Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Bruce W. McClendon, FAICP
Director of Planning

NOTICE OF PREPARATION
AND
NOTICE OF SCOPING MEETING

NOP CIRCULATION DATES:	June 6, 2008 to July 7, 2008
PROJECT TITLE:	Canyon Residences Project Project No. R 2008-00549 General Plan Amendment No. T2008-00004 Zone Change No. RZC T2008-00015 Conditional Use Permit No. RCUP T2008-00069 Oak Tree Permit No. ROAK T2008-00015 Environmental Review No. RENV T2008-00042
PROJECT ADDRESS:	1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road Rowland Heights, CA 91748
PROJECT APPLICANT:	Canyons Apartments LLC
CEQA LEAD AGENCY:	County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning 320 W. Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

The County of Los Angeles will be the lead agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project identified below. In compliance with Section 15082 of the *State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the County of Los Angeles is sending this Notice of Preparation to each responsible agency, interested parties, and federal agencies involved in approving the project and to trustee agencies responsible for natural resources affected by the project. Within 30 days after receiving the Notice of Preparation, each agency shall provide the County of Los Angeles with specific details about the scope and content of the environmental information related to that agency's area of statutory responsibility.

The purpose of this Notice of Preparation is to solicit the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The review period for the Notice of Preparation will be from **June 6, 2008 to July 7, 2008**.

Due to the time limits mandated by State Law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than July 7, 2008. Please direct all written comments to the following address. In your written response, please include the name of a contact person in your agency.

Mr. Anthony Curzi
County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3225
Telephone: (213) 974-6461
Fax (213) 626-0434
e-mail: acurzi@planning.lacounty.gov

PROEJCT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project site is approximately 15.7 acres and is located at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road. The site is located in the northern portion of the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of Rowland Heights, approximately 0.75 mile south of the Pomona Freeway (SR-60). Regional access to the project site is provided by the Pomona Freeway, while local access to the site is provided by Fairway Drive, Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road, and Colima Road. The site is bounded by a senior housing complex and three commercial buildings along Colima Road on the north, the Royal Vista Golf Course and multi-family residences along Drusilla Way, Esquiline Avenue and Bithynia Way on the east, multi-family residences along Ostia Way and Latium Way on the south, and Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road and single

family residences on the west. Retail centers occupy three of the four corners of the Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road/Colima Road intersection. Land uses in the project area south of the Pomona Freeway are primarily residential and resident-serving commercial uses, while uses immediately north of the freeway are generally industrial.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project involves the redevelopment of the approximately 15.7-acre property located at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road. The existing Southlands Church and Schools structures, parking lots, and athletic field would be replaced with 775 for-lease residential units in multiple buildings, a recreational facility, parking structures containing 1,544 parking spaces, and landscaping throughout the project site. Three different types of residences are proposed: three-story townhomes, a four-story podium building, and a three- and four-story wrap-around building. The floor area ratio (FAR) on the proposed project site would be 1.35.

ENTITLEMENT REQUIREMENTS AND DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

The proposed project is an application for: (1) Zone Change from the existing A-1-20,000 (Light Agriculture) designation to Residential Planned Development 50 U; (2) Conditional Use Permit; (3) General Plan Amendment (Rowland Heights Community Plan) to amend the existing "Low Density Residential (1)" designation; (4) Oak Tree Permit for the removal of 3 oak trees; (5) Haul Route Permit; (6) Certification of an Environmental Impact Report; (7) Grading, excavation, foundation, and associated building permits; and 8) Other permits and approvals as deemed necessary.

AREAS OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS TO BE ANALYZED IN THE EIR

The Department of Regional Planning has determined by way of an Initial Study (see attached Initial Study) that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is necessary for the proposed project. The areas of potential environmental impact to be addressed in the EIR will include at least the following (see attached Initial Study):

Potential Hazards

- Geotechnical Hazards
- Flood Hazards
- Fire Hazards
- Noise Hazards

Potential Impacts to Resources

- Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Visual Qualities

Potential Impacts on Services

- Traffic and Access
- Sewage Disposal
- Education
- Fire and Sheriff
- Utilities

Potential Other Impacts

- Changes in Scale of the Surrounding Area
- Environmental Safety
- Land Use
- Population, Housing, Employment and Recreation

REVIEW MATERIALS

The County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning is soliciting input based on your views and opinions concerning the scope of the EIR for the proposed project. To facilitate your review, the following materials are attached:

- Expanded Project Description
- Los Angeles County Initial Study and Impact Analysis
- 500-foot Radius Land Use Map

Additional copies of the NOP are available for public review through July 7, 2008 on the Department of Regional Planning website http://planning.co.la.ca.us/case.htm as well as at the following libraries:

Rowland Heights Library	Diamond Bar Library
1850 Nogales Street	1061 S. Grand Avenue
Rowland Heights, CA 91748-2945	Diamond Bar, CA 91765-2299
Environmental Documents	Environmental Documents
Phone: (626) 912-5348	Phone: (909) 861-4978

