicular drop-off loop to manage stormwater flows from the parking lot.

2.3.6 Project Construction

Construction of the project would occur when all design and construction plans are completed and approved by the County and other required agencies. Construction activities would include demolition of the existing museum entrances, grading and excavation, and construction of new structures and related infrastructure. All construction activities, including construction staging of equipment, would be situated entirely within the project site. Typical construction equipment would be used during all phases of the project construction and would be stored within the staging area, including excavators, dozers, backhoes, dump trucks, water trucks, sand blasters, rollers, pavers, generators, scrapers, forklifts, delivery trucks, paving equipment, cranes, and air compressors. The grading and construction phase would be the peak period of construction with the highest number of construction vehicles. The grading phase is estimated to result in up to 127 one-way truck trips (e.g., vendor, hauling) and 75 worker vehicle trips per day. The building construction phase is estimated to result in up to 24 one-way truck trips and 200 worker vehicle trips per day.

Any hazardous materials found during construction and renovation would be abated and removed during the construction process in accordance with the applicable hazardous materials standards and requirements. Due to anticipated soil conditions, on-site soils are not expected to be suitable for reuse and

would need to be exported for remediation and disposal. Therefore, it is anticipated that project earthwork activities would include an estimated 53,000 cubic yards of cut/export and potentially 37,000 cubic yards of imported fill. At the time of preparation of this EIR, final engineering, design, and grading plans for the project had not been finalized. Because the project design is at a preliminary stage, the level of detail needed to determine the precise depth of ground disturbance is not known. However, the level of design that has occurred to date allows for a general characterization of the overall ground disturbance and excavation that would be necessary for the project. The project design team worked with the Foundation and the County to characterize a "worst-case" ground-disturbance estimate, which represents the most-impactful scenario in terms of depths and amount of excavation that includes all project elements. While separate estimates for each project element (e.g., the new museum building) are not yet available, the estimate based on the worst-cast scenario provides a reasonable basis on which the potential for environmental impacts can be analyzed.

Under the most-impactful scenario, the project would maximally require excavations from 6 to 10 feet deep. In general, the new museum building would require the most ground disturbance and excavation. While the final elevation of the foundation for the new museum building is not known at this time, it may be below the existing ground surface to provide a smooth connection to the existing Page Museum. While certain project elements are expected to require less excavation than the new museum, this EIR assumes that excavations could occur up to 10 feet deep throughout the 13-acre project site to allow maximum flexibility as the project designs become more refined.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, as a departmental unit of the County and the Foundation have identified the following objectives for the project:

1. Renovate and expand the existing museum structure to address deferred maintenance of the building envelope and systems, to meet modern seismic, electrical, building code standards, and universal design standards, and to meet sustainability goals consistent with the County's sustainability plan (County of Los Angeles 2019; County of Los Angeles 2024).
2. Provide expanded collections storage facilities that enable access for scientific research, and preserve, protect, and allow future growth of the museum's world-class collections.
3. Provide expanded state-of-the-art laboratory research facilities to accommodate internationally significant and advanced research in paleontology.
4. Provide state-of-the-art exhibition facilities and learning environments within the park and museum to enrich the visitor experience and to support active educational and public programming.
5. Improve access and entry for different visitor types, increase connections between the museum and the park, as well as support increased visitation, special events, and revenue-producing amenities within the park and museum.
6. Expand the museum exhibits, educational classrooms, collection spaces, offices, and laboratory research facilities in one unified, cohesive facility, with the fewest impacts to historical resources possible.
7. Create a central entrance to the museum facilities to enhance the visitor experience of the museum and Hancock Park.

8. Preserve and protect the National Natural Landmark—La Brea Tar Pits—to allow access for future research and excavation, support cultural and educational interpretation, and enable the ongoing natural processes of the asphaltic seeps.
9. Redesign and renovate the Hancock Park community park green space as an expression of the goals of the County of Los Angeles's General Plan Conservation and Natural Resources Element and the City of Los Angeles's Open Space and Conservation Elements of the General Plan, to increase sustainable landscape and site design, to support passive recreational use, to increase the legibility of this important cultural destination, and to enhance connections to the quickly evolving Miracle Mile neighborhood.

2.5 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

Impacts of the proposed project have been classified using the following categories:

- **Less than significant impacts:** Less than significant impacts means the effect does not meet or exceed the applicable significance criteria thresholds for a particular resource. No mitigation measures are required for less than significant impacts.
- **Less than significant impact with mitigation:** An adverse impact that would cause a substantial adverse effect that meets or exceeds the applicable significance criteria thresholds for a particular resource but can be reduced to a less-than-significant impact through successfully implementing identified mitigation measures.
- **Significant and unavoidable impacts:** Significant impacts that cannot be fully and effectively mitigated. No measures could be taken to avoid or reduce these adverse effects to insignificant or negligible levels.

The term "significance" is used throughout the EIR to characterize the magnitude of the projected impact. For this EIR, a significant impact is a substantial or potentially substantial change to resources in the local proposed project site or the area adjacent to the project site. In the discussions of each issue area, thresholds are identified that are used to distinguish between significant impacts and impacts that are less than significant. To the extent feasible, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce project impacts to less than significant. CEQA requires that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if feasible mitigation measures are available that would substantially lessen the environmental effects of such projects (California Public Resources Code Section 21002).

The impacts and associated mitigation measures identified for the project are shown in Table 2-2. The table includes impacts that are categorized as significant and less than significant, all of which are identified with an impact number (e.g., AQ Impact 1). The impact summary table describes and classifies each impact, lists recommended mitigation when applicable, and states the level of impact remaining after implementation of identified mitigation. A summary of project alternatives, including the environmentally superior alternative, is included in Section 2.8, Project Alternatives.

Table 2-2. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES Impact 1: The project would not have a substantial effect on a scenic vista either during project construction or operation. Impacts during project construction and operation would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold I. a)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Not applicable (N/A)
AES Impact 2: The project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State- or City-designated Scenic Highway during either project construction or operation. Impacts during construction and operation of the project would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold I. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
AES Impact 3: The project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality during either project construction or operation. Impacts during construction and operation of the project would be less than significant (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold I. c).	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
AES Impact 4: The project could create a new source of substantial light or glare during both construction activities and project operation as part of the final building and project design which could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. Impacts during construction and operation of the project could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold I. d)	Significant	**AES/mm-4.1:** During project construction, the following measures shall be required: • The hours of construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and national holidays, with no construction permitted on Sundays. • If construction during evening hours is deemed necessary, construction-related illumination shall be used for safety and security purposes only. Additionally, any construction lighting shall be directed toward the area undergoing work, which requires that construction lighting be shielded and/or aimed so that no direct beam illumination would fall outside of the project site boundary. **AES/mm-4.2:** The project shall implement the following design features: • All facades and/or building surfaces including glass windows shall be constructed using non-reflective materials or be treated with non-reflective coating.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• All light emanating from new uses shall be either low scaled lighting or shielded to focus lighting and prevent lighting from spilling onto adjacent sensitive uses. • The project shall not include outdoor lighting that causes residential property to be illuminated by more than two footcandles of lighting intensity or receive direct glare from the light source. • All lights used to illuminate parking areas shall be designed, located, and arranged to reflect the light away from any street and any adjacent premises. • Signage with a light intensity of greater than three footcandles above ambient lighting, as measured at the property line of the nearest residentially zoned property, shall be prohibited.	
AES Impact 5 (Cumulative): The project has the potential to contribute considerably to cumulative impacts associated with light and glare during both project construction and operation.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1 and AES/mm-4.2.	Less than significant
Air Quality			
AQ Impact 1: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans during either construction or operation. Construction and operation impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold III. a)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
AQ Impact 2: The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants that would exceed applicable SCAQMD thresholds during either construction or operation. Construction and operation impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold III. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
AQ Impact 3: The project could expose sensitive residential receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction related to diesel exhaust. Construction impacts could be significant. Operation of the project would not expose sensitive residential receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Operation impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold III. c)	Significant	**AQ/mm-3.1:** To reduce the potential for health risks as a result of construction of the project, the following measures shall be implemented: • Prior to the start of construction activities, it shall be ensured that all 75 horsepower or greater diesel-powered equipment are powered with CARB-certified Tier 4 Interim engines, except where the County establishes that Tier 4 Interim equipment is not available.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		There are several other SCAQMD rules and regulations that serve as mitigation measures for the project construction. These rules are: • SCAQMD Rule 403, which requires projects to incorporate fugitive dust control measures; • SCAQMD Rule 1113, which limits the volatile organic compound content of architectural coating; and • SCAQMD Regulation XIII, New Source Review, which requires new on-site facility nitrogen oxide emissions to be minimized through the use of emission control measures (e.g., use of best available technology control technology for new combustion sources such as boilers and water heaters).	
AQ Impact 4: The project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people during either project construction or operation. Construction and operation impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold III. d**)**	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
AQ Impact 5 (Cumulative): The project's air pollutant emissions related to diesel exhaust during construction could result in a cumulative contribution to air pollution in the region. Operation of the project would not result in a significant contribution to air pollution in the region.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measure AQ/mm-3.1.	Less than significant
Biological Resources			
BIO Impact 1: The project could result in in significant effects during the construction process on one species, the federal candidate monarch butterfly, either directly or through habitat modifications. Impacts during project construction could be significant. During project operation, the project would not result in significant effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any identified candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. Impacts during project operation would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. a)	Significant	**BIO/mm-1.1:** To protect the federal candidate monarch butterfly, which is a candidate species for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act, the following measures (BIO/mm-1.1a or BIO/mm-1.1b) shall be implemented: a. Full avoidance of impacting any milkweed populations on-site with observable monarch eggs and larvae. After obtaining permits and prior to construction, all individual milkweed plants will be surveyed. All individual plants found with eggs or larvae will be flagged for re-survey and avoidance. Individual plants without eggs and larvae will be removed. Flagged plants will be re-surveyed and removed when no eggs or larvae are present. All tropical milkweed will be replaced with native narrowleaf milkweed (*Asclepias fascicularis*) following construction. OR	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		b. If monarch eggs and larvae are not present, any tropical milkweed populations in the project area should be replanted with native narrowleaf milkweed and other nectar-providing plants following construction activities. All tropical milkweed on the property will be assessed for the absence of monarch eggs and larvae and replaced with narrowleaf milkweed after construction.	
BIO Impact 2: The project could directly and indirectly impact the riparian wetland habitat associated with Oil Creek during both construction and operation as a reconnaissance survey suggests there may be approximately 0.3 acre of regulated aquatic resources associated with Oil Creek. Impacts during construction and operation could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. b)	Significant	**BIO/mm-2.1:** Impacts to Oil Creek may be avoidable but are subject to final project design. To protect sensitive and regulated aquatic resources associated with Oil Creek, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-2.1a or BIO/mm-2.1b) shall be implemented: a. Full avoidance of Oil Creek, including riparian habitats. To attain full avoidance of Oil Creek, construction and ground disturbance shall not occur within 125 feet of the centerline of Oil Creek. The limits of riparian habitat shall be flagged and construction fencing erected to clearly denote the limits of construction. No overnight staging of equipment or materials shall occur within the protected "no work" zone as delineated by the fencing. Storing, fueling, and equipment maintenance shall not occur in locations where spilled materials could potentially enter Oil Creek and its associated riparian habitat. Spill kits/absorbent clean-up materials shall be available on-site. All equipment and vehicles shall be checked and maintained daily to prevent spills of fuel, oil, and other hazardous materials. A designated staging area shall be established for vehicle/equipment parking and storage of fuel, lubricants, and solvents a minimum of 100 feet outside of the protected zone. All fueling and maintenance activities shall take place in the designated staging area. OR b. If full avoidance of Oil Creek and a designated "no work" buffer is not possible after determination of final design, the following measures shall be required: i. A formal aquatic resources delineation shall be implemented to determine the jurisdictional boundaries of the Oil Creek feature. The delineation shall determine the limits of potentially regulated aquatic resources, the riparian features, and an appropriate buffer for protection (the "protected zone"). The aquatic resources delineation shall identify all appropriate jurisdictional agencies and be used in securing all applicable permits prior to construction and after a	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		project final design has been determined. At the discretion of the regulatory agencies, the requirements of the permits may supplement or exceed the requirements of this measure. If permits are required, all environmental requirements of the regulatory permits shall be implemented, and the executed permits shall be kept on-site. ii. Within the riparian habitat and buffer, vegetation removal shall be kept to the minimum necessary to removed diseased and/or non-native vegetation and to implement the features of the Master Plan. Initial removal of vegetation within the riparian habitat shall be monitored full-time by a qualified biologist, and weekly spot-check monitoring shall continue throughout the construction of the project. Work within riparian habitat shall not be conducted during or immediately after a rain event. iii. A restoration plan, prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist, shall be prepared and implemented. The restoration plan will include detailed success criteria, typically associated with 80% relative cover to pre-project baseline conditions with less than 10% invasive cover, to provide replacement habitat at an equal or better value than the existing Oil Creek riparian corridor, within 5 years of planting. The final plan shall be approved by the County of Los Angeles Museum of Natural History, the County Department of Regional Planning, and the permitting agencies (if any). At a minimum, restoration requirements included in the plan and implemented shall include the following: • Native tree replacement requirements consistent with the requirements of the Plant Pest and Disease Management Plan (BIO/mm-6.2). • A detailed planting scheme identifying the location and sizes of all container stock. • Details on planned irrigation which shall provide for successful plant establishment; survival should occur without supplemental irrigation for at least 2 years.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• Annual monitoring, maintenance, and adaptive management measures and annual reporting requirements. iv. The riparian habitat and buffer specified in the aquatic resources delineation shall be flagged and construction fencing erected to clearly denote the limits of the protected zone. No overnight staging of equipment or materials shall occur within the protected zone. Storing, fueling, and equipment maintenance shall not occur in locations where spilled materials could potentially enter Oil Creek and its associated riparian habitat. Spill kits/absorbent clean-up materials shall be available on-site. All equipment and vehicles shall be checked and maintained daily to prevent spills of fuel, oil, and other hazardous materials. A designated staging area shall be established for vehicle/equipment parking and storage of fuel, lubricants, and solvents a minimum of 100 feet outside of the protected zone. All fueling and maintenance activities shall take place in the designated staging area. v. Mitigation requirements and permit conditions shall be conveyed to construction crews prior to construction.	
BIO Impact 3: The project could directly and indirectly impact the Lake Pit lakebed and its associated riparian habitat during both construction and operation as a reconnaissance survey suggests there may be approximately 1.2 acres of regulated aquatic resources associated with the Lake Pit. Impacts during construction and operation could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. b)	Significant	**BIO/mm-3.1:** This mitigation measure only applies to project features implemented in and around the Lake Pit, including the pedestrian path and bridge. The following measures shall be implemented prior to the implementation of these features: a. A formal aquatic resources delineation shall be implemented to determine the jurisdictional boundaries of the Lake Pit features. The delineation shall determine the limits of potentially regulated aquatic resources, the riparian features, and an appropriate buffer for protection (the "protected zone"). The aquatic resources delineation shall identify all appropriate jurisdictional agencies and be used in securing all applicable permits prior to construction and after a project final design has been determined. At the discretion of the regulatory agencies, the requirements of the permits may supplement or exceed the requirements of this measure. If permits are required, all environmental requirements of the regulatory permits shall be implemented, and the executed permits shall be kept on-site.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		b. Within the riparian habitat and buffer, vegetation removal shall be kept to the minimum necessary to remove diseased and/or non-native vegetation and to implement the features of the Master Plan. Initial removal of vegetation within the riparian habitat shall be monitored full-time by a qualified biologist, and weekly spot-check monitoring shall continue throughout the construction of the project. Work within riparian habitat shall not be conducted during or immediately after a rain event. c. A restoration plan, prepared by a qualified restoration ecologist, shall be prepared and implemented. The restoration plan will include detailed success criteria, typically associated with 80% relative cover to pre-project baseline conditions with less than 10% invasive cover, to provide replacement habitat at an equal or better value than the existing riparian vegetation within and along the margins of the Lake Pit, within 5 years of planting. The final plan shall be approved by the County of Los Angeles Museum of Natural History, the County Department of Regional Planning, and the permitting agencies (if any). At a minimum, restoration requirements included in the plan and implemented shall include the following: • A detailed planting scheme identifying the location and sizes of all container stock. • Details on planned irrigation which shall provide for successful plant establishment; survival should occur without supplemental irrigation for at least 2 years. • Five years of annual monitoring, maintenance, and adaptive management measures and annual reporting requirements. d. The riparian habitat and buffer specified in the aquatic resources delineation shall be flagged and construction fencing erected to clearly denote the limits of the protected zone. No overnight staging of equipment or materials shall occur within the protected zone. Storing, fueling, and equipment maintenance shall not occur in locations where spilled materials could potentially enter the Lake Pit and its associated riparian habitat. Spill kits/absorbent clean-up materials shall be available on-site. All equipment and vehicles shall be checked and maintained daily to prevent spills of fuel, oil, and other hazardous materials. A designated staging area shall be established for vehicle/equipment parking and storage of	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		fuel, lubricants, and solvents a minimum of 100 feet outside of the protected zone. All fueling and maintenance activities shall take place in the designated staging area. e. Mitigation requirements and permit conditions shall be conveyed to construction crews prior to construction.	
BIO Impact 4: The project site may contain potential jurisdictional wetland/aquatic resources in and along Oil Creek and the Lake Pit. Project construction and operation may result in impacts to wetland habitat. Impacts during construction and operation of the project could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. c)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures BIO/mm-2.1 and BIO/mm-3.1.	Less than significant
BIO Impact 5: The project could directly impact nesting birds during project construction and temporally impact nesting bird habitat during project operation. Impacts during construction and operation of the project could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. d)	Significant	**BIO/mm-5.1:** To avoid impacts to nesting birds, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-5.1a or BIO/mm-5.1b) shall be implemented: a. If possible, no vegetation trimming, pruning, removal, construction, or grading shall occur during the nesting and breeding season (January 1 through September 15). OR b. If activities associated with vegetation trimming, pruning, removal, construction, or grading are necessary during the bird nesting and breeding season (January 1 through September 15), the following measures shall be implemented: • A qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for active nests weekly, beginning 14 days prior to initiation of any new construction activities, with the last survey conducted no more than 3 days prior to the start of clearance/construction work. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed, additional pre-construction surveys should be conducted so that no more than 3 days have elapsed between the survey and ground-disturbing activities. • Active nests found within 100 feet of the construction zone shall be delineated with highly visible construction fencing or other exclusionary material that would inhibit entry by personnel or equipment into the buffer zone. The size of the buffer zone shall be at the discretion of the qualified biologist and shall be no less than 25 feet. Raptors may require a larger buffer zone, up to 300 feet. Installation of the exclusionary material shall be completed by construction personnel under the supervision of a	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		qualified biologist prior to initiation of construction activities. The buffer zone shall remain intact and maintained while the nest is active (i.e., occupied or being constructed by at least one adult bird) and until young birds have fledged and no continued use of the nest is observed, as determined by a qualified biologist. The barrier shall be removed by construction personnel only at the direction of the biologist. **BIO/mm-5.2:** New and replacement trees shall be 24-inch box specimen trees or larger to reduce temporary impacts to nesting birds. **BIO/mm-5.3:** To reduce the risk of birds striking or colliding with the building, new construction would include deterrent features on glass barriers, windows, and building elements likely to present imperceptible barriers for avian species. These features would include ceramic frit patterns and/or other features that meet the criteria from the American Bird Conservancy for bird friendly glazing.	
BIO Impact 6: Removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement of the 13 protected oak trees on the project site during project construction and operation could potentially conflict with the County of Los Angeles Oak Tree Ordinance. Impacts during construction and operation of the project could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. e)	Significant	**BIO/mm-6.1:** For oak trees within the project site that are to be retained in their current location, prior to construction, chain-link fencing shall be installed around the protected zone of the trees (5 feet beyond the dripline, the outermost extent of the tree's branches, or 15 feet from the trunk, whichever is greater). The fencing shall remain in place throughout the entire period of construction. Any excavation or grading allowed within the protected zone shall be limited to hand tools or small hand-powered equipment. This measure shall only apply to existing trees where the limits of construction work are within 20 feet of the protected zone. In addition, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-6.1a or BIO/mm-6.1b) shall be implemented: a. If possible, removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement of the oak trees at the Tar Pits site shall be avoided. b. If modification (removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement) of protected oaks is required, coordination with the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning shall occur prior to commencement of any work on-site. Any encroachment or removal requests must be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning for consistency with County policies and ordinances relating to oak tree protection prior to commencement of any work on-site. Although an oak tree permit is not required, measures to mitigate for impacts to oak trees shall include the following:	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• Removed oak trees shall be mitigated by planting coast live oaks at a 2:1 ratio on the project site. Each replacement tree shall be at least a 15-gallon specimen. • The replacement oaks shall be monitored for a period of 5 years, with any failures resulting in a new oak being planted and initiation of a new 5-year monitoring period for the replanted tree. **BIO/mm-6.2:** A Plant Pest and Disease Management Plan shall be prepared prior to initiation of landscape planting and developed in consultation with an International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist. The Plant Pest and Disease Management Plan shall define methods to ensure new plant materials (container stock) are free of insect pests and diseases prior to delivery to the project site. Implementation of the Plant Pest and Disease Management Plan shall occur through the life of the project; modification and adaptation may occur to ensure applicability and viability of the plan.	
BIO Impact 7: Construction and operation of the project would not 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 would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. f)	No impact	No mitigation required.	N/A
BIO Impact 8 (Cumulative): During construction and operation, the project has the potential to contribute considerably to cumulative impacts to biological resources.	Significant	The project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1, BIO/mm-5.2, BIO/mm-6.1, and BIO/mm-6.2.	Less than significant
Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources			
CR-ARCH Impact 1: During project construction, the project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an unknown archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Construction impacts could be significant. Project operation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an unknown archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. No operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold v. b)	Significant	**CR-ARCH/mm-1.1:** Retain a Qualified Archaeologist. a. Prior to initiating any ground-disturbing activities, a Qualified Archaeologist shall be retained. A Qualified Archaeologist is defined as one who meets the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Standards for professional archeology and those defined for a Principal Investigator by the Society for California Archaeology (SCA). The qualifications shall be presented as part of a resume for at least one primary point of contact who will act in capacity as the Qualified Archaeologist but also other key staff who may serve in this role. The resume shall demonstrate their SOI and SCA qualifications and shall be subject to approval by the County.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		b. Ground-disturbing activities shall include excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site. The Qualified Archaeologist shall carry out and ensure proper implementation of the mitigation measures and regulatory compliance related to archaeological resources and, where appropriate, tribal cultural resources during the project. The Qualified Archaeologist shall be responsible for establishing a meeting schedule with Page Museum curators and collections managers during implementation of the project to address any outstanding questions or concerns that arise during mitigation efforts to ensure effective communication and coordination. c. No more than 21 days before ground-disturbing activities for the project commence, the Qualified Archaeologist shall submit a letter confirming that they have been retained consistent with the terms of the CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 and attach the professional resumes for all staff who may be acting in the capacity of the Qualified Archaeologist. **CR-ARCH/mm-1.2:** Prepare an Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Management Plan (AR-TCR Management Plan). a. Prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities, an AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared by the Qualified Archaeologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators and the NHMLAC Curator of Anthropology, who shall review and approve the AR-TCR Management Plan on behalf of the County. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared in conformance with Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1. b. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall include but not be limited to the following elements: i. Historical context statement, research design, the specific types of archaeological sites likely to be encountered. ii. Construction worker training program (described in CR-ARCH/mm-1.3). iii. Monitoring protocol for ground-disturbing activities that includes a framework for assessing the geoarchaeological setting to determine whether	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Impacts Following Mitigation
			sediments capable of preserving archaeological remains are present in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment and include a protocol for identifying the conditions under which additional or reduced levels of monitoring (e.g., spot-checking) may be appropriate. The duration and timing of the monitoring shall be determined based on the rate of excavation, geoarchaeological assessment, and, if present, the quantity, type, and spatial distribution of archaeological resources identified.	
		iv.	Limited program of archaeological presence/absence testing within naturally deposited asphaltic or non-asphaltic alluvial sediments before they are mechanically excavated. In particular, the area of the new museum, promenade, and parking lot expansion shall be further investigated. These investigations shall be conducted via a combination of archaeological units, hand tools, and mechanical trenching. The methods used to conduct the limited archaeological testing shall be coordinated with contractors to ensure that sufficient time is afforded to evaluate the significance <u>of</u> any identified resources, and if they are found to be significant, time to develop and implement a treatment plan appropriate to the type of resource. The timing of any such efforts shall be conducted in localized areas so that delays to project earthwork activities are minimized while allowing archaeological materials to be identified in a manner that retains the scientific integrity of the discovery.	
		v.	An approach to evaluate newly identified site components, if applicable, as contributors to the significance of LAN-159/H as a “historical resource” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a “unique archaeological resource” pursuant to PRC 21083.2(g). If any archaeological resources are identified and are found not to be significant or do not retain integrity, then they shall be recorded to a level sufficient to document the contents and condition.	
		vi.	Potential treatment plans to be implemented in the event a newly discovered archaeological resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		contribute to the significance of the site as a historical resource based on California Register of Historical Resources criteria or a unique archaeological resource in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall require that if the treatment plans outlined therein are found to be infeasible or other alternatives are proposed, the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the project proponent and the County to amend the AR-TCR Management Plan with a formal treatment plan that would reduce impacts to the resource(s). The treatment plans stated in the AR-TCR Management Plan or prepared after the discovery of a historical resource, shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment and if it is determined avoidance is not feasible, treatment may include but not be limited to any of the following depending on the type of resource and the significance evaluation: • Native American archaeological site components. Data recovery shall be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant where significance is determined under CRHR Criterion 4 or as a unique archaeological resources and integrity is retained. Additional treatment measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts to the component as a tribal cultural resource, which is to be carried out in consultation with the Tribal Consultants and after considering the status of the discovery as a tribal cultural resource. • Historical archaeological site components. If a historical archaeological component of the site is present and found to retain integrity, data recovery shall be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant. vii. Discovery and processing protocol for inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources that are encountered when an Archaeological Monitor is not present. viii. A process by which recovered materials will be prepared for curation at the Page Museum or the Research and Collections Department at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~at the Los Angeles Exposition Park~~, as directed by Page Museum curators and collections managers, and in consultation with Tribal Consultants. The curation shall ensure their long-term preservation and allow access to interested scholars and shall be done at the expense of the County and/or the Foundation. If the materials are Native American in origin or any item of cultural patrimony, the manner of their handling and long-term curation may require additional consultation with the appropriate Native American community that shall be determined as part of a tribal consultation process to be conducted by the County who shall be responsible for the disposition of these materials. ix. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall summarize the requirements for tribal coordination ~~during~~ in the event of an inadvertent discovery of Native American archaeological resources, including the applicable regulatory compliance measures or conditions of approval for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources to be carried out in concert. **CR-ARCH/mm-1.3:** Conduct an archaeological awareness training. a. The Qualified Archaeologist or a designee working under their direction shall provide training to on-site project personnel who are responsible for overseeing ground-disturbing activities (i.e., a foreman or site supervisor) and machine operators. The initial training shall be conducted prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in the project site. The training shall brief the crews on the regulatory compliance requirements and applicable mitigation measures that must be adhered to during ground-disturbing activities for the protection of	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		archaeological resources. As an element of the worker training, the Qualified Archaeologist or their designee shall advise the construction crews on proper procedures to follow if an unanticipated archaeological resource is discovered during construction, including the authority of Archaeological Monitor(s) to temporarily halt or redirect work away from such a discovery. Workers shall be shown examples of the types of archaeological resources that would require notification of the archaeologist, if encountered. The workers shall be provided with contact information for the Qualified Archaeologist and their designee(s) as part of a brief handout summarizing the critical components of the training. Once the ground-disturbing activities have commenced, the need for additional or supplemental worker trainings shall be determined by the Qualified Archaeologist based upon consultation with project personnel. b. Within five days of completing each training, a list of those in attendance shall be provided by the Qualified Archaeologist to a point of contact designated by the Museum of Natural History. **CR-ARCH/mm-1.4:** Monitoring for Archaeological Resources. a. At least one Archaeological Monitor working under the direction of the Qualified Archaeologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities to implement the AR-TCR Management Plan. The Archaeological Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities when an archaeological resource, suspected resource, or archaeologically sensitive sediments are encountered, as determined by the Qualified Archaeologist in consultation with the Page Museum curators. The presence/absence testing protocol shall be implemented within the asphaltic alluvial sediments that have elevated archaeological sensitivity as stipulated in the AR-TCR Management Plan and conducted in concert with Tribal Monitors and applicable tribal cultural measure measures. The Qualified Archaeologist and Archaeological Monitor shall document the results of the presence/absence testing and allow ground-disturbing activities to proceed in the sediments with archaeological sensitivity once the archaeological and tribal monitors have confirmed the absence of resources. The Archaeological Monitor shall continue to monitor the ground-disturbing activities with the depths assessed by the presence/absence testing. Once the	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		Archaeological Monitor identifies sediments or depths of excavation that are not capable of containing or are unlikely to contain archaeological resources, a corresponding reduction of monitoring coverage would be appropriate, and may be recommended by the Qualified Archaeologist. The Archaeological Monitor shall complete a daily written log documenting construction activities and observations, which shall be included in the final report. The number of Archaeological Monitors shall be determined by the County, based on the scale of ground-disturbing activities and a reasonable degree of effort required to implement the mitigation measures. b. In the event that potentially significant archaeological resources are exposed during construction, work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within 8 meters [25 feet]) shall stop until the Qualified Archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find, with input from the tribal monitor if the discovery is affiliated with Native Americans and is also being assessed as tribal cultural resources. Construction activities may continue in other areas in coordination with the Qualified Archaeologist and, if applicable, tribal monitors. c. At the conclusion of all ground-disturbing activities the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a technical report documenting the methods and results of all work completed under the AR-TCR Management Plan, including, if any, treatment of archaeological materials, results of artifact processing, analysis, and research, and evaluation of the resource(s) for the California Register of Historical Resources. The format and content of the report shall follow the California Office of Historic Preservation's Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format. Any archaeological resources identified shall be documented on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation 523-Series Forms. The report shall be prepared under the supervision of a Qualified Archaeologist and submitted to curators of the Page Museum for initial review (on behalf of the Museum of Natural History, as the County departmental unit), and final copies shall be submitted to the County. The report shall be completed with 12 months of completion of the monitoring, unless other arrangements are required, as documented in writing and approved by the County, given the nature of the discovery, in which case a revised date can be determined through	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		consultation with the Museum of Natural History. The final draft of the report shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center and the Tribal Consultants.	
CR-ARCH Impact 2: Construction of the project could disturb previously unidentified human remains if present within the project site. Construction impacts could be significant. Operation of the project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. No operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold v. c)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through CR-ARCH/mm-1.4.	Less than significant
CR-ARCH Impact 3 (Cumulative): Prior to the consideration of proposed mitigation measures, construction of the project could result in significant contributions to cumulative impacts related to the disturbance and destruction of archaeological resources pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and human remains. Cumulative construction impacts could be significant.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through CR-ARCH/mm-1.4. These measures put forward a process that ensures any new archaeological resources or new components of existing historical resources would be identified, inventoried, and evaluated as contributors to the historical significance of the resource, and treated appropriately if found to be a contributing element, which incorporates input from culturally and geographically affiliated California Native American tribes.	Less than significant
Cultural Resources – Historical Resources			
CR-HIST Impact 1: As a result of project construction, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Historical Resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of two identified historical resources: the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the George C. Page Museum. This impact would be significant. Project operation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historic resources pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. No operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold V. a)	Significant	**CR-HIST/mm-1.1:** Impacts to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum resulting from project implementation shall be reduced through the ongoing input to the Design Team from a qualified Historic Architect, as the project design progresses. The Historic Architect shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Architecture as defined by the National Park Service and in accordance with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in designing, developing, and reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary's Standards. The Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify options for new construction, upgrades, stabilization, repairs, and rehabilitation activities that will facilitate compliance with the Secretary's Standards. This historic preservation input to the Design Team shall begin in the earliest phases of schematic design phase possible and extend throughout the development of 50% Construction Drawings. For new construction, the Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify options and opportunities for: (1) ensuring compatibility of scale and character for new construction, site and	Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		landscape features, and circulation corridors, (2) ensuring that new construction, in materials, finishes, design, scale, and appearance, is compatible but differentiated from historic contributors and character-defining features; and (3) ensuring that new construction is designed and sited in such a way that it reinforces and strengthens, as much as feasible, character-defining site plan features, landscaping, and circulation corridors. For modernization and upgrade projects, the Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify project options that facilitate compliance with the Secretary's Standards. The Historic Architect shall review proposed materials, finishes, window treatments/configuration, and other details to ensure compliance with the Secretary's Standards. The Historic Architect shall provide specifications for architectural features or materials requiring restoration or removal, maintaining and protecting relevant features in place, or on-site storage. Specifications shall include detailed drawings or instructions where historic features may be impacted. The Historic Architect shall document the input provided to the Design Team in Memoranda for the Record at the Schematic and 50% Construction Documents phases. A Draft Memorandum for the Record shall be provided to interested parties including the Los Angeles Conservancy and the Los Angeles County Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. The Historic Architect shall participate in pre-construction and construction monitoring activities, as appropriate, to facilitate conformance with the Secretary's Standards and/or lessening of material impairment to historical resources. **CR-HIST/mm-1.2:** An Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional and implemented for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. Once complete, the Draft Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be provided to interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be finalized prior to the commencement of construction activities. Specific requirements for the Inventory and Treatment Plan are provided below: • A qualified historic preservation professional shall be retained to prepare the Inventory and Treatment Plan. The historic preservation professional shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for History and/or Architectural History as defined by the National Park Service and in accordance	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in CEQA review of historic resources and reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary's Standards. A landscape architect or landscape specialist with a minimum of five (5) demonstrated years of experience working with historic landscapes shall contribute to preparation of the Inventory and Treatment Plan to identify historic landscaping and trees that fall within the period of significance for the historic district (up to 1977). • The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and State Office of Historic Preservation. • The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall supplement the historic resources survey completed and documented in the Historic Resources Technical Report for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan by documenting the character-defining features and existing conditions of those "contributing" (i.e., historically significant) components of the historical resource. The inventory shall include site plan features, commemorative plaques and statues, artwork and sculptures, and other extant contributors to the historic district. • The study shall include recommendations for annual maintenance activities, treatment and repair priorities, and maximum retention of remaining district contributors. All recommendations shall be designed to maximize retention of remaining contributors to the historic district and minimize the loss of character-defining features. The Final Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be used for the ongoing stewardship of the property following construction. **CR-HIST/mm-1.3:** ~~A Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-like Documentation Package~~ A historic documentation package shall be prepared to document the contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum prior to the authorization of demolition or construction activities. The documentation package shall emulate and include elements of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and/or the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS). The HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and shall be provided to interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. Documentation shall be in accordance with the applicable standards described in	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History shall be retained to prepare HABS/HALS -like documentation for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum. Required contents for the HABS/HALS-like package include the following: • Photographs: Photographic documentation will focus on the Page Museum and, within the historic district, those contributing elements (built, landscape, hardscape, paleontological, and natural features) slated for demolition, alterations, or adjacent new construction. Photographs shall include detail shots of contributing features and components slated for demolition, with overview and context photographs for the adjacent setting. Photographs shall be taken using a professional-quality single lens reflex (SLR) digital camera with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels. Digital photographs will be provided in electronic format. • Descriptive and Historic Narrative: The historian or architectural historian will prepare descriptive and historic narrative of the historical resources/features slated for demolition. Physical descriptions will detail each contributing component, with accompanying photographs, and information on how the resource fits within the broader historic district during its period of significance. The historic narrative shall draw upon previously prepared studies, including the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, as well as the La Brea Tar Pits Inventory and Treatment Plan prepared under Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2. The narrative shall also include a methodology section specifying the name of researcher, date of research, and sources/archives visited, as well as a bibliography. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate. Upon finalization of the HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package, a hard copy and digital copy shall be prepared and offered to the Seaver Center for Western History Research at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~Seaver Center for Western History~~	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		~~Research~~, University of Southern California Special Collections, and the Los Angeles Public Library. **CR-HIST/mm-1.4:** A Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Program shall be prepared and implemented. The Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Project shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History. The exhibit materials shall be drawn from previous studies including but not limited to the Inventory and Treatment Plan described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2 and the HABS/HALS-like documentation package described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.3, as well as other supplemental research materials as needed. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall focus on the history of the site, the people involved in the early ownership, development, and scientific discoveries and excavations, and the events leading to its donation to the County of Los Angeles, as well as on the site's development through the end of the period of significance for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, 1977. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program may include but not be limited to exhibit materials and interpretive panels, both exterior (e.g., as a series of panels in the park), interior (e.g., as a permanent exhibit in the Page Museum or new museum building), and online (on the museum website). The exhibit and interpretive program shall be designed for maximum public accessibility. The plan for the interpretive and commemorative program shall be detailed in an Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum to be prepared with the guidance of a qualified historic preservation professional. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall be completed within three (3) years of commencement of initial construction activities. The Draft Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum shall be reviewed by interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for comment. **CR-HIST/mm-1.5:** A pre-construction protection plan for historical resources shall be prepared prior to any major alteration or construction activities that may potentially damage historic resources or contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District or Page Museum. A qualified Historic Architect shall be retained to develop a Preservation Protection Plan that identifies potential risks to historical resources within or adjacent to the immediate project footprint. The Historic Architect shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Architecture as defined by the National Park Service and in	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		accordance with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary's Standards. The Preservation Protection Plan may include, but not be limited to, the following components: • Inclusion/mapping of the historical resource/contributing feature on any architectural drawings, site plans, and/or construction documents. • Site walk with Design Team and construction team representative to review staging areas for construction and construction sequence and activities, to identify areas of concern and to provide input for proactive avoidance of unforeseen impacts. • Procedures and timing for the placement and removal of temporary protection features, such as fencing and other barriers, around the historical resource/contributing feature. • Monitoring of the installation and removal of temporary protection features by the Historic Architect, or designee. • Post-construction survey to document the condition of the historic resource after project completion. • Preparation of a technical memorandum documenting the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of the historic resource and compliance with protective measures outlined in the Preservation Protection Plan. The Preservation Protection Plan shall be submitted in draft form to interested parties including the Los Angeles Conservancy and the Los Angeles County Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment.	
CR-HIST Impact 2 (Cumulative): Construction of the project would result in substantial adverse changes to the significance of a Historical Resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which would be considerable impacts contributing to cumulative historical resources impacts. Specifically, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of two identified historical resources: the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the George C. Page Museum. These direct construction impacts would also be significant. No operational impacts to historical resources would occur; therefore, contributions to cumulative impact would similarly not occur during the project's operational period.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5.	Significant and unavoidable

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Geology and Soils			
GEO Impact 1: The project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. Impacts associated with these issues would be less than significant during project construction and operation. The project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides during either project construction or operation. No impact would occur during project construction and operation related to landslides. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. a)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
GEO Impact 2: Through compliance with existing regulations, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant during project construction and operation. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
GEO Impact 3: The project could cause geologic instability at the project site related to subsidence as well as compressible and collapsible soils during project construction and operation. Impacts during construction and operation could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. c)	Significant	**GEO/mm-3.1:** To prevent subsidence of the ground surface within the project site, temporary dewatering shall be required during construction for excavations which extend below the existing groundwater level (i.e., greater than 10 feet below ground surface), anticipated for deepest excavations associated with the proposed Page Museum one-story addition, as excavations will be required for construction of the proposed mat foundation and associated new utility placement. Dewatering activities shall be conducted as follows: a. Dewatering shall be performed prior to excavation. Temporary dewatering shall be performed during the construction stage, prior to beginning any excavation which will extend beneath the groundwater. The Construction Contractor shall decide the proper timeline which will permit a dry environment for the excavation work and prevent water seepage into the excavation. b. The design of a temporary dewatering system shall be performed by an experienced, qualified dewatering contractor. Prior to proceeding with the actual design of	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		the dewatering system, a test installation shall be constructed to verify the design's effectiveness. c. The dewatering system shall be designed to lower the site groundwater sufficiently to permit a dry environment and to prevent water seepage from the temporary perimeter cut slopes. The design shall balance the soil conditions with well spacing and well depth. Recommendations for well design provided in the project's Geology and Soil Discipline Report shall be incorporated into the final design of the dewatering system, including: • Installation of relatively closely spaced wells around the excavation perimeter, referred to as well points • Wells shall include perforated casing with annular space filled with suitable filter material • Well points shall extend past the depth of proposed excavation • Elements of current dewatering system within the Lake Pit shall be incorporated, including collection piping, sump pumps, a sand-oil separator device, and a micro-filter device. In addition, separator and filter devices shall be considered for temporary dewatering pumps to help maintain the system's efficiency and increase the amount of time prior to the pumps being plugged up with tar. d. Groundwater shall be pumped from the tar sands and is anticipated to contain a relatively high percentage of tar. The tar shall be removed, and the groundwater treated in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements prior to disposal. **GEO/mm-3.2:** To ensure proper design and stability of structures to be constructed on existing artificial fill or upper alluvial soils, the excavation and replacement of existing compressible materials within the areas of the proposed improvements shall be required. Excavation and replacement shall consist of complete removal of artificial fill and/or compressible surficial alluvial soil beneath the areas of the proposed improvements and replacement with compacted structural fill, with an anticipated artificial fill depth ranging between 1 and 8 feet below ground surface based on review of existing explorations performed within or adjacent to the project site. This value will be confirmed after completion of subsurface explorations during the final geotechnical design to further characterize the subsurface conditions underlying the improvement areas (i.e., compressibility of the soft layers and the depth to firm material). Due to the anticipated soil contamination, on-site soils are	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		not anticipated to be suitable for reuse as fill material and shall be exported for proper remediation and disposal in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements. The final engineering design of the structures included in the project shall be reviewed and approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division.	
GEO Impact 4: The project site is located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating a potentially significant risk to life and/or property during project construction and operation. Impacts could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. d)	Significant	**GEO/mm-4.1:** To address impacts related to expansive soils within the project site, additional expansion testing shall be required as part of the final geotechnical design for the project. Based on the outcome of the additional expansion testing, one or more of the following options shall be implemented to address expansive soils: a. Over-excavation: Over-excavation and replacement of the expansive material with a soil having low or non-expansive potential, with the upper 2 feet of expansive soil (where encountered at the site) being removed and replaced with non-expansive fill. OR b. Soil Treatment: Chemical treatment, such as lime treatment. This generally involves mixing a certain percentage of the chemical into the subgrade soil, compacting the mixed soil-chemical material, and then allowing the material curing time prior to continuing construction. The percentage of the chemical addition and the associated engineering properties of the improved soil will need to be determined through geotechnical laboratory testing. If chosen, the final geotechnical design shall provide design and construction recommendations related for this option. OR c. Structural Design: The structural design option would involve increasing the bearing pressure on the soil and/or extending the foundation or flatwork depth. However, while increasing the bearing pressure reduces the potential impact from expansive soil, it does increase the potential impact associated with excessive settlement. If this option is elected, settlement evaluation shall be performed as part of the final geotechnical design and based on the proposed loading conditions. Loading conditions shall be limited to a maximum differential of 1 inch over a 20-foot span within the structure. The final design solution will be determined by the project engineer consistent with the above measures. The final engineering design of the structures included in the project shall be reviewed and	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division.	
GEO Impact 5: The project would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems during either project construction or operation. No impact would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. e)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
GEO Impact 6: Given the high paleontological sensitivity of the project site, ground-disturbing activities associated with project construction could damage paleontological resources that may be present below the surface. Construction impacts could be significant. Operation of the project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature. No operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VII. f)	Significant	**GEO/mm-6.1: Retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist (Project Paleontologist):** Prior to the start of construction and/or ground-disturbing activities, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation, at the direction of the County, shall retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist (Project Paleontologist) who meets or exceeds the professional standards defined by the SVP (2010), and who has specific experience overseeing mitigation projects in Pleistocene deposits of the Los Angeles Basin. The SVP (2010:10) defines a qualified professional paleontologist as: "a practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontological community as a professional and can demonstrate familiarity and proficiency with paleontology in a stratigraphic context." The Project Paleontologist shall have a graduate degree in paleontology or geology, and/or a publication record in peer reviewed journals; have demonstrated competence in field techniques, preparation, identification, curation, and reporting; have at least 2 full years of professional experience as assistant to a qualified professional paleontologist with administration and project management experience (supported by a list of projects and referral contacts); have proficiency in recognizing fossils in the field and in determining their significance; have expertise in local geology, stratigraphy, and biostratigraphy; and have experience collecting vertebrate fossils in the field (SVP 2010). The Project Paleontologist and Page Museum curators and collections managers shall meet weekly during scheduled ground-disturbing activities associated with the construction of the project to address any outstanding questions or concerns that arise during mitigation efforts to ensure effective communication and coordination. The Project Paleontologist shall oversee all regulatory compliance measures, shall oversee mitigation protocols related to paleontological resources, and shall be a point of contact for the Page Museum curators and County officials. A professional resume or curriculum vitae of the Project Paleontologist shall be submitted to the County for approval prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities. **GEO/mm-6.2: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Management Plan:** After finalization of the engineering, design, and	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		grading plans for the project and prior to the start of preconstruction ground-disturbing activities, a Paleontological Resources Management Plan (PRMP) shall be prepared by the Project Paleontologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators, who shall review and approve the final PRMP on behalf of the County ~~and Natural History Museum~~. The PRMP shall define the processes and procedures for paleontological monitoring and fossil excavation based on the nature of ground-disturbing activities required for project. The PRMP shall: a. Incorporate the results of the Paleontological Resources Technical Report (SWCA 2023), the final geotechnical investigation, and the final engineering/grading plans for the project. b. Require all construction personnel to attend a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training to be presented by the Project Paleontologist, or their designee. c. Define the processes and procedures for coordinating and communicating with responsible parties and stakeholders (including but not limited to the contractors, consultants, County officials, and the Page Museum curators and collections managers), when construction activities would be halted due to discovery and subsequent salvage efforts during ground-disturbing activities, and when regularly scheduled meetings between the Project Paleontologist and the Page Museum curators and collections managers would be required. d. Outline a procedure whereby mechanical excavation is conducted to remove any non-fossil-bearing sediments or soils subject to environmental soil remediation, such that adequate time is afforded to identify fossil localities and to conduct scientific salvage operations to a feasible extent (see Millington and Dietler 2023); the timing of scientific fossil salvage operations during initial grading should be given special considerations in the PRMP such that delays to earthwork activities are minimized while allowing paleontological material to be salvaged at an acceptable level that retains the scientific integrity of the discoveries. e. Require full-time paleontological monitoring by qualified paleontological monitors who meet the standards of the SVP (2010) and shall be supervised by the Project Paleontologist; qualified paleontological monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities to record and salvage fossil discoveries as they are unearthed to allow for potentially significant fossils to	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		be collected with their scientific integrity intact to the extent feasible and practical. f. Discuss unanticipated fossil discovery and communication protocols if paleontological resources are discovered by non-paleontology staff working on the project in instances where paleontological monitors are documenting or recording paleontological resources discovered elsewhere within the project site. g. Discuss feasible monitoring procedures for each of the different ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to active observation or inspection of sediments during active ground disturbances, whether they be trenching, grading, excavating, drilling, or some other activity that disturbs sediments; inspection of sedimentary spoils spiles or cuttings, as well as backfill originating from Hancock Park that may contain asphaltum or fossil material; and/or matrix screening of spoils for small or microfossils as needed. h. Define fossil salvaging procedures, including but not limited to outlining the treebox method for asphaltum bearing large accumulations of fossils, salvaging of isolated fossils, matrix screening in the field for microfossils, and chain-of-custody procedures for transferring the fossil discoveries to the Page Museum curators or collection managers as they are exhumed from the project site. Because of the unique conditions of La Brea Tar Pits and the chemical considerations of working with asphaltum fossil deposits, any paleontological resource discoveries shall remain on-site with the Page Museum. The paleontological monitor shall record pertinent geologic data and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities. i. Require the Project Paleontologist to prepare a report of the findings of the monitoring efforts within 90 days after construction is completed. **GEO/mm-6.3: Conduct Worker Training:** The Project Paleontologist shall develop and present a WEAP training to educate the construction crew on the legal requirements for preserving fossil resources, as well as the procedures to follow in the event of an unanticipated fossil discovery. This training program shall be given to the crew before ground-disturbing work commences and shall include handouts to be given to new workers as needed.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		GEO/mm-6.4: Monitor for Paleontological Resources: Full-time monitoring shall be required during all ground-disturbing activities (including artificial fill or previously disturbed sediments), regardless of depth. Additionally, special considerations shall be given to the project design elements and geotechnical and soils remediation or hazard reduction recommendations, including but not limited to the paleontological screening of tar sands prior to disposal or treatment. Procedures and protocols for paleontological monitoring and fossil salvage shall be outlined in the PRMP. Monitoring shall: a. Be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor who meets the standards of the SVP (2010) and shall be supervised by the Project Paleontologist, who shall coordinate with the Page Museum curators and collections managers and County officials. The Project Paleontologist may periodically inspect construction activities to recommend adjusting the level of monitoring in response to subsurface conditions; however, modifications, such as increasing, reducing, or ceasing of paleontological monitoring, or any changes of the implementation of the PRMP, should be approved by Page Museum curators and the County ~~Natural History Museum~~. b. Include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations, grading, tar sand removal, and any other ground-disturbing activity that has the potential to impact sediments capable of preserving significant fossils. The Page Museum curators (or their representatives) and the paleontological monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, shall the fossils be determined significant or likely significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data while minimizing delays. Data collection procedures may require the support of construction contractors to carefully and efficiently collect field data and extract the fossils to allow construction to continue. c. Require grading and earthwork contractors to follow the guidance of Page Museum staff or the Project Paleontologist regarding the collection and/or extraction of paleontological resources. The paleontological monitor shall record pertinent geologic data and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities. Recovered fossils shall be directly retained by the Page Museum for later analysis, laboratory preparation, and	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		eventual curation if deemed significant or important by the Page Museum curators or collection managers. **GEO/mm-6.5: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Report:** Upon conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, the Project Paleontologist overseeing the implementation of the PRMP, including paleontological monitoring and fossil salvaging, shall prepare a final monitoring report that documents the paleontological monitoring efforts for the project and describes any paleontological resources discoveries observed and/or recorded during the life of the project. The final monitoring report and any associated data pertinent to the salvaged fossil specimen(s) shall be submitted to the Page Museum and the Research and Collections Department at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County within 90 days after construction is completed. If the project is developed in phases, the final report is only necessary at the completion of the last phase to be constructed. At the discretion of the County, if there are unanticipated gaps in the phases of construction or other reasons why the County would prefer phased final reports, multiple final reports could be prepared.	
GEO Impact 7 (Cumulative): The project would not result in significant contributions to cumulatively considerable impacts related to geotechnical or soils-related hazards; however, the project could result in significant contributions to cumulatively considerable impacts related to paleontological resources.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures GEO/mm-6.1 through GEO/mm-6.5.	Less than significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG Impact 1: During project construction, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would result in a significant impact on the environment. Project construction impacts would be less than significant. During project operation, the project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Project operation impacts could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VIII. a)	Significant	**GHG/mm-1.1:** The modifications to the George C. Page Museum and the development of the new museum shall not include the installation of natural gas infrastructure. Future operation of the new facilities shall not use natural gas–fired appliances. In addition, the project shall provide more electric vehicle charging stations than the mandatory requirements in the Los Angeles County Code, Title 31, Green Building Standards, electric vehicle charging space and charging station calculations (Code Section 5.106.5.3.3).	Less than significant
GHG Impact 2: The project could result in a significant impact related to consistency with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, specifically the potential conflict with the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS in relation to	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures TRA/mm-1.1.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
improving mobility and accessibility, transportation productivity, and encouraging active transportation. Impacts could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold VIII. b)			
GHG Impact 3 (Cumulative): The project could result in a significant contribution to the cumulative impact of GHG emissions and global climate change.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures GHG/mm-1.1 and TRA/mm-1.1.	Less than significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ Impact 1: During project construction, the project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction workers, facility employees, and the public could be exposed to hazardous materials associated with the naturally occurring tar seeps present within the project site through the required removal of contaminated soils to an off-site location. Impacts during project construction could be significant. Project operation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. a)	Significant	**HAZ/mm-1.1:** Prior to earthwork activities, the project contractor, in coordination with the LAFD and the County, through the Foundation, shall be required to prepare a Soil Management Plan (SMP) for the removal of contaminated soils and their transportation off-site. The SMP shall be prepared in accordance with all relevant and applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations that pertain to the transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and waste. The SMP shall: • Describe the methodology to identify and manage (reuse or off-site disposal) contaminated soil during soil excavation and/or construction; • Provide protocols for confirmation sampling, segregation and stockpiling, profiling, backfilling, disposal, guidelines for imported soil, and backfill approval from the DTSC Information Advisory on Clean Imported Fill Material; and • In addition, the LAFD may consult with other agencies (e.g., DTSC and the LARWQCB) if the nature of the contamination warrants the involvement of these agencies. **HAZ/mm-1.2:** The following requirements and precautionary actions shall be implemented when disturbing soil at the project site: • No soil disturbance or excavation activities shall occur without a project site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP). Any soil that is disturbed, excavated, or trenched due to on-site construction activities shall be handled in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, as well as sampled and analyzed by a certified laboratory for constituents in accordance with the accepting landfill's requirements (including testing for the presence of hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, heavy metals, and pesticides).	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• The contractor shall prepare a project-specific HASP. It is the responsibility of the contractor to review available information regarding project site conditions, including the SMP, and potential health and safety concerns in the planned area of work. The HASP shall describe the proposed construction activities and hazards associated with each activity. Hazard mitigation shall be presented in the HASP to limit construction-related risks to workers. The HASP shall include emergency contact numbers, maps to the nearest hospital, gas monitoring action levels, gas response actions, allowable worker exposure times, and mandatory personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements. The HASP shall specify Certificate of Competency action levels for construction workers as well as monitoring criteria for increasing the level of PPE. The HASP shall be signed by all workers on-site to demonstrate their understanding of the construction-related risks. • The contractor and each subcontractor shall require their employees who may directly come in contact with Suspect Soil (soil that is stained or odorous) to perform all activities in accordance with the contractor's HASP. If Suspect Soil is encountered, to minimize the exposure of other workers to potential contaminants on the project site, the contractor may erect temporary fencing around excavation areas with appropriate signage as necessary to restrict access and to warn unauthorized on-site personnel not to enter the fenced area. • There shall be no reuse of excavated soil deemed inappropriate for reuse as defined in the project-specific SMP. • The contractor shall conduct, or have its designated subcontractor conduct, visual screening of soil during activities that include soil disturbance. If the contractor or subcontractor(s) encounter any Suspect Soil, the contractor and subcontractor(s) shall immediately stop work and take measures to not further disturb the soils (e.g., cover suspect soil with plastic sheeting) and inform the Foundation and the environmental monitor. The Foundation shall identify the environmental monitor—an experienced professional trained in the practice of the evaluation and screening of soil for potential impact working under the direction of a licensed Geologist or Engineer—prior to the beginning of work.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• Prior to excavation activities, the contractor or designated subcontractor shall establish specific areas for stockpiling Suspect Soil, should it be encountered, to control contact by workers and dispersal into the environment, per the provisions provided in the SMP.	
HAZ Impact 2: Construction of the project could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment related to naturally occurring tar seeps and subsurface methane gas. Impacts during project construction could be significant. During project operation, hazardous vapors from subsurface methane gas could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts during project operation could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. b)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures HAZ/mm-1.1 and HAZ/mm-1.2. **HAZ/mm-2.1:** During construction activities at the project site, controls shall be in place to address the effects of subsurface gases and impacted soil and groundwater on workers and the public. During construction, the following shall be implemented: • Monitoring devices for methane and benzene shall be present to alert workers of elevated gas concentrations when subsurface soil-disturbing work is being performed. • Any trench or excavation wider than 18 inches and having a depth greater than 2× its narrowest width shall be monitored with a portable combustible gas detector. The portable detector shall have a resolution capable of reporting to 1% LEL (Lower Explosive Limit), or 0.1% by volume in air, or in parts per million (ppm). If concentrations of combustible gases reach or exceed 20% LEL, or 1.0% by volume in air, or 10,000 ppm, the trench or excavation shall be evacuated until such time as the gas concentrations are determined to be steadily below these levels. All welding and electrical equipment shall be removed from the trench/excavation until the area is deemed to be safe. Portable blowers are the most appropriate means of controlling combustible gas concentrations. The blower motors and appurtenant electrical wiring shall not be placed in the trench or excavation. • No welding, cutting, or other hot work shall be performed close to flammable tars which, when subjected to heat, might produce flammable or toxic vapors (per OSHA 1910.252(a)(3)(i)). Smoking should also be avoided when working near tar seeps. • Contingency procedures shall be in place if elevated gas concentrations are detected, such as the mandatory use of PPE, evacuating the area, and/or increasing ventilation within the immediate work area where the elevated concentrations are detected. • Workers shall be trained to identify exposure symptoms and implement alarm response actions.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• Soil and groundwater exposure during excavations shall be minimized to reduce the surface area which could off-gas. This shall be achieved by staggering exposed excavation areas. • Soil removed as part of construction shall be sampled and tested for off-site disposal in a timely manner. If soil is stockpiled prior to disposal, it shall be managed in accordance with the project's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. • Fencing shall be erected to limit public access and allow for gas dilution. The construction contractor can determine the appropriate type of fencing, as long as public access is restricted such that interaction with hazardous construction conditions does not occur. • All requirements of the project-specific HASP shall be implemented and followed as described in HAZ/mm-1.2. **HAZ/mm-2.2:** As part of the final project design, the project engineer shall develop and implement a methane mitigation system. The mitigation system, which would provide a barrier for hazardous vapors, methane, and tar, consists of a subslab venting system that exhausts to the atmosphere, a subslab impermeable gas/tar barrier membrane system, and a monitoring system consisting of probes above and below the gas barrier membrane. The monitoring program consists of routine (quarterly) monitoring and reporting to the County Public Works, Environmental Programs Division. The Environmental Programs Division shall also review the plans to see if the criteria meet the requirements of Los Angeles County Code 110.4 Methane Gas Hazards. Additionally, tar collection systems underneath the gas mitigation systems need to be evaluated by the engineer and by the county engineer to evaluate the performance of the overall system. A contingency plan should also be prepared to describe how matters shall be handled in the event that high concentrations of methane gas enter a building despite the mitigation measures. The inspection and periodic observations of membrane and vapor control measures shall be performed by the Vapor Barrier Engineer (i.e., the Engineer or his Designee). At a minimum, inspection/observation shall take place during the installation of the vent piping, after backfilling of the vent piping, during the installation of the vapor barrier, after the installation of the vapor barrier (prior to backfilling), during the placement of the protection course, immediately prior to placement of foundation concrete, during and at the completion of the vent riser installation for the vent piping, and at	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		the completion of construction prior to the issuance of the system certification and certification of occupancy.	
HAZ Impact 3: The project could introduce hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school during both construction and operation. Impacts during project construction and operation could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. c)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures HAZ/mm-1.1, HAZ/mm-1.2, HAZ/mm-2.1, and HAZ/mm-2.2.	Less than significant
HAZ Impact 4: The project site is not identified on any of the hazardous materials lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Construction and operation of the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as it relates to hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. d)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HAZ Impact 5: The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard during either project construction or operation. No impact would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. e)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HAZ Impact 6: The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan during either construction or operation. Construction and operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IX. f)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HAZ Impact 7 (Cumulative): Prior to the consideration of proposed mitigation measures, construction and operation of the project could result in hazardous materials impacts associated with the naturally occurring tar seeps and methane conditions present at the project site, including accidental spills or releases associated with the disposal, transport, and management of hazardous materials. If unaddressed, potential contributions to cumulative hazardous materials impacts could be significant.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures HAZ/mm-1.1, HAZ/mm-1.2, HAZ/mm-2.1, and HAZ/mm-2.2.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
HYD Impact 1: During project construction, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Construction impacts would be less than significant. Implementation of the project would increase impervious surfaces within the project site, and project operation would have the potential to contribute to the degradation of surface or groundwater quality. Operational impacts could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold X. a)	Significant	**HYD/mm-1.1:** The Foundation shall implement the following non-structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the life of the project: **Open Paved Areas and Biofiltration Planter Areas** • Regular sweeping of all open and planter areas, at a minimum, on a weekly basis in order to prevent dispersal of pollutants that may collect on those surfaces. • Regular pruning of the trees and shrubs in the planter areas to avoid formation of dried leaves and twigs, which are normally blown by the wind during windy days. These dried leaves are likely to clog the surface inlets of the drainage system when rain comes, which would result in flooding of the surrounding area due to reduced flow capacities of the inlets. • Trash and recycling containers shall be used such that, if they are to be located outside or apart from the principal structure, are fully enclosed and watertight in order to prevent contact of stormwater with waste matter, which can be a potential source of bacteria and other pollutants in runoff. These containers shall be emptied and the wastes disposed of properly on a regular basis. **Education and Training** • Annual training of employees on property management and proper methods of handling and disposal of waste shall be provided. Employees should understand the on-site BMPs and their maintenance requirements. **Landscape Management** • Landscaping shall be maintained using minimum or no pesticides. **Litter Control** • An adequate number of trash receptacles shall be provided and inspected regularly. Leaky receptacles shall be prepared or replaced. Receptacles shall be covered. • Prohibit/prevent dumping of liquid or hazardous wastes. Post “no hazardous materials” signs. Inspect and pick up litter daily and clean up spills immediately. Keep spill control materials available on-site.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		Housekeeping of Loading Docks • Loaded and unloaded items shall be moved indoors as soon as possible. **Catch Basin Inspection** • Stormwater pollution prevention information shall be provided. Owner shall be made aware that the following is to be followed: "Property owner shall not allow anyone to discharge anything to storm drains or to store or deposit materials so as to create potential discharge to storm drains." • Catch basins shall be inspected regularly. **Design and Construct Trash and Waste Storage Areas to Reduce Pollutant Introduction** • Trash and waste will be handled and stored for pickup adjacent to the loading dock. This limits the potential introduction of pollutants into the site. Trash and waste pickup will occur regularly. **Use Efficient Irrigation Systems and Landscaping Design** • Landscape shall be generally designed to provide an efficient and continuous irrigation system. • Landscape areas shall be designed to include plants that are friendly to the climate of Los Angeles. **Storm Drain Stencil Signage** • Stencil or label all storm drain inlets and catch basins, constructed or modified, within the project area with prohibitive language to prevent dumping of improper materials into the urban runoff conveyance system. **HYD/mm-1.2:** The Foundation shall ensure all structural and non-structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) are operated, monitored, and maintained for the life of the project pursuant to the following: • All structural BMPs shall be inspected, cleaned-out, and where necessary, repaired, at the following minimum frequencies: 1) prior to October 15th each year; 2) during each month between October 15th and April 15th of each year and, 3) at least twice during the dry season (between April 16th and October 14th of each year). • Debris and other water pollutants removed from structural BMPs during cleanout shall be contained and disposed of in a proper manner.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• The drainage system, the associated structures, and BMPs shall be maintained according to manufacturer's specification to ensure maximum pollutant removal efficiencies.	
HYD Impact 2: The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Construction and operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold X. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HYD Impact 3: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or increase surface water runoff in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, flooding, or an exceedance of stormwater drainage systems. Construction and operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold X. c)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HYD Impact 4: The project site is not in a flood hazard zone or tsunami zone and the risk of seiche is low. Therefore, there would be no risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation by these hazards. No construction or operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold X. d)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HYD Impact 5: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Construction and operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold X. e)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
HYD Impact 6 (Cumulative): Prior to consideration of the proposed mitigation measures, operation of the project could have the potential to contribute to the degradation of surface or groundwater quality. If unaddressed, potential contributions to cumulative impacts associated with degradation of surface or groundwater quality could be significant.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures HYD/mm-1.1 and HYD/mm-1.2.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
LUP Impact 1: The project would not include features that would physically divide an established community during construction and operation. No impact would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XI. a)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
LUP Impact 2: Implementation of the project would result in the alteration of designated historical resources and would be potentially inconsistent with the objectives, goals, and policies of the County's General Plan Conservation and Natural Resources Element, the City's General Plan Conservation Element, and the Wilshire Community Plan as they pertain to the protection of designated historical resources. Impacts would be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XI. b)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5.	Significant and unavoidable
LUP Impact 3 (Cumulative): The project would contribute incrementally toward cumulative effects on historical resources associated with the project and related land use policies protecting these resources (i.e., County of Los Angeles General Plan, the City of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Wilshire Community Plan). The potential inconsistencies are identified in Table 5.10-8. The project would contribute significantly to cumulative impacts to historic resources, which would be considered a significant impact.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5.	Significant and unavoidable
Noise and Vibration			
NOI Impact 1: During project construction, the project could generate a substantial increase (5 dBA Leq) in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, which could affect noise-sensitive land uses. As a result, the project could result in generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of established standards. Therefore, noise impacts resulting from project construction could be significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIII. a)	Significant	**NOI/mm-1.1:** The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction-related noise impacts: a. Operation of equipment used in construction, alteration, drilling, or demolition work shall be prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., Monday through Friday; before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday; and any time on Sundays or legal holidays. b. A temporary barrier shall be erected around active construction areas. The placement and height of the barrier shall be adjusted based on the specific location of construction activities within the site, ensuring that the barriers are positioned as close as feasible to the work area and are sufficiently tall to maximize effectiveness in minimizing direct noise transmission to surrounding areas,	Less than significant

such that a sound reduction of 10 dBA is achieved at the property lines on the east side of Curson Avenue and north side of 6th Street. Prior to the commencement of each construction phase, a phase-specific acoustic analysis shall be conducted to determine the optimal placement and configuration of noise barriers. In consultation with an acoustical engineer, the barrier configuration may be modified to address the specific conditions of phased construction, provided that the adjustments achieve an equivalent noise reduction outcome. ~~and impermeable 12-foot-high temporary barrier designed to provide a 10 dBA noise reduction, shall be erected along the eastern and northern sides of the project site boundary. This barrier shall be constructed in one of the following ways:~~

- ~~from acoustical blankets hung over or from a supporting frame, or~~
- ~~from commercially available acoustical panels lined with sound-absorbing material, or~~
- ~~from common construction materials such as plywood, provided that the barrier is designed with overlapping material at the seams to ensure that no gaps exist between the panels.~~

c. Noise levels from powered equipment or powered hand tools at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source or within 500 feet of a residential zone will be limited to 75 dBA, such limits shall not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. Technical infeasibility means that the noise limit cannot be achieved despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques during operation of the equipment.

d. All construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise-suppression devices.

e. Pneumatic tools used at the site shall be equipped with an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust to minimize noise levels.

f. Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptors as possible and shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds or insulated barriers when possible.

g. Prior to commencement of construction, a designated project contact person will directly notify the management of any surrounding residential properties located within 100 feet of the project site about the construction

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		schedule and activities and provide a contact number to address any noise-related complaints during construction. h. A designated point of contact shall be identified to address noise-related complaints during construction. The noise disturbance coordinator will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise.	
NOI Impact 2: During project operation, the project would not generate a substantial increase in ambient noise in excess of applicable standards or thresholds; noise impacts during project operation would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIII. a)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
NOI Impact 3: The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels either during project construction or operation; impacts related to groundborne vibration and noise levels would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIII. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
NOI Impact 4: Because the project is not located in the vicinity of an airstrip or airport, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels related to aircraft during either project construction or operation. No impact would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIII. c)	No impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A
NOI Impact 5 (Cumulative): The project would not contribute considerably to cumulative noise and/or vibration impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
Recreation			
REC Impact 1: The project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities during either project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVI. a)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
REC Impact 2: Construction of the project would include enhancements and modifications to existing recreational facilities within the 13-acre project site. These activities could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Construction impacts could be significant.	Significant	Implement construction-related Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1; AQ/mm 3.1; BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1 and 5.2, BIO/mm-6.1; CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through 1.4; GEO/mm-3.1 and 3.2, GEO/mm-4.1, GEO/mm-6.1 through 6.5; GHG/mm-1.1;	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Operation of the project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVI. b)		HAZ/mm-1.1 and 1.2, HAZ/mm-2.1 and 2.2; NOI/mm-1.1; TRA/mm-4.1 through 4.3; and TCR/mm-1.1 through 1.4.	
REC Impact 3 (Cumulative): Prior to the application of proposed project mitigation measures, the project could contribute to cumulative impacts associated with adverse physical effects on the environment. Cumulative construction impacts could be significant. Operation of the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts.	Significant	Implement construction-related Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1; AQ/mm 3.1; BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1 and 5.2, BIO/mm-6.1; CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through 1.4; GEO/mm-3.1 and 3.2, GEO/mm-4.1, GEO/mm-6.1 through 6.5; GHG/mm-1.1; HAZ/mm-1.1 through 1.3, HAZ/mm-2.1; NOI/mm-1.1; TRA/mm-4.1 through 4.3; and TCR/mm-1.1 through 1.4.	Less than significant
Transportation			
TRA Impact 1: The project could result in a significant impact related to consistency with transportation plans, programs, ordinances, or policies. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVII a)	Significant	**TRA/mm-1.1:** In consultation with the LADOT, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation (Foundation) shall prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to reduce museum employee and visitor vehicle trips and increase alternative modes such as walking, bicycling, public transit, and rideshare. The Foundation shall designate an existing member of staff as the on-site TDM Coordinator. This coordinator shall be responsible for monitoring and tracking employee and visitor mode share and annual reporting to LADOT. **Employee Strategies:** Information shall be distributed to employees and displayed on a bulletin board, display case, or kiosk (displaying transportation information) where the greatest number of employees are likely to see it. The following measures may be applied to reduce employee vehicle trips and VMT: • Provide a transportation information bulletin board on-site with public transit information, contact information for rideshare and transit, ridesharing promotional material, bike route and facility information, and listing of on-site services or facilities. • Provide facilities on-site to support bicycling to work, such as secure bike parking, showers, and lockers. • Encourage and support participation in Metro vanpool, including subsidies for participation. • Implement paid parking for employees. • Subsidize transit passes.	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		• Offer flexible work schedules and telecommuting, when feasible. **Visitor Strategies:** Transportation information for visitors shall be displayed on La Brea Tar Pits' website and distributed with physical marketing materials. The following measures may be applied to reduce visitor vehicle trips and VMT: • Advertise and offer discounted museum tickets for visitors who use public transit or a bicycle to visit the project. • Provide and maintain secure on-site bicycle parking for visitors and monitor usage to determine if additional bicycle racks are needed. o Provide wayfinding signage directing bicyclists from the visitor entrances to where on-site bicycle parking is located. o Ensure bicycle parking is well lit and monitored by staff. • Continue to have paid parking for visitors. • Coordinate with Metro to improve transit access and user comfort and encourage visitors to take local bus service or the future Purple Line extension to La Brea Tar Pits, through the following measures: o Improve pedestrian wayfinding between the planned Purple Line station, local bus stops, and La Brea Tar Pits. o Implement bus stop improvements such as shelters along Wilshire Boulevard bus stops that would be used by La Brea Tar Pits visitors. o Coordinate with Metro and the City of Los Angeles to ensure that safe and comfortable pedestrian facilities (such as ADA curb ramps and continental crosswalks) are available between local bus stops and the project entrances, including at the Curson Avenue/ Wilshire Boulevard intersection. • Coordinate with the City of Los Angeles to implement planned bikeways in the vicinity of the project site and contribute to the implementation of the bikeways. This includes planned bikeways along Wilshire Boulevard and West 6th Street.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
TRA Impact 2: The project would result in a net increase in VMT and would result in a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled. Impacts would be considered significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVII b)	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measure TRA/mm-1.1.	Significant and unavoidable
TRA Impact 3: Once developed, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature; impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVII c)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
TRA Impact 4: The project could result in inadequate emergency access during construction and operation. Project impacts would be potentially significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVII d)	Significant	**TRA/mm-4.1:** A construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be developed by the contractor, approved by the County, ~~and~~ the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), Caltrans, and LA Metro, and implemented to alleviate construction period impacts. The CTMP will include, but may not be limited to, the following restrictions: • Prohibition of construction worker parking on nearby residential streets. • Prohibition of construction-related vehicles parking or staging on surrounding public streets. • Prohibition of construction-related parking or staging on streets with bus service. • Temporary pedestrian and vehicular traffic controls (i.e., flag persons) during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways. • Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers shall be implemented as appropriate. • Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., shall occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible. • Avoidance of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc. from routing along congested local and state facilities, to the extent feasible. • Relocation and accommodation (as needed) of adjacent bus stops and access, to the extent feasible. **TRA/mm-4.2:** Consultation shall occur with the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) to analyze the project's emergency access design, including a review of the proposed vehicle access points. Construction activities and their impact on emergency access shall also be reviewed to ensure that the final design provides adequate	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		access to the project site and neighboring businesses and residences. **TRA/mm-4.3:** To improve emergency access safety and circulation, coordination shall occur with LADOT to explore the feasibility of implementing one or more of the following improvements: • Signal timing at the built-out intersection of Curson Avenue/Wilshire Boulevard shall be regularly updated to optimize traffic signal timing. In addition, the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak period bus-only lanes on Wilshire Boulevard shall be extended to the weekday midday and weekend midday peak hours to improve bus operations through that intersection. • Signal timing at the Curson Avenue/West 6th Street intersection shall be regularly updated to optimize splits. In addition, improve existing lane striping to extend the northbound left-turn lane at the intersection, and/or add an inbound left-turn lane at the project's Curson Avenue driveway. • Incorporate safety features to accommodate passenger pick-up and drop-off along West 6th Street when planned separated bike lanes are implemented. • Monitor driveway operations at Curson Avenue. • The County of Los Angeles does not have the authority to impose these measures because they are within the discretionally authority of the City of Los Angeles. Thus, while they are recommended, the County of Los Angeles is not required to implement them. However, the requirement to coordinate with the City and facilitate possible implementation of the above measures shall be required.	
TRA Impact 5 (Cumulative): The project would result in a significant contribution to cumulative transportation impacts by resulting in a net increase in VMT.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measure TRA/mm-1.1.	Significant and unavoidable
Tribal Cultural Resources			
TCR Impact 1: During project construction, the project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Sections 5020.1(k) and 5024.1. Construction impacts could be significant.	Significant	**TCR/mm-1.1:** Retain Tribal Consultants. a. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities on the project site associated with the proposed project, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno/ Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, and Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California shall be retained	Less than significant

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
Project operation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Sections 5020.1(k) and 5024.1. No operational impacts would occur. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XVIII. a, i. and ii)		as Tribal Consultants. Each of the Tribal Consultants shall provide the services of a representative, known as a Tribal Monitor. The Tribal Monitor(s) shall be present on-site and carry out actions described in the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Management Plan (AR-TCR Management Plan) and any actions required to comply with mitigation measures for tribal cultural resources. These actions shall include but not be limited to monitoring ground-disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined as excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing trees, clearing, driving posts or pilings, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site. The frequency of the monitoring services shall be provided on a rotational basis as outlined in TCR/mm-1.3. b. At least 21 days before any ground disturbing activities commence, each of the Tribal Consultants shall submit a letter of retention to the Museum of Natural History confirming that the that they have been retained consistent with the terms of the TCR/mm-1.1. **TCR/mm-1.2:** Prior to any ground-disturbing activities on the project site associated with the proposed project, the Tribal Consultants or Tribal Monitors shall provide a worker training to on-site project personnel responsible for supervising ground-disturbing activities (i.e., foreman or supervisor) and machine operators. The initial training shall be conducted prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in the project site. The worker training shall include but not be limited to any topics related to protocols related to tribal cultural resources, regulatory compliance requirements, monitoring procedures and stop-work restrictions, and any other applicable mitigation measures that must be adhered to during ground-disturbing activities for the protection of tribal cultural resources. As an element of the worker training, the Tribal Consultants or Tribal Monitors shall advise the construction crews on proper procedures to follow if an unanticipated tribal cultural resource is discovered during construction whether a Tribal Monitor is present or not. The Tribal Consultants or Tribal Monitors shall also provide the construction workers with contact information for the Tribal Consultants and Tribal Monitors. Once the ground disturbances have commenced, the need for additional or supplemental worker training shall be determined through consultation with the Tribal Consultants, and project proponent or their designated project supervisor. Within 5 days of completing a worker training, a list of those in attendance shall be provided to the Museum of Natural	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		History by the Tribal Consultants, the Qualified Archaeologist, or a designee of either parties. **TCR/mm-1.3:** Monitoring for Tribal Cultural Resources. a. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, a minimum of one Tribal Monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activities as stipulated in the AR-TCR Management Plan. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall establish a monitoring schedule in a manner that provides opportunities for each of the three Tribal Consultants to participate in monitoring throughout the project's duration and within specific project phases that involve ground-disturbing activities. The monitoring schedule shall be determined at the sole discretion of the Museum of Natural History. The Museum of Natural History or their designee shall notify each Tribal Consultant in advance of its assigned monitoring period to allow for adequate preparation and planning. The Qualified Archaeologist shall be responsible for coordinating and communicating with the Tribal Consultants to address the need for consistency in reporting of the results during the rotational monitoring process. If one Tribal Monitor is unable to attend on a given day, but another Tribal Monitor is present, ground disturbing work shall commence. The need for additional monitors exceeding the two respective Tribal Monitors shall be assessed if the areas subject to monitoring exceeds what can be reasonably covered. The Tribal Monitors shall work under the direction of their respective Tribal Consultant. The Tribal Monitors shall complete daily monitoring logs that provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities (the type of construction activities performed and location of ground-disturbing activities), sediment types, presence or absence of tribal cultural resources or potential tribal cultural resources, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribal Consultants. Monitor logs shall identify and describe any discovered tribal cultural resources or potential tribal cultural resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074(a), which includes but is not limited to Native American artifacts, remains, places of significance, as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs shall be provided to the project lead agency and the Qualified Archaeologist for purposes of summarizing in the monitoring report.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		b. The Tribal Monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities if a tribal cultural resource or potential tribal cultural resource is exposed during construction. If a tribal cultural resource or potential tribal cultural resource is identified, work in the immediate vicinity (not less than 50 feet) of the find shall stop unless another distance is determined by both the Tribal and Archaeological Monitors, which shall consider the nature of the find and the potential for additional portions of the resource to remain buried in the unexcavated areas of the project site. Construction activities may continue in other areas in coordination with the qualified archaeologist and tribal consultant. c. If a potential component of the existing tribal cultural resource (LAN-159/H) is identified, it shall be assessed by the Tribal Consultants as a tribal cultural resource in terms of its cultural value, based on tribal expertise, and supported by substantial evidence. If the discovery is archaeological in nature, then the assessment shall also incorporate the Qualified Archaeologist's evaluation as a potential contributor to the significance of LAN-159/H based on the California Register of Historical Resources criteria or as a unique archaeological resource, as specific in the AR-TCR Management Plan and in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment. Any identified tribal cultural resources shall be assessed by both Tribal Consultants and the materials shall be cataloged and stored at the Page Museum for the period in which the ground-disturbing activities are occurring. Further analysis and the disposition of any collected materials shall be determined through consultation with the Tribal Consultant, the County, and informed by the evaluation of the materials as elements that contribute to the significance of the archaeological resource. Any consultation required shall occur on an as-needed basis during the ground-disturbing activities and continue after tribal monitoring has concluded as part of the reporting process described in Part F of TCR/mm-1.4 and CR-ARCH/mm-1.4. d. If initial monitoring identifies no further sensitivity (i.e., sediments incapable of containing tribal cultural resources) below a certain depth or within a certain portion of the project site, a corresponding reduction of monitoring coverage would be appropriate. The reasoning for and scale of the recommended reduction shall be	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
		assessed by the Tribal Consultant in consultation with the Qualified Archaeologist and communicated to the Museum of Natural History in writing prior to reduction. Monitoring for tribal cultural resources shall be required until there is written confirmation from the County or a supervisor responsible for overseeing the ground-disturbing activities that there shall be no further ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project site, either for the duration of the project. e. Within one month of concluding the tribal cultural resources monitoring, the Tribal Consultants shall prepare a memo stating that the monitoring requirements have been fulfilled consistent with the terms of TCR/mm-1.3 and summarize the results of any finds and actions taken by the tribal monitor to implement the final measures related to tribal cultural resources. The memo shall be submitted to the Museum of Natural History and the Qualified Archaeologist to be attached to a final archaeological and tribal monitoring report prepared by the Qualified Archaeologist consistent with CR-ARCH/mm-1.4. **TCR/mm-1.4:** If human remains are encountered during construction all ground-disturbing work shall be immediately diverted from the discovery as directed by the Tribal Consultant and Qualified Archaeologist and based on consideration of the possibility that additional or multiple Native American human remains may be located in the project site, and after having considered whether the bones are human or faunal. Upon discovery of human remains, whether the archaeological or tribal monitor is present, the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office shall be notified, as prescribed in PRC Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner shall proceed as directed in Section 15064.5(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, and as specified in the TCRMMP, which require the coroner to notify the NAHC who will appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated accordingly. While the coroner determines whether the remains are Native American and the MLD is designated and notified, the discovery is to remain confidential and secure to prevent any further disturbance.	

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
TCR Impact 2 (Cumulative): Prior to the consideration of proposed mitigation measures, construction of the project could result in significant contributions to cumulative impacts related to the disturbance and destruction of tribal cultural resources.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures TCR/mm-1.1 through TCR/mm-1.4. These measures put forward a process that ensures any new tribal cultural resources or new components of an existing tribal cultural resource will be identified, inventoried, evaluated for significance in terms of its value to a California Native American tribe, and treated appropriately if found to be a contributing element.	Less than significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
UTL Impact 1: During project construction, the project could require the construction of new or expanded sewer lines from the project site to an identified point of connection within existing sewer system facilities. LASAN will not be able to give a definitive confirmation of adequate sewer system capacity for the project without further detailed gauging and evaluation associated with more detailed architectural plans, which would be provided during the project's permitting phase. At this juncture, it is not known if new or upgraded sewer lines would be required and conclusion of this analysis would be speculative. Impacts related to construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure could be significant. Operational impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIX. a)	Significant	**UTL/mm-1.1:** To confirm the sewer system serving the project site can accommodate the total wastewater flows generated by the project, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation (Foundation) shall coordinate with Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment (LASAN) during project permitting and prior to construction for confirmation of sewer system capacity. LASAN shall make this determination by conducting detailed gauging and further evaluation to identify a specific sewer connection point and/or to determine if upgrading or additional sewer lines are necessary to accommodate the project. Implement Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1; AQ/mm-3.1; BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1 and 5.2, BIO/mm-6.1; CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through 1.4; GEO/mm-3.1 and 3.2, GEO/mm-4.1, GEO/mm-6.1 through 6.5; GHG/mm-1.1; HAZ/mm-1.1 and 1.2, HAZ/mm-2.1 and 2.2; NOI/mm-1.1; TRA/mm-1.1, TRA/mm-4.1 through 4.3; and TCR/mm-1.1 through 1.4.	Less than significant
UTL Impact 2: LADWP would have sufficient water supply to serve the water demand generated by the project and the existing service area during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry years conditions during both construction and operation of the project. Impacts related to water supply and demand would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIX. b)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
UTL Impact 3: It has been determined that the wastewater treatment provider serving the project (LASAN) would have adequate capacity to serve the wastewater flows generated by the project. Impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIX. c)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A

Impacts	Impacts Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Impacts Following Mitigation
UTL Impact 4: The project would not generate solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair state or local solid waste reduction goals during construction and operation of the project. Impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIX. d)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
UTL Impact 5: The project would comply with federal, state, and local solid waste reduction goals during construction and operation. Impacts would be less than significant. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold XIX. e)	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A
UTL Impact 6 (Cumulative): The project could result in contributions to cumulatively considerable impacts related to off-site upgrades to LASAN's sewage collection system. At this juncture, it is not known whether new or upgraded sewer lines would be required and the conclusion of this analysis would be speculative. However, it is reasonable to assume that some potential for environmental impacts would occur with an infrastructure upgrade that may be required to collect sewage from the La Brea Master Plan project in combination with other development projects that are developed within LASAN's service area.	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1; AQ/mm-3.1; BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1 and 5.2, BIO/mm-6.1; CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through 1.4; CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through 1.5; GEO/mm-3.1 and 3.2, GEO/mm-4.1, GEO/mm-6.1 through 6.5; GHG/mm-1.1; HAZ/mm-1.1 through 1.2, HAZ/mm-2.1 and 2.2; NOI/mm-1.1; TRA/mm-1.1, TRA/mm-4.1 through 4.3; TCR/mm-1.1 through 1.4; and UTL/mm-1.1.	Less than significant

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identifying areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. On February 14, 2022, in accordance with Sections 15063 and 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR and circulated it to governmental agencies, organizations, and persons who may be interested in the proposed project, including nearby landowners, homeowners, and tenants. As part of releasing the NOP, the County requested comments on the scope of the EIR and asked interested parties for their suggestions regarding ways the project could be revised to reduce or avoid any significant environmental impacts. The NOP provided a general description of the proposed project, a description of the project site, and a preliminary list of potential environmental effects. The 30-day comment period extended through March 16, 2022.

