

3.6 Coastal Resources

3.6.1 Introduction

The potential impacts that could result to existing coastal resources at or in the vicinity of the proposed components from construction and operation of each of the components are addressed in this section. The significance of those impacts, if anticipated, is analyzed for each of the four Project Alternatives and the No Project Alternative. Mitigation to reduce the impacts of the Project is provided where applicable.

3.6.2 Environmental Setting

This subsection provides an overview of coastal resources known to occur within the HSA, specifically those relevant to each component of the IRP. Coastal resources, for purposes of this EIR, are resources that the California Coastal Commission (CCC) considers important to assess as part of the coastal permit process and include:

- Coastal Zone access (including beach access)
- Coastal recreation (boating and water-oriented activities)
- Marine environment (biological productivity, hazardous substances)
- Land resources in the Coastal Zone (sensitive habitats)

3.6.2.1 General Setting

The City of Los Angeles and the surrounding coastal cities of Malibu, Santa Monica, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Redondo Beach share approximately 50 miles of coastline and 22 public beaches along the Santa Monica Bay. The Santa Monica Bay receives secondary-treated effluent from Hyperion via a 5-mile outfall. In addition, surface runoff from the highly urbanized areas of coastal cities drains to the Santa Monica Bay. The Los Angeles River and its watershed drain into the San Pedro Channel Basin (Los Angeles Harbor). The City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles have numerous storm drains that channel runoff into the Santa Monica Bay and San Pedro Channel Basin (Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission, 2004). The storm drain system for the City of Los Angeles comprises 35,000 catch basins, more than 1,500 miles of underground pipes, and hundreds of miles of open channels. In total, runoff from approximately 1,060 square miles of developed land reach the Bays of Santa Monica and San Pedro through approximately 60 storm drain outfalls. Approximately 100 million gallons of water flow through the Los Angeles storm drain system on an average dry day. When it rains, the amount of water flowing through the channels can increase to 10 billion gallons per day reaching speeds of 35 miles per hour (mph) and depths of 25 feet (City of Los Angeles, 2005).

The coastal areas are used year round for recreational activities such as boating, surfing, hang gliding, swimming, fishing, beach volleyball, and sunbathing. For more information on coastal recreation activities, see Section 3.16 – Recreation.

The coastal area is also home to a variety of aquatic, avian, and other coastal species, with some being threatened or endangered and living in sensitive habitats. For more information on biological resources, see Section 3.5 – Biological Resources of this document.

3.6.2.2 Components

For each of the following components evaluated at a project level and a program level, coastal resources that could be affected include access to the Coastal Zone, coastal recreation opportunities, protection of the marine environment, and protection of sensitive coastal habitats.

Project-Level Components

Hyperion

Hyperion is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and lies east of the southern end of Dockweiler State Beach, which is operated by the Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors. Visitors gain access the southern portion of the beach via Imperial Highway and Vista del Mar, which are roadways that create the northern and western boundaries of Hyperion. Recreational uses in this area include water sports activities, including surfing, jet skiing, boating, and fishing. Dockweiler State Beach maintains parking capacity for more than 2,100 automobiles and recreational vehicles (Wibble, 2005). In 2004, approximately 2.7 million persons visited the southern section of the beach. Water quality associated with Hyperion and the outfall is discussed in Section 3.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality, and the marine environment is addressed in Section 3.5 – Biological Resources.

Tillman

No coastal areas or resources are in the vicinity of Tillman because it is located several miles inland.

LAG

No coastal areas or resources are in the vicinity of LAG because it is located several miles inland.

NEIS II

No coastal resources are in the vicinity of the proposed NEIS II alignments because the proposed alignments would be located several miles inland.

GBIS

No coastal resources are in the vicinity of the proposed GBIS alignments because the proposed alignments would be located several miles inland.

Program-Level Components

VSLIS

The area of the VSLIS alignment would be situated several miles inland and would not be in the vicinity of coastal resources.

Recycled Water Distribution

Recycled water pipelines would be placed beneath City of Los Angeles streets and other public rights-of-way, whereas pump stations and storage tanks would be above-or belowground of public easements. A majority of the recycled water distribution system, whether for irrigation and industrial uses or groundwater recharge, would not be located in the Coastal Zone. Recycled water pipelines for irrigation and industrial users, however, could be located near Hyperion.

Dry Weather Runoff - Low-Flow Diversions

The runoff diversions would occur in two primary areas, the coastal area along the Santa Monica Bay and an inland area in the San Fernando Valley. The coastal runoff diversions placed along the Santa Monica Bay could be situated in parking areas in the vicinity of public beaches, which are a part of coastal resources.

Wet Weather Runoff - Onsite Management

Onsite capture and percolation components would occur in areas that are several miles inland and would not affect coastal resources. Onsite storage and use components would occur at schools and government facilities throughout the City, which could occur in the vicinity of the Coastal Zone but would not involve coastal resources.

Dry Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants or Treatment Wetlands

Dry weather runoff URPs or treatment wetlands would be located in the inland San Fernando Valley near runoff sources that are several miles inland and would not involve coastal resources.

Wet Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants

This component would be located along the coast within the Santa Monica watershed. No specific locations for wet weather runoff URPs have been identified, but they could be situated in the Coastal Zone and could involve coastal resources.

Dry Weather Runoff - Smart Irrigation

Implementation of smart irrigation would require the installation of small control devices to automated irrigation systems on individual residential, commercial, and industrial properties throughout the City of Los Angeles. Some of these properties may lie within the Coastal Zone but would not involve coastal resources.

Wet Weather Runoff - Non-Urban Regional Recharge

This component would take place solely in the San Fernando Valley, which is located several miles inland from coastal resources.

3.6.3 Environmental Impacts

3.6.3.1 Background

Regulatory Framework

Federal

In 1972, Congress enacted the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) to protect and restore the Coastal Zone and its natural resources, including "wetlands, floodplains, estuaries, beaches, dunes, barrier islands, coral reefs, and fish and wildlife and their habitat within the Coastal Zone." Although the Secretary of Commerce has authority under the CZMA, the CZMA allows states with approved Coastal Zone management programs to review plans for coastal development before federal approval is granted.

State

The California Coastal Act (CCA), enacted in 1976, is the Coastal Zone Management Program for California, and its guidelines are either consistent with or more stringent than the federal requirements for Coastal Zone protection. The CCC provides regulatory oversight of coastal development along the California coast, acts on coastal development permits, and reviews local coastal programs (LCPs) prepared by local governments and submitted for commission approval (Carpenter, 2005).

For public access, the CCA specifies that "development shall not interfere with public right of access to the sea...including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches..." Specifically, Section 30252 states:

The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development with public transportation, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation...

For coastal recreation, Section 30223 of the CCA specifies that coastal and upland areas "necessary to support coastal recreational uses" must be protected.

For the marine environment, the CCA addresses the sustainability of biological productivity of coastal waters. Specifically, Section 30231 states:

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff...encouraging waste water reclamation...

For land resources, Section 30240 of the CCA states:

...environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values," and "development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habit areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas...

The governing body of the CCA is the California Coastal Commission (CCC), which reviews and approves new development in coastal areas and provides comments on impacts from areas adjacent to coastal areas.

Section 30254.5 states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the commission may not impose any term or condition on the development of any sewage treatment plant which is applicable to any future development that the commission finds can be accommodated by that plant consistent with this division...

Local

The CCA allows for oversight from municipalities if an approved LCP exists. Currently, no approved LCPs exist in the City of Los Angeles. LCPS are in effect for the cities of Malibu, Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Long Beach. The County of Los Angeles, Department of Beaches and Harbors administers an LCP for the unincorporated area of Marina del Rey. (Carpenter, 2005).

Methodology

Maps and documents were reviewed to determine the existing location of the Coastal Zone. In addition, the thresholds of significance (CR-1 and CR-2, below) were reviewed to determine impacts to Coastal Zone Access and Recreation guidelines as set forth in Section 3.16 - Recreation and in Section 3.17 - Transportation, Traffic, and Parking. For determining the impacts of CR-3 and CR-4 to the marine environment and to land resources in the Coastal Zone, guidelines were reviewed as set forth in Section 3.5 - Biology, Section 3.11 - Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section 3.12 - Land Use and Planning, because these sections pertain to the Coastal Zone and its resources.

Thresholds of Significance

The *CEQA Thresholds Guide* does not address effects on coastal resources (City of Los Angeles, 1998). Therefore, the thresholds of significance for this EIR are resources that the CCC considers important to assess as part of the coastal permit process. These coastal resource areas and issues of concern involve Coastal Zone access, coastal recreation, marine environment, and land resources in the Coastal Zone. Therefore, the following thresholds of significance are applied in this analysis of coastal resources:

- CR-1 The Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would result in permanent or substantial temporary obstructions to Coastal Zone access (including beach access).
- CR-2 The Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would result in permanent or substantial temporary obstructions to Coastal recreation (boating and water-oriented activities).
- CR-3 The Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would substantially affect the Marine environment (biological productivity and hazardous substances).
- CR-4 The Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would substantially affect land resources in the Coastal Zone (sensitive habitats).