SCOPING MEETING

To assist in location participation, a Scoping Meeting will be held to present the proposed project and to solicit suggestions from the public. This meeting will be held at the gymnasium for the **Southlands Christian School located at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road in Rowland Heights on June 19, 2008 from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM**.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. INTRODUCTION

Canyons Apartments LLC (Applicant) proposes the development of a multi-family residential rental community (proposed project) at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road (project site) in the Rowland Heights community of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed project would consist of multiple residential buildings containing 775 high-quality for-lease residential units. The development would be composed of three different building types, including podium building units, townhomes, and wrap-around buildings. In addition to the residential units, the development would include recreational amenities that will serve all project residents. Such amenities as currently proposed may include a central recreational facility, swimming pools, spas, fitness centers, social rooms, and a business center. The proposed project would also include abundant landscaping throughout the project site, and the currently proposed landscaping program includes elements such as canopies of mature shade trees, flowers, landscaping lighting features, broad landscaped setbacks, and streetscape amenities. Upon completion, the proposed project will include a maximum of approximately 924,250 square feet of gross floor area.

2. PROJECT LOCATION AND SURROUNDING USES

The proposed project would develop 775 multi-family residential units on an approximately 15.7-acre site located at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road. The proposed project site is located in the northern portion of the unincorporated Los Angeles County community of Rowland Heights, approximately 0.75 mile south of the Pomona Freeway (SR-60). Regional access to the project site is provided by the Pomona Freeway, while local access to the site is provided by Fairway Drive, Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road, and Colima Road. **Figure 1, Vicinity Map,** and **Figure 2, Project Location Map**, show the project site and surrounding roadways.

The project site is bounded by a senior housing complex and three commercial buildings along Colima Road on the north, the Royal Vista Golf Course and multi-family residences along Drusilla Way, Esquiline Avenue and Bithynia Way on the east, multi-family residences along Ostia Way and Latium Way on the south, and Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road and single family residences on the west. Shopping centers occupy three of the four corners of the Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road/Colima Road intersection. Land uses in the project area south of the Pomona Freeway are primarily residential and resident-serving commercial uses, while uses immediately north of the freeway are generally industrial.

Land use in Rowland Heights is governed by the County of Los Angeles Zoning Ordinance and the Rowland Heights Community Plan (Community Plan) of the County of Los Angeles General Plan. The

General Plan designation for the project site is Low Density Residential (1) while the Community Plan designation is U1 (Urban-1)[1]. According to the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance (County Zoning Ordinance), the zoning designation for the site is A-1-20,000 (Light Agriculture). This designation allows for single family dwelling units, adult residential facilities, crops, family childcare homes, and various light agricultural uses. The proposed project is also subject to the Rowland Heights Community Standards District (CSD), which implements the Community Plan and establishes standards for new development.

3. PROJECT SITE BACKGROUND

The project site comprises two parcels (Parcel 1 and Parcel 2) and is currently developed with Southlands Christian Schools, which span grades Pre-K through 12, and the affiliated Southlands Church. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the site. Approximately 70 percent (11 acres) of the project site is currently developed with buildings or paved, and approximately 30 percent (4.7 acres) is unpaved. The church and school were constructed between 1970 and 2002; prior to their construction, the project site was used for agricultural cultivation.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Applicant seeks to develop the proposed project on the approximately 15.7-acre project site in the northern portion of Rowland Heights, south of the Pomona Freeway. Key objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- Meet the housing needs of local and area residents and alleviate the housing shortage in the Rowland Heights community and in the San Gabriel Valley.
- Provide housing in proximity to existing employment centers in the eastern San Gabriel Valley.
- Encourage pedestrian activity and minimize vehicle use by providing housing in proximity to existing neighborhood-serving retail and commercial uses.
- Provide high-quality housing options without displacing existing residential uses.
- Provide an appropriate residential unit mix and amenities to meet the needs of a variety of tenants.
- Use architecture and abundant landscaping to create a visually attractive environment.

---

1 Robert Glaser (Senior Planner at the County Department of Regional Planning) confirmed that the current land use designation is Urban-1, and corrections are being made to County maps that erroneously indicated the land use designation as Public or Semi-Public Facilities.

Figure 1 Vicinity Map

Figure 2 Project Location Map

- Implement design features that incorporate the *California Build It Green Multi-Family Greenpoint Checklist* of sustainable, green design principles into site design, building construction techniques, and building materials.
- Utilize existing topography to minimize visual impacts off-site.
- Provide streetscaping improvements that enhance the visual environment of the neighborhood and encourage pedestrian activity within the project site, and between the site and nearby retail and commercial land uses.
- Locate housing in an area served by mass transit to reduce project-related vehicle trips.
- Meet all project-related parking demand on the project site on the project site.

4. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

4.1 Overview of the Concept Plan

The proposed project involves the redevelopment of the approximately 15.7-acre property located at 1920 Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road. The existing Southlands Church and Schools structures, parking lots, and athletic field would be replaced with 775 for-lease residential units in multiple buildings, a recreational facility, parking structures containing 1,544 parking spaces, and landscaping throughout the project site.

Three different types of residences are proposed: three-story townhomes, a four-story podium building, and a three- and four-story wrap-around building. The three residential unit types are described in **Sections 4.2** through **4.4**.

Additional project characteristics, including Recreation and Amenities, Landscaping, Infrastructure, and Access and Circulation, are described in **Sections 4.5** through **4.8**. The proposed project's parking requirement is described in **Section 4.9**.

A conceptual site plan is illustrated in **Figure 3, Conceptual Site Plan**. Site plans for the three types of residences are shown in **Figures 4** through **8**. Elevations of the proposed residences are shown in **Figures 9 through 12**. The proposed project would implement environmentally sensitive and sustainable design features that incorporate the *California Build It Green Multi-Family Greenpoint Checklist*. A summary of all major project components is provided in **Table 1, Summary of Project Components**.

The floor area ratio (FAR) on the proposed project site would be 1.35.

Table 1
Summary of Project Components

Unit Type	One Bedroom	Two Bedroom	Three Bedroom	Total No. of Units	Building Height	Gross Floor Area [a]
Podium Units	282	168	N/A	450	4 stories	499,500
Townhomes	N/A	78	30	108	3 stories	150,900
Wrap Around Units	119	82	16	217	3–4 stories	266,000
Recreational Facility					2 stories	7,850
Total	**401**	**328**	**46**	**775**	N/A	**924,250**

[a] *Gross square area encompasses leaseable building space plus "accessory" nonleaseable space including mechanical/electrical/maintenance rooms, corridors, stairwells, elevators, storage, etc., but excludes parking. The FAR (floor area ratio), a measure of the proposed project's density, is the ratio of gross floor area to total lot gross square footage: 924,250/ 685,014=1.35).*

Source: Van Tilburg, Banvard & Soderbergh, AIA, March 2008

4.2 Podium Building Units

Podium building units would be contained in two four-story buildings set above a landscaped courtyard and partial below-grade parking, occupying the northern end of the project site. A total of 450 podium-building units is proposed, including 282 one-bedroom units and 168 two-bedroom units. The one- and two-bedroom units proposed would range in size from 620 square feet (sq. ft.) for one-bedroom units to 905 sq. ft. for two-bedroom units. The podium buildings would total 499,500 sq. ft.

The height above grade of the podium building varies across a given elevation because of the slope of the site. As shown in **Figure 9**, previously referenced, building heights along the western elevation (facing Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road) would range from 56 feet to 69 feet above finished grade; the maximum building height along the southern elevation (along the interior driveway) would be approximately 57 feet.[2]

4.3 Townhomes

Rowhouse-style townhomes are proposed within two three-story building clusters occupying the central portion of the project site. A total of 108 townhomes is proposed, including 78 two-bedroom units and 30 three-bedroom units. Townhomes would include two- and three-bedroom residences ranging in size from 1,150 sq. ft. to 1,450 sq. ft. The townhomes would total 150,900 sq. ft. The two proposed floor plans are shown in **Figure 7**, previously referenced.

As shown in **Figure 10**, previously referenced, the townhomes would be approximately 39 feet and 6 inches in height above finished grade.

[2] Building heights are measured from adjacent finished grade to the top of the roofline, excluding stairwell, elevator, and mechanical equipment enclosures.

Figure 3, Conceptual Site Plan

Figure 4, Site Plan – Podium Building

Figure 5, Podium Building Parking – Upper Level

Figure 6, Podium Building Parking – Lower Level

Figure 7, Site Plan – Townhomes

Figure 8, Site Plan – Wrap Around Building

Figure 9, Conceptual Elevations – Podium Building

Figure 10, Conceptual Elevations – Townhomes

Figure 11, Conceptual Elevations – Wrap-Around Building (West)

Figure 12, Conceptual Elevations – Wrap-Around Building (South)

4.4 Wrap-Around Units

The wrap-around buildings are defined as three- and four-story buildings arrayed around landscaped courtyards and a four-level above-grade parking structure. The wrap around building would be located at the southern end of the project site. The building would contain 217 wrap-around units, including 119 one-bedroom units, 82 two-bedroom units and 16 three-bedroom units. Unit size would range from 628 sq. ft. for one-bedroom units to 1,216 sq. ft. for three-bedroom units. The wrap-around building would total 266,000 sq. ft. Floor plans are shown in **Figure 8**.

As shown in **Figures 11** and **12**, the western elevation of the three- and four-story wrap-around building would range from approximately 44 feet to 60 feet above finished grade and maximum height above finished grade of the southern elevation (along the interior driveway) would be approximately 47 feet. Variation in heights is due to the number of building floors as well as the slope of the site.

4.5 Recreation and Amenities

A recreation facility that would serve all project residents would be centrally located on the project site. The facility would be 7,850 sq. ft. Additional recreational amenities may be incorporated into the podium, townhome, and wrap-around buildings. Project amenities as currently proposed include, but are not limited to, swimming pools, spas, fitness center, tot lot, social room, and business center.

4.6 Landscaping

The podium and wrap-around residential units would be arranged around landscaped courtyards incorporated into each building**.** The proposed project would also include abundant landscaping throughout the site, and the currently proposed landscaping program includes such elements as mature shade trees, flowers, landscaping lighting, deep landscaped building setbacks, and streetscape amenities.

4.7 Infrastructure Improvements

The Applicant may include on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements as part of project implementation, including new water supply, fire flow and wastewater systems as required. Since the proposed development would increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the site from approximately 70 to 85 percent, new drainage facilities may be required. Street and/or traffic improvements may also be required subject to completion of a traffic study and consultation with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Traffic and Lighting Division.

4.8 Access and Circulation

The project site would be accessed by three driveways off Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road, which runs along the western side of the site. The three driveways include a primary driveway accessing the center of the

project site and two secondary driveways at the northern and southern ends of the site. The final placement and design of the proposed buildings, along with specifications of the Los Angeles County Fire Department, will likewise determine the final design of the internal circulation system.

4.9 Parking

The proposed project would be developed as a residential planned development under County Zoning Ordinance section 20.20.460. Residential planned developments are required to provide parking "in an amount adequate to prevent traffic congestion and excessive street parking" and in no event less than one covered parking space per dwelling unit. A sitewide total of 1,544 parking spaces is proposed, which conforms with the County's general apartment parking requirements. This total includes 872 spaces in the parking structure beneath the podium building, 243 garage spaces associated with the townhome residences, and 429 spaces in the above-grade structure incorporated into the wrap around building. **Table 2**, below, itemizes the parking that would be provided by the proposed project. The proposed parking supply meets or exceeds the County requirement for residential planned development, as it will provide parking in an amount adequate to prevent traffic congestion and excessive street parking.

Table 2
Project Parking Proposed

Unit Type	No. of Units	Parking Ratio (stalls per unit)	No. of Stalls Provided
Podium Units			
One-bedroom	282	1.5	423
Two-bedroom	168	2.0	336
Guest stalls	450	0.25	113
Podium Building Subtotal	**450**		**872**
Townhomes			
Two-bedroom	78	2.0	156
Three-bedroom	30	2.0	60
Guest stalls	108	0.25	27
Townhome Subtotal	**108**		**243**
Wrap Around Building			
One-bedroom	119	1.5	179
Two-bedroom	82	2.0	164
Three-bedroom	16	2.0	32
Guest stalls	217	0.25	54
Wrap Around Building Subtotal	**217**		**429**
Recreational Facility	N/A		
Total	**775**		**1,544**

Source: Van Tilburg, Banvard & Soderbergh, AIA, March 2008

Podium Building. Parking for podium building residents and guests would be contained in a two-level, partially below-grade parking structure. A driveway along the south side of the podium building would provide parking structure access from Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road.

Townhomes. Each townhome unit includes a two-car garage, which would provide the required parking for townhome residents and guests. The garages would be attached to the townhomes, at grade, and would be accessed via the internal project site driveways.

Wrap Around Building. A four-level open parking structure adjacent to the wrap-around building would provide the required parking for building residents and guests. Access to the parking structure would be provided via an internal driveway accessed from Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road.

5. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND PHASING

Construction of the proposed project would involve several phases, including demolition of asphalt paving and the existing structures, excavation of the site for below-grade parking, and construction of the new buildings, parking areas, and related improvements. These phases and the anticipated timeframe associated with each phase are provided in **Table 3, Project Construction Phasing**. This process would occur over an approximately 36-month period and some of the phases would overlap with other phases.

Table 3
Project Construction Phasing

Construction Phase	Approximate Duration
Demolition	2 months
Grading	3 months
Construction	31 months
Total Combined Construction Phases (assuming overlap)	**36 months**

Source: Canyons Apartments LLC, March 2008

6. LIST OF REQUIRED APPROVALS

This environmental review will encompass all discretionary and ministerial project approvals applicable to the proposed project including, but not limited to, the following entitlements:

- Zone Change (Residential Planned Development 50 U)
- Conditional Use Permit
- General Plan Amendment (Rowland Heights Community Plan)

- Oak Tree Permit
- Haul Route Permit
- Certification of an Environmental Impact Report
- Grading, excavation, foundation, and associated building permits
- Other permits and approvals as deemed necessary

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *R2008-00549*

CASES: *RENVT200800042*
ROAKT200800015
RPAT200800004
RZCT200800003
RCUPT200800069

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *05/28/08* Staff Member: *Anthony Curzi*

Thomas Guide: *Page 679, Grid E5* USGS Quad: *Yorba Linda*

Location: *1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, CA 91748*

Description of Project: *See Project Description Attachment*

Gross Area: *15.7 acres*

Environmental Setting:

a. *The Project Site is currently developed with Southlands Christian Schools, which span grades Pre-K through 12, and the affiliated Southlands Church. Nine single-story structures, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the Project Site. The Project Site is bounded by a senior housing complex and three commercial buildings along Colima Road on the north, the Royal Vista Golf Course and multi-family residences along Drusilla Way, Esquiline Avenue and Bithynia Way on the east, multi-family residences along Ostia Way and Latium Way on the south, and Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road and single family residences on the west. Shopping centers occupy three of the four corners of the Brea Canyon Cut-Off Road/Colima Road intersection. Land uses in the Project area south of the Pomona Freeway are primarily residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses, while uses immediately north of the freeway are generally industrial.*

The Project Site is characterized by sloping terrain, with an elevation differential of 54 feet from the highest point at the southerly end to the lowest point at the northerly end. Existing vegetation on the Project Site consists of predominantly ornamental shrubs and trees in planters, and a turf grass athletic field. Three coast live oak trees (Quercus agrifolia) are present on the Project Site and are located in the pre-school parking lot, north of the pre-

school building in the play area, and near the southeast corner of the elementary school building. There are no natural or channelized surface watercourses on the Project Site.

Zoning: *A-1 (Light Agriculture)*

General Plan: *Low Density Residential (1)*

Community/Area Wide Plan: *Rowland Heights Community Plan: U-1 (Urban 1)*

Major projects in area:

Project Number	Description & Status
TR 53843	*Six single-family lots on 3 acres (approved).*
TR 53612	*Five single-family lots on 2.66 acres (recorded).*
PM 26837	*Two single-family lots on 1.01 acres (approved).*
PM 060247	*Two single-family lots (pending).*

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ Caltrans District 7
- ☒ California Highway Patrol

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks
- ☒ Native American Heritage Commission
- ☐ _____

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ Rowland Unified School District
- ☒ City of Walnut
- ☒ City of West Covina
- ☒ City of Diamond Bar
- ☒ City of Industry
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____

Regional Significance

- ☐ None
- ☒ SCAG Criteria
- ☒ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns Area
- ☒ Walnut Valley Water District

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ Public Works: *GMED, Traffic and Lighting, Drainage and Grading*
- ☒ Health Services: Env. Hygiene
- ☒ Sanitation Districts_____
- ☒ Sheriff and Fire Department_____
- ☒ County Library
- ☒ Parks and Recreation

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details) Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	6	☐	☐	☒	*Liquefaction; groundwater*
	2. Flood	8	☐	☐	☒	*Alteration of existing drainage pattern/ increased runoff*
	3. Fire	10	☐	☐	☒	*Fire flow requirements; service demand increases*
	4. Noise	12	☐	☐	☒	*Increased roadway noise*
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	14	☐	☐	☒	*Increased storm runoff/ construction impacts*
	2. Air Quality	16	☐	☐	☒	*Increased mobile-source air emissions*
	3. Biota	18	☐	☒	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	20	☐	☒	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	22	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	23	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	25	☐	☐	☒	*Increased building height and mass*
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	27	☐	☐	☒	*Increased roadway traffic*
	2. Sewage Disposal	29	☐	☐	☒	*Increased wastewater generation*
	3. Education	30	☐	☐	☒	*Increased demand for schools*
	4. Fire/Sheriff	31	☐	☐	☒	*Increased demand for services*
	5. Utilities	32	☐	☐	☒	*Increased demand for utilities*
OTHER	1. General	34	☐	☐	☒	*Change in the scale of the surrounding area*
	2. Environmental Safety	36	☐	☐	☒	*Accidental release of hazardous materials*
	3. Land Use	39	☐	☐	☒	*Inconsistency with current land use plan and zone*
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	41	☐	☐	☒	*Potential to exceed population projections*
	Mandatory Findings	43	☐	☐	☒	*Cumulative impacts; severity of impacts*

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: 6/4/08

Approved by: _____ Date: 6-4-08

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

The Project Site is not within the currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No active or potentially active faults are known to pass directly beneath the Project Site. The closest active fault to the Project Site is the Whittier Fault, located 2.8 miles south of the Project Site, and the closest potentially active fault is the San Jose Fault, located 4.3 miles north of the Project Site. Further, the buildings would be constructed in compliance with the County's Uniform Building Code, and would include mandatory seismic safety features in the design. As such, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?

According to the Los Angeles County Seismic Safety Element and the California Geological Survey, the Project Site is not within an area identified as having a potential for landslides. There are no known landslides near the Project Site, nor is the Project Site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, the Project would not place structures or people in a landslide hazard area.

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?

According to the Los Angeles County Seismic Safety Element and the California Geological Survey, the Project Site is not within an area identified as having a potential for slope instability.

d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?

Groundwater: *During exploratory boring conducted on the Project Site, groundwater was encountered at depths of 11 to 19 feet beneath the ground surface, which may present a geotechnical hazard. Accordingly, additional analysis in an EIR is required.*

Liquefaction: *The Rowland Heights Community General Plan (RHCGB) only identifies areas north of SR-60 as occurring in a potential liquefaction zone, according to the Seismic Hazard Maps of the State of California, Yorba Linda Quadrangle.*

Subsidence and hydrocompaction: *According to the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Project Site, the existing fill and alluvial soils may not be suitable for direct support of the proposed Project buildings. As such, additional analysis in an EIR is required.*

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?

The Project would introduce a residential use to the Project Site. The Project Site is not located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard and the Project Site is not located in an area subject to liquefaction. However, the Project Site contains soils that may not be capable of supporting the Project and the site is within an area known to have substantially high groundwater, as discussed in (d) above. Accordingly, additional analysis in an EIR is required.

f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?

Construction of the Project includes grading and excavation, which may substantially alter the topography of the Project Site and may alter topography and slopes with grades in excess ofo 25 percent. The Project would require the import of approximately 20,000 cy of fill. Additional analysis in an EIR is required.

g. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

The Project Site is underlain by fine-grained silty sand, sandy silt and sandy clay deposits. The soils are primarily medium-dense to dense and firm to hard. However, due to the presence of groundwater beneath the Project Site, further investigation in an EIR is required to determine if the soils exhibit expansive properties

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?

Brea Canyon Cut Off Road channels storm water runoff from the hills to south of the Project Site. Additionally, according to the A.L.TA./A.C.S.M. Land Title Survey conducted for the Project Site in October 2007, a storm drain runs north-south through the Project Site. A second storm drain easement runs along the southeastern property boundary of the Project Site. However, the USGS quad sheet on which the Project Site is depicted does not identify a major drainage course on the Project Site. Consequently, site development with the proposed residential uses would not impact a defined major drainage course.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?

No Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone has been established for the Project Site. The Project Site lies within an unmapped panel of the FEMA/FIRM Community Panel No. 0650430960B. Brea Canyon Cut Off Road channels storm water runoff from the hills to south of the Project Site. Additionally, according to the A.L.TA./A.C.S.M. Land Title Survey conducted for the Project Site in October 2007, a storm drain runs north-south through the Project Site. A second storm drain easement runs along the southeastern property boundary of the Project Site. Therefore, additional analysis in an EIR is required to determine the potential for flood related hazards.

c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?

The Project Site is located within an existing urbanized area and is surrounded by residential and commercial uses, as well as an adjacent golf course. Due to the urbanized nature of the site and the surrounding area, as well as the site's topography, which does not include slopes in excess of 25 percent,

d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?

The Project would increase the portion of the Project Site currently covered by pavement, building footprints and other non-erodible surfaces. The remainder of the Project Site would be landscaped. The Project would not be subject to high erosion or debris deposition from runoff since the Project Site is buffered by residential uses south (uphill) of the Project Site. Additionally, a retaining wall is proposed along the portion of the Project Site downslope of the adjacent golf course. The Project would also be subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit during both construction and operation. As a part of this permit process, the Applicant would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as well as comply with the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements for treating the first three-quarter inch of rainfall over a 24-hour period. The Applicant is required to comply with the permit requirements through incorporation of design features and use of best management practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the Project. The County of Los Angeles will review the

Project plans for compliance with NPDES requirements as part of the Project review and approval process. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to high erosion or debris deposition from run off.

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?

The proposed development includes grading and excavation activities. Additionally, the Project would increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site, which could substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the Project Site. As such, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *The Los Angeles County Seismic Safety Element indicates that the Project Site is not located within the inundation boundaries of up gradient dams or reservoirs.*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?

The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of Los Angeles County that is not designated a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4).

b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?

The Project Site is not located in a high fire hazard area. The Project Site is developed with adequate access for fire fighting equipment. The Project Site is located on a stretch of Brea Canyon Cut Off Road which is four lanes in width, and is within 250 feet of the centerline of Colima Road, which is a major highway. In addition, final building plans will be submitted to the Los Angeles County Fire Department for review and approval, and the Project will comply with all County standards, including those related to roadway geomtrics and access, and must be reviewed against County standards by staff as part of the standard development review process to ensure compliance.

c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?

The Project proposes 775 dwelling units; however, the Project Site is not served by a single access, and the Project Site is not located within a high fire hazard area.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

The water system serving the Project Site is provided and maintained by the Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD). The WVWD has not yet indicated whether existing fire flow is adequate to serve the Project. Subject to further consultation with the Walnut Valley Water District and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD), additional water supply, pressure and fire hydrants may be required to meet fire flow standards. As such, further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

The Project Site is not located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions or uses. The Project Site is surrounded by residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses. The closest industrial uses to the Project Site are located approximately 0.75 miles north of the Pomona Freeway (SR-60).

f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

The Project proposes residential uses that do not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. No manufacturing, refining, or other industrial use that would consume, emit, or store potentially hazardous chemicals are associated with the Project.

g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?_____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?

The Project Site is not located in close proximity to any high noise sources such as airports, railroads, freeways or industrial uses. The site is approximately 0.75 miles south of the Pomona Freeway (SR-60), and the closest industrial uses are located north of the freeway.

b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?

The Project proposes residential uses. Existing sensitive uses in close proximity to the Project Site include a senior housing complex immediately to the north and single- and multi-family residences to the west, south and east. Additional analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?

During Project construction activities, the use of construction equipment during demolition, grading, excavation and construction activities would have the potential to substantially increase ambient noise levels in the surrounding area; although these increases would be temporary in nature.

During Project operations, vehicle traffic is expected to be the major source of noise. The number of vehicle trips generated by the Project would exceed the number of trips currently generated by present uses on the Project Site. The increase in local roadway traffic could increase ambient noise levels in the Project area. Other anticipated sources of noise include outdoor activities permitted on balconies and in planned open space or recreational areas on-site. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

d.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?

Noise generated by construction activities would be required to comply with the County of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance and all applicable codes and regulations for noise control. However, the noise generated by construction activities, which are anticipated to occur over a three-year period, may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. During Project operations, vehicle traffic would be the major source of noise in the Project vicinity. Other potential sources of noise include outdoor activities permitted on balconies and in planned open space or recreational areas on-site. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?

No water wells are located on site. The Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD) currently provides domestic water service to the Project Site and would serve the Project. The WVWD obtains its water supply from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). This water is treated by both the MWD and WVWD and meets all federal and state drinking water standards. Therefore, the Project is not proposing the use of local groundwater sources or individual water wells.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently provides sanitary sewer service to the Project Site and would serve the Project. Since the Project would discharge to the existing sewage system, no private sewage disposal system is required.

	☐	☒	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?

Not applicable (see above).

c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

The Project shall comply with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit discharge requirements during both construction and operation. As part of this permit process, the Applicant would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The Applicant is required to comply with the permit requirements through incorporation of design features and use of best management practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the Project. The County of Los Angeles will review the Project plans for compliance with NPDES requirements as part of the Project review and approval process. However, grading and construction activities could potentially result in impacts to storm water runoff. As a result, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is necessary.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

The proposed development would increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would most likely result in an increase in storm water runoff from the site. The Project shall comply with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the County National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit discharge requirements. However, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

_____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the Project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with Project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed Project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?

Since the Project proposes the introduction of approximately 775 dwelling units, the Project would exceed the State's criteria for regional significance. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?

The Project proposes residential uses and the Project Site is located approximately 0.75-miles south of the SR-60 and is not located near a heavy industrial use. Because the Project is not a sensitive use and is not located near a freeway or heavy industrial use, no further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?

The number of vehicle trips generated by the Project would exceed the number of trips currently generated by present uses on the Project Site. The increase in local roadway traffic has the potential to increase local vehicle emissions to a significant extent. The Project will also include parking structures on site. Accordingly, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?

The Project Site is not located in close proximity to sources of obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions; surrounding land uses are residential, commercial and recreational in nature. During construction, the Project could periodically generate obnoxious odors, dust and/or hazardous emissions. No obnoxious odors, dust and/or hazardous emissions would be generated during Project operation. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Project construction would involve the use of heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and on-site stationary equipment, which would generate air pollutant emissions. In addition, fugitive dust would be generated during excavation of the Project Site to construct the subterranean parking garage and grading of the Project Site. Construction emissions would be short term in nature and would be limited to the time periods during which construction activity occurs. Therefore, construction emissions would not add to long-term air quality degradation. The Project is located within South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and daily emissions from construction sources may exceed daily SCAQMD emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, the Project could conflict with the provisions of the applicable air quality plan, and further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

Project operations would increase local roadway traffic and, consequently, vehicle emissions. Daily mobile-source emissions may exceed daily SCAQMD emissions thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, the Project could conflict with the provisions of the applicable air quality plan, and further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Since the Project would generate construction emissions and increase local roadway traffic and, consequently, vehicle emissions, the Project has the potential to violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Accordingly, further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

g. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

The Project Site is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is currently in non-attainment for ozone (which is not directly emitted into the air but instead forms through NO_x and VOCs), PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Since the Project would generate construction emissions and increase local roadway traffic and, consequently, vehicle emissions, the Project has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors: _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☒ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

The Project Site is not located within a SEA, SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource area. The Project Site, which is located within a predominantly urbanized area of Rowland Heights, has been developed with institutional uses since the 1970s and contains no areas that could be considered undisturbed or natural.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

No natural habitat areas occur on the Project Site or in the immediately surrounding area. Since the Project Site is presently developed and surrounded by residential and commercial uses, implementation of the proposed Project would not remove substantial natural habitat areas.

c.	☐	☒	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

The USGS Yorba Linda quad sheet, which contains the Project Site, does not indicate a major drainage course on the Project Site. As such, a less than significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

d.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?

