COUNTY	CLERK'S USE
--------	--------------------

CITY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK ROOM 395, CITY HALL LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

(Article III, Section 3, City CEQA Guidelines)

FORM RP 1-1-91

Submission of this form is optional. This form shall be filed with the County Clerk, 12400 East Imperial Highway, Norwalk, California 90650, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152(b). Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21168(d), the filing of this notice starts a 35-day statute of limitation on Court challenges to the approval of the project. Failure to file this notice with the County Clerk results in the statute of limitation being extended to 180 days.

е II I ;	,		, ,				
LEAD CITY AGENCY AND ADD Parks, 221 N. Figueroa Stree	COUNCIL DISTRICT: 04						
PROJECT TITLE:	GRIFFITH PARK - installation of an informa Autry Museum of the American West	LOG REFERENCE: BR 23-057					
PROJECT LOCATION:	4730 North Crystal Springs Drive, Los Angeles, CA, 90027						
DESCRIPTION OF NATURE, PL	DESCRIPTION OF NATURE, PURPOSE, AND BENEFICIARIES OF PROJECT:						
The proposed Project consists of the installation of an informational sign at the Autry Museum of the American West for a length of ten (10) years.							
CONTACT PERSON: ELENA MAGGIONI	AREA CODE 213	TELEPHONE NUM 482-698					
	Y Art. II, Sec. 2a(1) Art. II, Sec. 2(a)(2)(3) Art. II, Sec. 2b ION Art. II, Sec. 2(c) See Below Art. II, Sec. 2(d) N Art. II, Sec. 2(i)	AR AR AR AR AR AR (St Art Art Art Art Art	ATE CEQA GUIDELINES T. 18, Sec. 15269(a) T. 18, Sec. 15269(b)(c) T. 18, Sec. 15268 T. 19, Sec. 15300 -15333 T. 18, Sec. 15262 T. 18, Sec. 15282 ate CEQA Guidelines) . 19, Sec(s). . 19, Sec(s).				
JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT EXEMPTION: The proposed Project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article III, Section 1, Class 11(5) of City CEQA Guidelines as well as to Article 19, Section 15311(a) of California CEQA Guidelines. None of the limitations set forth in State CEQA Guidelines 15300.2 apply, see attached narrative.							
IF FILED BY APPLICANT, ATTACH CERTIFIED DOCUMENT OF EXEMPTION FINDING							
			2475				

SIGNATURE: ELENA MAGGIONI Environmental Supe			DATE : 3/16/2023
FEE \$75.00	RECEIPT NO.	REC'D. BY:	DATE:

GRIFFITH PARK - installation of an informational sign at the Autry Museum of the American West CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION NARRATIVE

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project consists of the installation of an informational sign to memorialize the Rodger Young Village at the Autry Museum of the American West for a length of ten (10) years.

Rodger Young was a private who fought in the South West Pacific theatre of World War II. During the Battle of Munda Point on July 31, 1943, the infantry company of which Pvt. Young was a member was ordered to make a limited withdrawal from the battle line in order to adjust the battalion's position for the night. At this time, Pvt. Young's platoon was engaged with the enemy in a dense jungle where observation was very limited. The platoon suddenly was pinned down by intense fire from a Japanese machine gun concealed on higher ground only 75 yards away. The initial burst wounded Pvt. Young. As the platoon started to obey the order to withdraw, Pvt. Young called out that he could see the enemy emplacement, whereupon he started creeping toward it. Another burst from the machine gun wounded him the second time. Despite the wounds, he continued his heroic advance, attracting enemy fire and answering with rifle fire. When he was close enough to his objective, he began throwing hand grenades and while doing so was hit again and killed. Pvt. Young's bold action in closing with this Japanese pillbox and thus diverting its fire, permitted his platoon to disengage itself, without loss and was responsible for several enemy casualties. On January 6, 1944 Young was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for his actions.

During the war, thousands of men and women left Southern California to serve their country. At the same time, thousands more men and women came to Southern California to acquire work in factories in order to support the war effort. Since raw materials were needed for weapons, aircraft, and other war-related goods, construction of new housing ceased during the war. This created a housing shortage for veterans returning home after their service. Although this shortage soon spurred a housing boom, returning veterans needed housing immediately. The Los Angeles City Housing Authority responded by building housing projects that offered affordable and temporary housing for veterans and their families.