Two public scoping meetings were held virtually via Zoom on March 2, 2022, at 2:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, to solicit input from any interested parties on the scope and content of the EIR in conformance with Section 21083.9 of the California Public Resources Code. Live language interpretation of the presentation and scoping meeting input was provided in Spanish and Korean during the scoping meetings.

Following the close of the 30-day comment period on the NOP, comment letters were reviewed to identify any key issues that may require additional technical studies or background research. A summary matrix of written comments received during the NOP comment period and the verbal comments recorded at the two public scoping meetings is provided in Appendix A.

Areas of controversy raised by public agencies, public organizations, and individual members of the public primarily included concerns regarding the overall design of the project as it relates to protecting the passive recreational spaces and pedestrian pathways in and around the Lake Pit; the desire for the inclusion of a dog park and children's playground; the potential for project renovations to increase light pollution in the area; changes to landscaping and the potential for tree removal and/or replacement within the project site; and impacts of the project on traffic and circulation in and around the project site. To the extent these issues and concerns are within the scope of CEQA, they are addressed in the evaluation and identification of potential mitigation measures for each environmental issue area included in Chapter 5, Environmental Impact Analysis.

2.7 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to identify any "issues to be resolved" by the decision-making body, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate any significant effects. In consideration of the project, the Foundation, under the direction of the County, will need to weigh transportation issues, modifications to designated historical resources, the replacement or relocation of existing trees, and the potential for additional environmental impacts to occur as described in this EIR. Specifically, determinations will need to be made as to whether the recommended mitigation measures for identified significant impacts should be adopted or modified, and whether the benefits of the project outweigh the environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to less than significant (i.e., the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources, conflicts with applicable plans and policies to protect historical resources, and increase in vehicle trips within the project area). Additionally, a determination will need to be made as to whether any of the alternatives, instead of the project, should be approved.

2.8 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR summary identify the choice among project alternatives. Alternatives to the project are discussed in detail in Chapter 6, Alternatives Analysis, of this EIR in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Alternatives required to be considered under CEQA are those that would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental effects identified during evaluation of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives. As evaluated throughout Chapter 5 of this EIR, the significant impacts of the project prior to implementation of project mitigation measures would occur in the following environmental issues areas: aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; archaeological resources; historical resources; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise and vibration; recreation; transportation; tribal cultural resources; and utilities and service systems.

Chapter 6 of this EIR identifies, describes, and evaluates the following four alternatives:

- **No Project/No Build Alternative**. Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires analysis of the No Project/No Build Alternative. In the No Project/No Build Alternative, implementation of the project would not occur and the existing project site and its physical conditions would generally remain as they are in their current state. This includes the majority of Hancock Park and the structures within the project boundary, including the Page Museum; therefore, these features would resemble existing conditions. Site elements, including the surface parking lot, maintenance areas, amphitheater, landscaping, and pathways, would all remain. Site access for visitors, loading, maintenance vehicles, and the fire department would remain in its current configuration.
- **Alternative 1: Renovate Page Museum Only**. In Alternative 1, the exterior conditions of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the Page Museum would be retained as-is under existing conditions, while addressing some of the museum's deficiencies by way of an interior renovation only. The renovation work within the Page Museum would upgrade its existing facilities and systems while maintaining its current program, spatial organization, and room sizes. This alternative was considered as the renovation would retain or replace in kind the historic, character-defining features related to the museum's interior such as the central open-air atrium and the fishbowl-like lab space. This alternative would emphasize remedial work on the building structure and existing exhibits and would be performed from the museum interior as much as possible. This alternative scenario would, however, require further study to determine the feasibility of the renovation to also meet modern seismic standards since modifications to the building's exterior would be avoided under this alternative. In those instances, the identified areas would be repaired or replaced in kind and designed to resemble their current physical appearance to avoid impacting the historic, character-defining features of the museum's exterior.
  The remainder of the project site would also resemble existing conditions, and site access for visitors, loading, maintenance vehicles, and the fire department would remain in the current configuration in this alternative. Other museum-related facilities, as well as associated passive recreational areas and pathways around and within the project site, would remain as-is under current conditions.
- **Alternative 2: Maintain Central Atrium Pleistocene Garden**. Alternative 2 would include renovating the existing Page Museum to maintain the central atrium with the Pleistocene Garden in place while also providing the same expanded museum facilities and programming as proposed by the project. To maintain the central atrium footprint while providing the proposed laboratory, classroom, and multi-purpose educational spaces, Alternative 2 would include expanding the new

museum space to the north and west of the existing Page Museum, increasing the size of the new museum building by approximately 15,000 square feet above what is proposed by the project. In addition, the character of the open-air roof would remain intact. This alternative would slightly reconfigure the surface parking lot, like the project, extending it west of the new museum building footprint. This alternative would adjust the project's triple-loop pedestrian path adjacent to the proposed new museum building to accommodate the larger building footprint. The landscaping improvements and overall landscape design of the project site in Alternative 2 would be similar to the project, except for the reconfigured northern portion of the project site, the reduced open space area, as well as the adjustment to the pedestrian path.

- **Refined Alternative 3: Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green**. Refined Alternative 3 would include the renovation of the Page Museum within the existing building footprint, similar to the project, but would incorporate a series of design refinements to reduce impacts on certain primary, character-defining features of the Page Museum, including refining the materiality and size of the expansion atrium pop-up to better compliment the frieze, preserving a larger portion of the existing berm on the west side of the Page Museum, and detailing the second-floor glass enclosure underneath the Page Museum frieze to be as transparent as possible. This alternative would also include constructing a new museum building of approximately 40,000 square feet, similar to the project, but would adjust the building footprint to the north and west of the project's proposed footprint. This adjustment would allow for more separation of the new museum from the existing Page Museum by narrowing the transition area connection between the two buildings. Adjusting the footprint of the new museum to the north would also allow for approximately 4,000 square feet of open space to be added to the Central Green. In this alternative, the on-site surface parking would be reconfigured to complement the adjusted building footprint, extending west of the new museum building as with the project, but this alternative would maintain the number of parking spaces that currently exist on-site and would not add additional parking spaces.

Table 2-3 provides a comparison of impacts among the project alternatives.

Table 2-3. Comparison of Impacts Among Alternatives

Issue Area	No Project/ No Build Alternative	Alternative 1: Renovate Page Museum Only	Alternative 2: Maintain Central Atrium Pleistocene Garden	Refined Alternative 3: Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green
Aesthetics	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Air Quality	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Biological Resources	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Cultural Resources – Historical Resources	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Similar; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable*	Decreased; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable†
Geology and Soils	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Decreased	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hydrology and Water Quality	~~Decreased~~ Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Issue Area	No Project/ No Build Alternative	Alternative 1: Renovate Page Museum Only	Alternative 2: Maintain Central Atrium Pleistocene Garden	Refined Alternative 3: Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green
Land Use and Planning	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Similar; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable	Decreased; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable.
Noise and Vibration	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Recreation	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Transportation	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Decreased; would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact	Similar; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable	Similar; impacts would continue to be significant and unavoidable
Tribal Cultural Resources	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Utilities and Service Systems	Decreased	Decreased	Similar	Similar
Meets Project Objectives?	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes

Notes:

* The benefits of avoiding the impacts to the Page Museum's character-defining features do not outweigh the additional impacts to the character-defining features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to alterations of historical resources.

†Impacts to certain character-defining features are lessened to both the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, thereby reducing the overall severity of the impacts to historical resources; however, it would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

As detailed in Chapter 6 and based strictly on an analysis of the relative environmental impacts, Alternative 1, Renovate the Page Museum Only, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it would be the built alternative that minimizes the project's adverse impacts on the environment. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History, as a departmental unit of the County, will consider the whole of the record when considering the project including, but not limited to, public comment and testimony ~~related to the size and design of the residence~~. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History may select the project as proposed, an alternative, or a specified combination of particular elements identified in the alternatives, as the approved project.

Alternative 1 would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources as it would result in renovations to the interior of the Page Museum only, while retaining the character-defining features of both the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District that qualify them as historical resources. Because Alternative 1 would avoid impacts to historical resources, it would also avoid the project's inconsistencies with applicable land use plans and policies. In addition, Alternative 1 would also avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact related to transportation as it would not result in the project's substantial increase in regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Alternative 1 would also result in decreased impacts to a majority of the other environmental issues areas listed in Table 2-3 as no grading or other earthwork activities would be necessary, and no other structures would be constructed as a result of this alternative. Further, upon completing this alternative, there would be no changes to the existing land use types or operational characteristics of the project site. Alternative 1 would meet one of the project objectives related to preserving and protecting the National Natural Landmark—La Brea Tar Pits. Alternative 1 would partially meet two other project objectives related to addressing the deferred maintenance and meeting modern building code standards of Page Museum as well as partially meeting the project objective related to providing state-of-the-art exhibition facilities and learning environments within the museum. While it would not meet most of the project objectives, Alternative 1 is the alternative scenario that reduces the most environmental impacts when compared to the project.

For comparison, Alternative 2, Maintain Central Atrium Pleistocene Garden, would preserve most of the character-defining features of the Page Museum, but it would result in the loss of a greater amount of open space in the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District due to the increased footprint of the project. As such, the benefits of avoiding the impacts to the Page Museum's character-defining features do not outweigh the additional impacts to character-defining features to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and this alternative would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to alterations of historical resources. Since Alternative 2 would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to historical resources, it would also result in the project's inconsistencies with applicable land use plans and policies. In addition, Alternative 2 would not avoid the project's substantial increase in regional VMT and would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to this issue. Alternative 2 would also result in similar impacts as the project to the other environmental issues areas listed in Table 2-3 as this alternative would result in similar types of construction activities and operational uses as proposed by the project. Alternative 2 would meet seven project objectives and partially meet the remaining two objectives due to the loss of open space as a result of the expanded museum footprint.

Refined Alternative 3, Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green, would result in similar environmental impacts as the project for each issue area analyzed in this EIR, as shown in Table 2-3, except for historical resources and land use and planning. While Refined Alternative 3 would lessen certain impacts to character-defining features to both the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District thereby reducing the overall severity of the impacts to historical resources, it would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. One of the primary character-defining features of the Page Museum is its visual primacy on the grounds of the Tar Pits; the design refinements presented in the refined version of Alternative 3 would result in less of an impact to the Page Museum's visual primacy. Refined Alternative 3 would reduce impacts to the Page Museum to the extent that the building would continue to convey its historic significance and retain its eligibility as a historical resource. However, the site plan changes would continue to result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. The overall severity of the significant and unavoidable impacts to the historic district would be reduced because of the separation of the new museum building from the Page Museum, the narrowing of the transition area connection between the two buildings, and the design refinements that retain more of the Page Museum's character-defining features such as the existing structural space frame, frieze, and courtyard. Similarly, the design refinements in this alternative would help to further support the land uses plans and policies applicable to the project as they relate to the protection and alternation of historical resources, but not in such a way to avoid the project's related significant and unavoidable impacts. This alternative would also result in the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to increased regional VMT. However, Refined Alternative 3 is the alternative that meets all project objectives by providing an adjusted museum footprint and incorporating a series of design refinements that would support the basic objectives of the project.

This page intentionally left blank.