3.6.3.2 Component Impacts

Project-Level Component Impacts

Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd

Construction. During the construction phase of Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd, an increase in traffic flow would occur as a result of construction-related truck trips to the site. This increase in construction traffic may cause minor delays in entering the parking areas for Dockweiler State Beach and other coastal resources, but would not result in permanent or substantial temporary access impacts. All construction activities and staging would occur onsite; therefore, parking spaces would not be required at adjacent beaches, and coastal recreation at the beaches near Hyperion would not be affected. In addition, proposed construction at Hyperion would be required to implement BMPs and other measures that would regulate construction discharges that have the potential to be received into the ocean.

Operation. Operation would result in a minimal increase in employee traffic and biosolids truck traffic. The increase in truck traffic to transport biosolids would be minimal and occur during off-peak hours when coastal access and resource use are not at a premium; consequently, no impacts would occur to access or recreation at Dockweiler State Beach or other surrounding coastal resources. In addition, during operation, the additional parking needed for five new employees and the reduced surface parking (from the secondary clarifiers) would be accommodated onsite and not affect parking or coastal recreation activities.

Additional discharge from the plant through the 5-mile outfall would continue in accordance with current operations and permit requirements; therefore, operation of this component would not affect the marine environment.

Hyperion Process Upgrades

Construction. Similar to the component to expand Hyperion to 500 mgd, construction of this component would not result in significant impacts to coastal access. As discussed above, construction activity and staging would not result in impacts to parking or recreational activities at adjacent beaches.

Operations. Similar to the component to expand Hyperion to 500 mgd, operations would not affect coastal resources.

Tillman Expansion to 100 mgd

Tillman is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

Tillman Expansion to 80 mgd

Tillman is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

Tillman Process Upgrades

Tillman is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

Tillman Wastewater Storage

Tillman is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

LAG Expansion to 30 mgd

LAG is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

LAG Operational Storage Only

LAG is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

NEIS II West Alignment

The proposed NEIS II West Alignment is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

NEIS II East Alignment

The proposed NEIS II East Alignment is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

GBIS South Alignment

The proposed GBIS South Alignment is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

GBIS North Alignment

The proposed GBIS North Alignment is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

Program-Level Component Impacts

VSLIS

VSLIS is not located near any coastal resources. Consequently, the construction and operation of this component would not affect coastal resources.

Recycled Water Distribution

Minimal coastal resources exist in the vicinity of the planned recycled water distribution system improvements, with possible exceptions for proposed recycled water pipelines around Hyperion for irrigation and industrial users. Construction of the recycled water pipeline in the vicinity of Hyperion would occur in City of Los Angeles streets and could result in minor and temporary constraints to access to coastal resources and recreation. Although construction of pipelines in the street system near coastal resources may result in minor delays in accessing such resources, the street system would remain operational and coastal resources would still be accessible. Consequently, permanent or substantial temporary restrictions to coastal resource access would not occur. In addition, construction of the recycled water system improvements would not occur on coastal recreational areas. Operation of the recycled water distribution system in coastal areas would not affect coastal resources.

Dry Weather Runoff – Smart Irrigation

Although the installation of smart irrigation might occur within coastal areas, the construction and operation of these small control devices to automate irrigation systems would occur on existing residential, commercial, and industrial properties. Coastal resources, access, recreation, marine environment, or sensitive habitat in the Coastal Zone would not be adversely affected.

Dry Weather Runoff – Low-Flow Diversions

The construction of low-flow diversions along the Santa Monica Bay could result in temporary minor delays in access to beaches and coastal recreation areas, it would not result in permanent or substantial temporary access impacts because the street system would remain operational. Construction of low-flow diversions would include standard BMPs for construction to reduce or eliminate discharges to storm drains that could affect the ocean or coast. Therefore, construction of this component would not affect the marine environment. In addition, low-flow diversions would be located in public streets or rights-of-way and not in areas of sensitive habitats. Operation of low-flow diversion devices along the Santa Monica Bay would divert potentially contaminated urban runoff from storm drains and beaches to the sewer system and, therefore, would improve the coastal resource environment.

Wet Weather Runoff - Onsite Management

Construction and operation of onsite storage and use components would occur at schools and government facilities throughout the City of Los Angeles, and could be located in the vicinity of the Coastal Zone. Because this component would be managed exclusively within the footprint of existing facilities, no impacts would occur on coastal access, recreation, marine environment or sensitive habitat.

Dry Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants or Treatment Wetlands

Dry weather runoff URPs are not expected to be located in the Coastal Zone or to affect bike paths along Ballona Creek leading to the coast because these facilities occur on dedicated parcels; therefore, construction and operation of URPs would not affect coastal access or coastal recreation. In addition, dry weather runoff URPs would be constructed using BMPs for construction that is designed to reduce or eliminate discharges to storm drains that could affect the ocean or coast. Following the treatment of dry weather runoff to Title 22 standards, the water would be discharged to Ballona Creek or reused locally as recycled water. Title 22 water would not result in impacts to the marine environment. Overall, implementation of the URPs would lead to cleaner urban runoff and/or reduced levels of pollutants that are ultimately discharged to the ocean. Therefore, construction and operation of this component would not affect the marine environment. Treatment wetlands are proposed for inland areas only and would not affect coastal resources.

Wet Weather Runoff - Urban Runoff Plants

This component could be located in the Coastal Zone. Construction of wet weather runoff URPs could result in additional traffic that causes minor delays in accessing coastal resources, but such would not result in permanent or substantial temporary access impacts because the resources would still be accessible. Wet weather runoff URPs would be on parcels that would not be expected to affect existing coastal access, recreation, or resources. In addition, after wet weather runoff has been retained, the water would be treated at the wet weather URP and eventually discharged to the ocean or storm drain system. Because the treated water would meet discharge permit requirements, this component would result in improved quality of coastal resources.

Wet Weather Runoff - Non-Urban Regional Recharge

Non-Urban Regional Recharge would take place solely in the San Fernando Valley, which is inland. Therefore, no coastal resources would be affected.

Summary of Component Impacts

Table 3.6-1 presents a summary of the component impacts to coastal resources in relation to the significance thresholds.

Table 3.6-1. Coastal Resources Component Impact Summary Table Integrated Resources Plan EIR	
IRP Component	Component Impact
	Coastal Access, Recreation, Marine Environment, and Sensitive Habitats
Project-Level	
Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd	No impacts
Hyperion Process Upgrade	No impacts
Tillman 100 mgd	Component not in coastal zone
Tillman 80 mgd	Component not in coastal zone
Tillman Process Upgrade	Component not in coastal zone
Tillman Wastewater Storage	Component not in coastal zone
LAG 30-mgd/Storage	Component not in coastal zone
LAG Operational Storage	Component not in coastal zone
NEIS II West Alignment	Component not in coastal zone
NEIS II East Alignment	Component not in coastal zone
GBIS South Alignment	Component not in coastal zone
GBIS North Alignment	Component not in coastal zone
Program-Level	
VSLIS	Component not in coastal zone
Recycled Water Distribution	Negligible effects to coast beach parking would occur as a result of construction. The potential for recycled water distribution facilities to affect coastal resources is minimal.
DWR – Smart Irrigation	Smart irrigation devices could be installed at residential, commercial, and industrial properties that could be within the Coastal Zone; however, it is not expected to affect coastal resources, access, recreation, marine environment, or sensitive habitat.
DWR – Low-Flow Diversions	Construction of low-flow diversions along the Santa Monica Bay could result in minor delays in accessing coastal resources from traffic, but the coastal resources would remain accessible. Operation would divert polluted urban runoff from storm drains and beaches to the sewer system, which would result in improved quality of the coastal environment. No adverse affect is anticipated to coastal access, recreation, marine environment, or sensitive habitats.
DWR – URP or TW	Construction and operation of URPs would not affect coastal access or coastal recreation, but would lead to cleaner discharges to the ocean environment.
WWR – Onsite Management	This component would be managed within existing facilities; therefore, no affect is expected on coastal access, recreation, marine environment, or sensitive habitat.
WW – URPs	Construction of wet weather URPs could result in additional traffic that causes minor delays in accessing coastal resources, but such would not result in permanent or substantial temporary access impacts because the resources would still be accessible. This component would result in improved quality of coastal resources.
WWR – Non-Urban Recharge	This component would not result in impacts to coastal resources.



3.6.3.3 Alternative Impacts

Alternative 1

Components of Alternative 1 are described in Section 2.3.4.

Impact CR-1

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 1 to Coastal Zone access are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The following proposed components under this Alternative are not located near the coast: Tillman, LAG, the NEIS II and GBIS alignments, VSLIS, recycled water distribution for groundwater recharge, dry weather runoff - low-flow diversions in the San Fernando Valley, wet weather runoff - onsite capture and percolation, dry weather runoff - URPs along Compton Creek and Ballona Creek, and wet weather runoff - non-urban regional recharge. Consequently, the construction and operation of these components would not affect Coastal Zone access.

Construction at Hyperion (expansion to 500 mgd or process upgrades) would cause increased traffic flow along Vista del Mar, which could result in minor delays in entering Dockweiler State Beach. Construction of low-flow diversion devices along the Santa Monica Bay, wet weather runoff - URPs, and recycled water distribution systems within the Coastal Zone also could cause temporary minor delays in accessing beaches and coastal recreation. Delay impacts from construction would be minor and the coastal resources would remain accessible; therefore, coastal resource access impacts would be less than significant. In addition, as described in Section 3.17 - Transportation and Traffic, a traffic control plan would be prepared for each construction site in a City street. The plan would be submitted to Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. Construction of dry weather runoff - URPs along Ballona Creek is not anticipated to affect any bike paths along the creek; therefore, no coastal access via bike path would be affected.

Recycled water distribution for irrigation and industrial users and wet weather runoff - onsite storage could occur in the Coastal Zone; however, these would not be expected to impact or involve coastal resources. Although smart irrigation devices could be installed at locations within the Coastal Zone, this component would require minor modifications to existing irrigation equipment and would not affect coastal access. Construction of low-flow diversions and wet weather URPs could result in delays in accessing coastal resources, but such delays would not be substantial and the resources would remain accessible.

Operation of improvements at Hyperion would result in minor increases in traffic in and around Hyperion, but would not result in significant traffic impacts (see Section 3-17 - Transportation and Traffic). As a consequence, no impacts to coastal access and resource use would occur at Dockweiler State Beach or other surrounding coastal resources. In addition, no operational impacts to parking at the state beach would occur.

Operation of low-flow diversions and recycled water distribution systems would be under City streets, with the exception of pump stations and storage tanks; therefore, no impact would occur to coastal access. The operation of at-grade recycled water distribution structures within the Coastal Zone, such as pumping stations and storage tanks, as well as wet weather runoff - URPs, is not expected to have a significant impact on coastal access because these structures would be required to go through the coastal permit process, which includes the maintenance and enhancement of coastal access for the "development" of structures within the Coastal Zone.

Secondary Impacts. None of the components under Alternative 1 would result in impacts to coastal access that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal access would not occur.

Mitigation Measure. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-2

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 1 to coastal recreation are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. As with coastal access, only the Hyperion components and various possible locations of specific program-level components potentially would be in or near the Coastal Zone.

As described in Impact CR-1, construction at Hyperion and other program-level components, if located near the coast or Coastal Zone, could cause minor increased traffic flow that could delay coastal access (vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians), and possibly coastal recreation. Impacts from construction generally would be confined to the project site and would be temporary and, therefore, less than significant. In addition, as described in Section 3.17 - Transportation and Traffic, a traffic control plan would be prepared for each construction site and would be submitted to LADOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. This plan would dictate and mitigate access during construction activities.

As described in Impact CR-1, although the process upgrades would involve an increase in transport trucks, this increase in truck traffic to transport biosolids would be minimal and generally would occur during the late evening hours when coastal recreation use is not at a premium; therefore, no significant impact would occur to recreation at Dockweiler State Beach or other surrounding coastal resources. In addition, no impacts to parking or recreational opportunities at the state beach would occur.

Operation of low-flow diversions and recycled water distribution systems would be under City streets; therefore, no impact would occur to coastal recreation. The operation of the pump stations and storage tanks within the Coastal Zone, as well as wet weather runoff - URPs, is not expected to have a

significant impact on coastal recreation because these structures would be required to go through the coastal permit process, which includes the maintaining and enhancement of coastal recreation (and access to that recreation) for the "development" of structures within the Coastal Zone.

Secondary Impacts. None of the components under Alternative 1 would result in impacts to coastal recreation that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal recreation would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-3

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 1 to the marine environment is discussed below.

Primary Impacts. As described under Impact CR-1 above, the only project-level components near Coastal Zone that could have a direct impact on the marine environment occur at Hyperion, while various possible locations exist where specific program-level components potentially would be in or near the Coastal Zone.

Because none of the components is proposed within the marine environment, and because construction of facilities (including those near the coast) would implement BMPs to control runoff discharges from construction sites, no impacts to the marine environment are anticipated.

Operation of the Hyperion Expansion to 500 mgd is not expected to affect the marine environment from increased effluent discharges because the effluent would meet permit requirements and initial dilution ratios (at the outfall diffuser). Improvements to Tillman treatment processes would result in brine discharges to the sewer system that could affect the ability of Hyperion to meet effluent quality standards at the 5-mile outfall, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

Secondary Impacts. All construction activities would be required to regulate any discharges during construction and implement BMPs to control runoff from construction sites. Consequently, potential secondary impacts of construction on the marine environment would be less than significant. A possible benefit from components under Alternative 1 would involve the low-flow diversions along the coast, the diversion of dry weather flows from Ballona and Compton Creeks, and then treatment of that water to higher quality standards prior to discharge. These activities would result in improved quality of the marine environment.

Mitigation. Mitigation measure WQ-MM-1 (see Section 3.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality), will be implemented and would establish operating parameters for Tillman to ensure that Hyperion's treatment process continues to meet permit requirements.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-4

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 1 to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. Only the Hyperion components and various program-level components that would affect the Santa Monica Bay or occur near the coast within the Santa Monica Bay watershed are considered. Because Hyperion improvements would be confined to the plant site, which is not located in the Coastal Zone, significant impacts to coastal land resources would not occur.

It is expected that program-level components in coastal areas (URPs and low-flow diversions) would occur on parcels or public rights-of-way that would not be classified as sensitive habitat; therefore, no impact on sensitive coastal habitats is anticipated from operation of these components.

Secondary Impacts. None of the components under Alternative 1 would result in impacts to sensitive coastal habitat (land resources) that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to land resources in the Coastal Zone would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Alternative 2

Components of Alternative 2 are described in Section 2.3.5.

Impact CR-1

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 2 to Coastal Zone access are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 2 are the same as those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact on coastal access. During operation of Alternative 2, no impact is anticipated to occur to coastal access.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 2 would result in impacts to coastal access that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal access would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-2

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 2 to coastal recreation are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 2 are the same as those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 2 would not have

a significant impact on coastal recreation. During operation of Alternative 2, no impacts to coastal recreation would occur.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 2 would result in impacts to coastal recreation that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal recreation would not occur..

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated

Impact CR-3

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 2 to the marine environment are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 2 are similar to Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact on the marine environment. During operation of Alternative 2, brine from the advanced treatment from Tillman and LAG would be discharged to the sewer system and could affect the ability of Hyperion to meet effluent quality standards at the 5-mile outfall, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

Secondary Impacts. As with Alternative 1, discharges during construction activities would be required to be regulated, and BMPs must be implemented to control runoff from construction sites. Consequently, secondary impacts on the marine environment from construction of Alternative 2 would not be significant. As described under Alternative 1, secondary benefits from components under Alternative 2 would include improvements to the quality of the marine environment associated with the low-flow diversions along the coast, the diversion of dry weather flows from Ballona and Compton Creeks, and then treatment of that water to higher quality standards prior to release back into the body of water.

Mitigation. Mitigation measure WQ-MM-1 (see Section 3.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality), will be implemented and would establish operating parameters for Tillman to ensure that the Hyperion treatment process continues to meet permit requirements.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-4

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 2 to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 2 are similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 2 would not have a significant impact on sensitive coastal habitat (land resources). During operation of Alternative 2, no impact is expected to occur to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources).

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 2 would result in impacts to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources), which, in turn, could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to land resources in the Coastal Zone would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Alternative 3 Impacts

Components of Alternative 3 are described in Section 2.3.6.

Impact CR-1

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 3 to Coastal Zone access are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 3 are similar to the impacts of Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 3 would not have a significant impact on coastal access. During operation of Alternative 3, no impact would occur to coastal access.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 3 would result in impacts to coastal access that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal access would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-2

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 3 to coastal recreation are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 3 are the same as those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 3 would not have a significant impact on coastal recreation. Operation of Alternative 3 would not result in impacts to coastal recreation.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 3 would result in impacts to coastal recreation that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal recreation would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-3

Potential primary and secondary cumulative impacts resulting from Alternative 3 to the marine environment are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 3 are similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 3 would not have a significant impact on the marine environment. During operation of Alternative 3, brine from the advanced treatment from Tillman would be discharged to the sewer system and could affect the ability of Hyperion to meet effluent quality standards at the 5-mile outfall, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

Secondary Impacts. As with Alternative 1, discharges during construction activities would be required to be regulated, and BMPs must be implemented to control runoff from construction sites. Consequently, secondary impacts on the marine environment from construction of Alternative 2 would not be significant. As described under Alternative 1, secondary benefits from components under Alternative 3 would include improvements to the quality of the marine environment associated with the low-flow diversions along the coast, the diversion of dry weather flows from Ballona and Compton Creeks, and then treatment of that water to higher quality standards prior to release back into the body of water.

Mitigation. Mitigation measure WQ-MM-1 (see Section 3.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality), will be implemented and will establish operating parameters for Tillman to ensure that Hyperion treatment processes continue to meet permit requirements.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-4

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 3 to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 3 are similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 3 would not have a significant impact on sensitive coastal habitat (land resources). During operation of Alternative 3, no impact would occur to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources).

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 3 would result in impacts to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources) that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to land resources in the Coastal Zone would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Alternative 4

Components of Alternative 4 are described in Section 2.3.7.

Impact CR-1

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 4 to Coastal Zone access are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 4 are similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 4 would not have a significant impact on coastal access. During operation of Alternative 4, no impact is anticipated to occur to coastal access.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 4 would result in impacts to coastal access that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal access would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-2

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 4 to coastal recreation are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 4 are similar to those for implementing Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 4 would not have a significant impact on coastal recreation. During operation of Alternative 4, no impact would occur to coastal recreation.

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 4 would result in impacts to coastal recreation that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal recreation would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-3

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 4 to the marine environment are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 4 would be similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 4 would not have a significant impact on the marine environment. During operation of Alternative 4, brine from the advanced treatment from Tillman would be discharged to the sewer system and could affect the ability of Hyperion to meet effluent quality standards at the 5-mile outfall, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

Secondary Impacts. As with Alternative 1, discharges during construction activities would be required to be regulated, and BMPs must be implemented to control runoff from construction sites. Consequently, secondary impacts on the marine environment from construction of Alternative 2 would not be significant. As described under Alternative 1, secondary benefits from components under Alternative 4 would include improvements to the quality of the marine environment associated with the low-flow diversions along the coast, the diversion of dry weather flows from Ballona and Compton Creeks,



and then treatment of that water to higher quality standards prior to release back into the body of water. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to the marine environment would not occur.

Mitigation. Mitigation measure WQ-MM-1 (see Section 3.11 – Hydrology and Water Quality), will be implemented and will establish operating parameters for Tillman to ensure that Hyperion treatment processes continue to meet permit requirements.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-4

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from Alternative 4 to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone are discussed below.

Primary Impacts. The primary impacts of implementing Alternative 4 are similar to those for Alternative 1. Construction of Alternative 4 would not have a significant impact on sensitive coastal habitat (land resources). During operation of Alternative 4, no impact is anticipated to occur to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources).

Secondary Impacts. Comparable to Alternative 1, none of the components under Alternative 4 would result in impacts to sensitive coastal habitats (land resources) that could result in secondary effects. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to land resources in the Coastal Zone would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

No Project Alternative Impacts

The No Project Alternative, for purposes of this EIR, is no action. Under this alternative, integrated improvements to the wastewater treatment and collection system, recycled water system, or runoff system would not occur.

Individual wastewater, recycled water, or runoff projects likely would be necessary to meet regulatory requirements and future demands, but such individual projects would be designed and constructed as the needs arise rather than being planned for a systemwide integrated manner. In this case, each individual project would be subject to its own environmental clearance in the future.

Potential primary and secondary impacts resulting from the No Project Alternative to coastal resources are discussed below.

Impact CR-1

Primary Impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no impacts would occur to coastal access because the proposed integrated wastewater, recycled water, or runoff improvements would not be constructed. Biosolids would continue to be generated at Hyperion and sent to the Green Acres Farm in Kern County for land application under the existing contract. The planning, design, and implementation of wastewater, recycled water, and runoff improvements

would continue to be pursued on an individual-project basis by the various departments and bureaus of the City of Los Angeles as demand requires and resources become available.

In the long term, however, various wastewater, recycled water, and runoff projects would be necessary to protect public health and safety or to meet regulatory requirements, as defined in the objectives for the IRP (see Section 1.3). In the absence of an integrated resources planning process for the wastewater system for the City of Los Angeles, projects likely would be implemented individually. The individual projects, however, would be constructed at unknown future dates and would not benefit from incremental consideration of various trigger mechanisms (discussed in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3) for maximizing efficiencies based on objectives of the IRP.

Secondary Impacts. The No Project Alternative does not include features that would result in physical changes to the environment that could have secondary impacts to coastal access. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal access would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-2

Primary Impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no impacts would occur to coastal recreation because the proposed integrated wastewater, recycled water, or runoff improvements throughout the City of Los Angeles would not be constructed. Biosolids would continue to be generated at Hyperion and sent to the Green Acres Farm in Kern County for land application under the existing contract. The planning, design, and implementation of wastewater, recycled water, and runoff improvements would continue to be pursued on an individual-project basis by the various departments and bureaus of the City of Los Angeles as demand requires and resources become available.

In the long term, however, various wastewater, recycled water, and runoff projects would be necessary to protect public health and safety or to meet regulatory requirements, as defined in the objectives for the IRP (see Section 1.3). In the absence of an integrated resources planning process for the wastewater system of the City of Los Angeles, projects likely would be implemented individually. The individual projects, however, would be constructed at unknown future dates and would not benefit from incremental consideration of various trigger mechanisms (discussed in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3) for maximizing efficiencies based on the objectives of the IRP.

Secondary Impacts. The No Project Alternative does not include features that would result in physical changes to the environment that could have secondary impacts to coastal recreation. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to coastal recreation would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-3

Primary Impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no impacts or benefits would occur to the marine environment because the proposed integrated wastewater, recycled water, or runoff improvements would be constructed. Hyperion would continue to discharge via the 5-mile outfall under the existing permit. The planning, design, and implementation of wastewater, recycled water, and runoff improvements would continue to be pursued on an individual project basis by the various departments and bureaus of the City of Los Angeles as demand requires and resources become available.

In the long term, however, various wastewater, recycled water, and runoff projects would be necessary to protect public health and safety or to meet regulatory requirements, as defined in the objectives for the IRP (see Section 1.3). In the absence of an integrated resources planning process for the wastewater system of the City of Los Angeles, projects likely would be implemented individually. The individual projects, however, would be constructed at unknown future dates and would not benefit from incremental consideration of various trigger mechanisms (discussed in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3) for maximizing efficiencies based on the objectives of the IRP.

Secondary Impacts. The No Project Alternative does not include features that would result in physical changes to the environment that could have secondary impacts to the marine environment. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to the marine environment would not occur. In addition, the potential benefit to the marine environment of treating dry weather and wet weather runoff at the URPs also would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

Impact CR-4

Primary Impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no impacts would occur to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone because the proposed integrated wastewater, recycled water or runoff improvements would not be constructed. Activity at Hyperion would continue to occur adjacent to the bluff. The planning, design, and implementation of wastewater, recycled water, and runoff improvements would continue to be pursued on an individual-project basis by the various departments and bureaus of the City of Los Angeles as demand requires and resources become available.

In the long term, however, various wastewater, recycled water, and runoff projects likely would be necessary to protect public health and safety or to meet regulatory requirements, as defined in the objectives for the IRP (see Section 1.3). In the absence of an integrated resources planning process for the wastewater system of the City of Los Angeles, projects likely would be implemented individually. The individual projects, however, would be constructed at unknown future dates and would not benefit from incremental

consideration of various trigger mechanisms (discussed in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, and 2.4.3) for maximizing efficiencies based on the objectives of the IRP.

Secondary Impacts. The No Project Alternative does not include features that would result in physical changes to the environment that could have secondary impacts to land resources (sensitive habitat) in the Coastal Zone. Consequently, significant secondary impacts to land resources in the Coastal Zone would not occur.

Mitigation. No mitigation is required.

Impacts after Mitigation. No impact is anticipated.

3.6.3.4 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed, the Proposed Alternatives would not result in impacts to coastal access, coastal recreation, or sensitive coastal habitats. Each Project Alternative has the potential to significantly affect the marine environment by introducing brine discharges from upstream treatment plant improvements to the sewer system, which could affect the treatment process at Hyperion and result in violations of effluent discharge standards. However, project-level mitigation has been identified that would mitigate potential impacts to the marine environment to a less-than-significant level. Operation of low-flow diversions and URPs under any of the Proposed Alternatives, in conjunction with the Sun Valley Watershed Management Plan, would be expected to result in improved urban runoff quality, which would result in beneficial impacts of improved water quality flows to the ocean. In addition, none of the other related plans or projects would adversely affect the marine environment in Santa Monica Bay in the vicinity of the 5-mile outfall. As a consequence, any of the Proposed Alternatives would not contribute incrementally to a cumulative coastal resource impact that would result in adverse impacts to coastal resources. Therefore, the Proposed Alternatives would not result in significant cumulative impacts to coastal resources.