One such public housing project, was Rodger Young Village. Built on a former airfield in Griffith Park and dedicated on April 27, 1946, it quickly became home to over 5,000 residents. The community consisted of 750 Quonset huts, as well as a market, pharmacy, barber shop, hardware shop, movie theater, church, elementary school, plus delivery services for milk, diapers, and baked goods. Open to veterans of all races and branches of the military, Rodger Young Village was one of the most diverse communities in Southern California at the time. Adults and children befriended their neighbors with little regard to their ethnic background, educational levels, or personal beliefs. Such acceptance of diversity helped end the practice of racial segregation in many local restaurants. Residents often went to nearby eateries to dine with their neighbors, and if a restaurant refused to serve someone in their party, the entire group would leave and often never return. Restaurants, faced with losing business, dropped discriminatory policies.

In an ongoing attempt to bring awareness to the historical relevancy of Griffith Park, the

implementation of this proposed signage will highlight the importance that the Rodger Young Village played in a post-WWI Los Angeles.

The project is located at 4730 North Crystal Springs Drive, Los Angeles, CA, 90027, in the Hollywood Community Planning Area (Fig.1).

II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Basis for Categorical Exemption

The proposed Project consists of a sign located on City property managed by a City department which has a sign policy adopted by its Board of Commissioners and is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article III, Section 1, Class 11(5) of City CEQA Guidelines as well as to Article 19, Section 15311(a) of California CEQA Guidelines.

Consideration of Potential Exceptions to Use of a Categorical Exemption

The State CEQA Guidelines (CCR Sec 15300.2) limit the use of categorical exemptions in the following circumstances:

1. Location. Exemption Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may be significant in a particularly sensitive environment. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply to all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

The proposed project falls under Class 11, and could potentially constitute an exception to CEQA exemptions. According to the parcel profile report retrieved on February 23, 2023, this site is not within a coastal, methane, or historic zone. The area, however, resides in a liquefaction zone. The construction of this Project will not create conditions that could lead to liquefaction so the project does not impact on a recognized environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern. Therefore, this exception has no application here.

2. Cumulative Impact. This exception applies when, although a particular project may not have a significant impact, the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

The proposed project consists of the installation of a plaque in an existing park. No other known projects would involve cumulatively significant impacts, and no future projects would result from the proposed project. Therefore, this exception has no application here.

3. Significant Effect. This exception applies when, although the project may otherwise be exempt, there is a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect due to unusual circumstances.

RAP is not aware of any unusual circumstances associated with this project. Therefore, this exception has no application here.

4. Scenic Highway. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project that may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway.

The proposed project is not within sight of any state designated scenic highway, nor of any other historic and scenic resource. Therefore, this exception has no application here.

5. Hazardous Waste Site. This exception applies when a project is located on a site listed as a hazardous waste site under Government Code Section 65962.5.

As of February 23, 2023, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) (Envirostor at www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov) and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWCB) (Geotracker at https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/) have not listed the Project site, but have listed RB Case #: 900270207 near the Project area (within 500 feet). The case was closed in 2020 and the project does not pose any threat related to contaminated soil or water. Therefore, this exception has no application here.

6. Historical Resources. This exception applies when a project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

The proposed Project is located in Griffith Park, a Historic Cultural Monument of the City of Los Angeles (HCM #942). The installation of the sign is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of this historical resource. No excavation is required, and this office does not anticipate the disruption of archaeological or paleontological resources.

Therefore, this exception has no application here.





List of References

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board. *GeoTracker.* Retrieved, February 23, 2023, from https:// geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov.
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Parcel Profile Report. Retrieved on February 23, 2023, from NavigateLA http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/navigatela/
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering. *NavigateLA*. Retrieved on February 23, 2023from http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/navigatela/
- City of Los Angeles Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.
- Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
- Los Angeles Municipal Code.
- Public Resources Code Section 5097.98
- Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction. Greenbook, 2012 edition.
- State CEQA Guidelines.
- State Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor*. Retrieved February 23, 2023, from www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov
- State Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System.*, from https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-communitylivability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways