

Department of Public Works

Bureau of Engineering  
Report No. 1

AND REFERRED TO THE CITY COUNCIL

JUL 19 2019

July 19, 2019  
CD No. 15  
Executive Officer  
Board of Public Works**PASEO DEL MAR PERMANENT RESTORATION PROJECT (PROJECT) - CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) [STATE CLEARINGHOUSE (SCH) No. 2016101016] AND PROJECT APPROVAL BY THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL****RECOMMENDATIONS**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), review and consider the Project EIR, and adopt and forward this report and transmittals to the City Council (Council) with the recommendations that it:

1. Certify that the Project Final EIR (Transmittal Nos. 1 and 2) was completed in compliance with the CEQA; that the Final EIR was presented to the Council, as the decision-making body of the City of Los Angeles (City), and that the Council reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR; and that the Final EIR reflects and expresses the City's independent judgment and analysis.
2. Adopt the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Transmittal No. 3).
3. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Transmittal No. 4).
4. Specify that the documents constituting the record of proceedings in this matter are in the custody of the City Clerk, located at 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 and in the files of the Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering (BOE), located at 1149 South Broadway, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90015.
5. Approve the Bridge Spanning Over Landslide Alternative (identified and described as Alternative 1 in the EIR).

**TRANSMITTALS**

1. Draft EIR, dated April 2017.
2. Final EIR, dated March 2019.
3. Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, dated March 2019.
4. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, dated March 2019.

**DISCUSSION*****Background***

The City is proposing to restore access along the portion of the Paseo Del Mar Right-of-Way (ROW) that was damaged by the 2011 White Point Landslide event. As the Lead agency

under CEQA, the City prepared an EIR that evaluated the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The City requested input from responsible agencies, trustee agencies, stakeholders, and other interested parties regarding the content of the environmental analysis and information included in the Draft EIR.

The 400-foot section of the Paseo Del Mar collapsed roadway lies along a steep bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The elevation is approximately 130 feet above mean sea level. A large block of the bluff containing the roadway moved approximately 60 feet toward the ocean and left a large depression, or “graben”, approximately 400 feet long by 60 feet wide by 40 feet deep where the roadway used to exist. The City initiated studies, cleanup, and stabilization of the eastern adjacent slope and introduced a street turn-around at the eastern end to close the road until a permanent solution was determined. The western end has also been fenced off.

### ***Project Description***

The project site includes the landslide area, located along a portion of the Paseo Del Mar ROW in the San Pedro Community of the City. Paseo Del Mar provides east-west access to residents in the southernmost area of the San Pedro Community. Paseo Del Mar is bound by the White Point Nature Preserve to the north and property owned by the County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors, and the Pacific Ocean to the south. To the east is Weymouth Avenue and to the west is White Point-Royal Palms County Beach Park.

The BOE considered three build alternatives for the permanent restoration of the collapsed portion of the Paseo Del Mar roadway. Additionally, the No Project Alternative was analyzed in the EIR pursuant to Section 15126.6(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines. This resulted in the analysis of four alternatives in the EIR, including Alternative 1 - Bridge Spanning Over Landslide, Alternative 2 - Anchored Cast-in-Drilled Hole (CIDH) Piles with Buttress, Alternative 3 - Shear Pins with Mechanically Stabilized Embankment (MSE) Wall, and the No Project Alternative. These four alternatives are analyzed with the same level of detail throughout the EIR. The analysis in the EIR identified Alternative 1 - Bridge Spanning Over Landslide, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative as it would result in the fewest environmental impacts overall when compared to the other alternatives considered, and would result in no permanent environmental impacts. Alternative 1 - Bridge Spanning Over Landslide (henceforth the preferred alternative) has been selected as the preferred alternative for the proposed project and is further described below.

The preferred alternative would seek to limit major earthwork and remediation of the existing landslide area by constructing a single long-span bridge supported on stable ground outside of the limits of the landslide area. Paseo Del Mar would be located on a bridge structure that spans over the landslide area. A cast-in-place concrete box girder or double box girder bridge superstructure would be utilized supported by seat abutments. The bridge span would be approximately 400 feet long and 63 feet 5 inches wide. The bridge proposed under this preferred alternative would be located approximately 130 feet

July 19, 2019  
Page 3

above the beach level. Stone patterning may potentially be considered for the bridge wingwalls as an aesthetic, architectural element. The proposed project would include the possibility of a sidewalk, up to 5 feet wide on the north side of the roadway, in addition to the sidewalk up to 15 feet wide on the south side of the roadway. Standard barriers would be installed on each edge of the bridge. These barriers may potentially include additional architectural features, such as concrete staining, cobble stone patterning, or decorative railing.

As the abutment pile supports for the bridge would be set back approximately 150 feet from the shoreline, protection against erosion would not immediately be required. However, like any structure proximal to the shoreline, ongoing monitoring would be needed and, should substantial erosion occur, protective measures would be implemented during the operation of this alternative.

Roadway and drainage design for the preferred alternative would conform to the BOE standard specifications. Signing, striping, and any traffic signal modifications, if needed, would be implemented in accordance with the City Department of Transportation standards. Additionally, the preferred alternative would include the planting of native vegetation on the seaward side of Paseo Del Mar to reduce erosion.

### ***Project Alternatives***

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, an analysis of the No Project Alternative is included in the EIR pursuant to Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as two project alternatives that included detailed analysis.

No Project Alternative: Under the No Project Alternative, the portion of the roadway damaged by the 2011 landslide event would not be restored and this segment of Paseo Del Mar would remain inaccessible to the public. The emergency measures that were implemented following the landslide event would remain in place. The additional stabilization measures in the existing landslide area described for the build alternatives would not occur under this alternative.

Alternative 2 - Anchored CIDH Piles with Buttress: Alternative 2 would include a single row of large diameter, CIDH piles near the edge of the existing slope. After partial removal of the landslide debris to an approximate elevation of 75 feet above the beach, the piles would be drilled and installed to below the basal shear interface layer. The piles would be connected with a reinforced concrete grade beam and tied back with soil anchors. A reinforced-earth buttress located above the piles would stabilize the head scarp and support the new roadway. A barrier and railing would also be required adjacent to the sidewalk similar to Alternative 1. Additionally, rock armor (riprap) protection up to an elevation of 25 feet above the mean high tide mark would be required under this alternative.

to protect the slope from recession due to wave action and other erosive forces. The construction of this alternative would last for approximately 22 months.

Alternative 3 - Shear Pins with MSE Wall: Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2; however, rather than being located at the face of the existing slope, a row of large diameter piles and a grid of smaller diameter piles would be constructed below the proposed roadway. The piles would handle the vertical loading of the MSE wall and mitigate lateral forces on the existing slope. The MSE-type wall utilizes a reinforcement strap tied to a segment of wall panel. The self-weight and friction of the compacted earth would keep the face of the panels in place. A barrier and railing adjacent to the sidewalk would be required, similar to Alternatives 1 and 2. Additionally, riprap protection up to an elevation of 15 feet above the mean high tide mark would be required under Alternative 3 to protect the slope from recession due to wave action and other erosive forces, similar to Alternative 2. However, due to the piles being set back more than 100 feet from the shoreline, implementation of slope protection under Alternative 3 is not expected to be necessary for a substantial period of time following completion of construction. The construction of this alternative would last for approximately 19 months.

The EIR also considered several alternatives that were dismissed from detailed analysis, including Single Span Steel Truss Bridge, Multiple Span Concrete Slab Bridge, Embankment - Deep Buttress Fill, and Alternate Location - Roadway Realignment Alternative. Among factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR are: (1) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (2) infeasibility, and (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

## ***Environmental Review***

### Scoping

A Notice-of-Preparation/Initial Study (NOP/IS) was released for the proposed project on October 6, 2016, and circulated for 30 days for public and agency comments. Comments were received from seven agencies, five organizations, and 34 individuals. These comments are included in the Draft EIR. A public scoping meeting was held on October 26, 2016; approximately 70 people attended.

### Draft EIR

The Draft EIR (Transmittal No. 1) was released on April 6, 2017, and was circulated for 60 days for public and agency review and comment. A Notice-of-Availability (NOA) and Notice-of-Completion (NOC) for the Draft EIR was mailed to interested parties and posted with the County of Los Angeles Clerk's Office and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse on April 6, 2017. A notice regarding the public review period and time and location for a public meeting on the Draft EIR was published in the *Los Angeles Times*. The Draft EIR was posted on the BOE website and hard copies were made available for review at several local public facilities (i.e., BOE main office, San Pedro Regional Library, Miraleste Library, and the office of Council District No. 15), as well as at a public hearing.

July 19, 2019  
Page 5

A public hearing was held on May 3, 2017, to solicit comments on the Draft EIR. The hearing was attended by 40 residents and interested parties. There were 14 speakers, as well as 44 written comments on the DEIR. Written comments and responses to those comments are documented in the Final EIR.

### Final EIR and Findings

The Final EIR (Transmittal No. 2) states that the proposed project would result in no impacts to agricultural resources, mineral resources, population and housing, or public services would occur as a result of the proposed project alternatives. Additionally, the Final EIR identifies no impacts under the No Project Alternative to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, paleontological resources, recreation, and tribal cultural resources. Aesthetics impacts under the preferred alternative would be less than significant. Impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, recreation, and utilities and service systems would be less than significant under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, impacts to transportation and traffic would be less than significant under all four alternatives. Impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

The Final EIR finds that even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, the proposed project would result in temporary unavoidable significant impacts on aesthetics under the No Project Alternative and Alternatives 2 and 3; geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and land use and planning under the No Project Alternative; and construction noise under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. As such, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Transmittal No. 3) must be adopted by the Council to approve the proposed project.

The findings are based on information contained in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR for the proposed project, as well as information contained within the administrative record. The administrative record includes, but is not limited to, the public hearing records, public notices, written comments on the proposed project and responses to those comments, proposed decisions and the findings on the proposed project, and other documents relating to the agency decision on the proposed project.

### ***Project Schedule***

Upon obtaining all required permits and planning entitlements, construction is anticipated to begin in Summer of 2021 and be completed in approximately 24 months.

Report No. 1

Page 6

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

The project cost is a function of the chosen build alternative, ranging from \$26.2 to \$43.2 million (based on 2017 costs). The Bridge Alternative is the least expensive option at \$26,200,000, while the anchored CIDH concrete pile structure is the most expensive option at \$43,200,000. The current estimated project budget is \$33,000,000, but funding sources have not been identified.

( MEM PJS RMK ALM )

Report reviewed by:

Respectfully submitted,

BOE (ADM)

Report prepared by:



Environmental Management Group

Gary Lee Moore, PE, ENV SP  
City Engineer

Maria E. Martin  
Environmental Affairs Officer  
Phone No. (213) 485-5753

MEM/WJ/05-2019-0078.EMG.gva

Questions regarding this report  
may be referred to:  
William Jones, Environmental Supervisor II  
Phone No. (213) 485-5760  
E-mail: William.Jones@lacity.org