The Project Site, which is presently developed, does not contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat. No coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, or wetland habitats are present on-site. Additionally, no sensitive habitats are present in the Project vicinity. As such, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

The Project Site contains three coast live oak trees (Quercus agrifolia), one of which is a heritage tree (i.e., greater than 36 inches in diameter measured at breast height). No other "special status" trees are present on the Project Site. All other vegetation on the Project Site, including trees, is ornamental and dates to construction of the church and school buildings (since 1970). The three oak trees located on the Project Site would be removed as part of the Project. However, consistent with the requirements outlined in the Oak Tree Report for the Project, this impact shall be mitigated through compliance with County Code section 22.56.2050 et seq., which provides for the replacement of affected oak trees at a ratio of at least 2:1 (County Code § 22.56.2180) or a payment into the Oak Forestry Special Fund in an amount equivalent to the oak resource loss if the County Forester determines that replacement or relocation on site is inappropriate (County Code

§ 22.56.2140). For more information, please refer to the Oak Tree Report submitted as part of the Project application submitted to the County.

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

The Project Site, which is located within an urbanized area, does not contain habitat for any known sensitive species. The Project Site is currently developed with Southlands Christian Schools, which span grades Pre-K through 12, and the affiliated Southlands Church. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the site.

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

The Project Site, which is located within an urbanized area, is not within a wildlife corridor or adjacent to an open space linkage area. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the site. Accordingly, no further analysis in an EIR is required.

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Oak Tree Permit ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

Although three oak trees exist on the Project Site, no other features such as drainage courses, springs, knolls, or rock outcroppings that indicate archeological sensitivity are present. No archeological sites or isolates were identified on the Project Site or within a 1/2-mile radius of the Project Site. Surface grading and shallow excavations on the Project Site are unlikely to encounter significant archeological isolates. Therefore, the Project Site is not considered archeologically sensitive. However, in the event a prehistoric or historic resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity would halt and the isolate would be professionally removed. Therefore, no impacts to archeological resources would occur with Project implementation, and no further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required. (Source: Thomas Shackford, Lead Staff Researcher, South Central Coastal Information Center, letter to Betty Sears, Project Planner, Impact Sciences, Inc., April 15, 2008.)

b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

The Project Site does not contain any rock formations that indicate potential paleontological resources. No paleontological resources were identified on the Project Site. However, various fossil marine vertebrates have been found within the Project area. Surface grading and shallow excavations on the Project Site are unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossils. In the event a paleontological resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity would halt and the isolate would be professionally removed. Therefore, no impacts to paleontological resources would occur with Project implementation, and no further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required. (Source: Samuel McLeod, Ph.D., Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, letter to Betty Sears, Project Planner, Impact Sciences, Inc., April 10, 2008.)

c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

Existing structures on the Project Site, which were constructed between 1970 and 2002, are not considered historic resources. No known historically significant events have occurred on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project Site does not contain known historic structures or sites

d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?

No historical or archeological resources were identified on the Project Site. Furthermore, no listed historic resources are located within a 1/2-mile radius of the Project Site. In the event a prehistoric or historic resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity would halt and the isolate would be

professionally removed. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archeological resource, and no further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required. (Source: Thomas Shackford, Lead Staff Researcher, South Central Coastal Information Center, letter to with Impact Sciences, Inc., April 15, 2008.)

e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No paleontological resources or unique geologic features were identified on the Project Site. However, various fossil marine vertebrates have been found within the Project area. Surface grading and shallow excavations on the Project Site are unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossils. In the event a paleontological resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity would halt and the isolate would be professionally removed. Therefore, the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources or unique geologic feature, and no further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required. (Source: Samuel McLeod, Ph.D., Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, letter to Betty Sears, Project Planner, Impact Sciences, Inc., April 10, 2008.)

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase I Archaeology Report

MM-1 *In the event a prehistoric or historic resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity of the resource shall halt and the isolate shall be professionally removed.*

MM-2 *In the event a paleontological resource is encountered during construction of the Project, all construction activity in the immediate vicinity of the resource shall halt and the isolate shall be professionally removed.*

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The Project Site, which is currently developed with church and school uses, is not located within a locally important mineral resource discovery site and Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resources. As such, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not required. (Source: United States Geological Survey, "Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data," http://mrdata.usgs.gov/website/MRData-US/viewer.htm. 2008.)

b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

According to the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Rowland Heights Community General Plan, the Project Site, which is currently developed with church and school uses, is not located within a locally important mineral resource discovery site. Further, the Rowland Heights Community General Plan does not designate any locally important mineral resource discovery sites

c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the Project Site. As such, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not required (Source: Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map)

b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

The Project Site is zoned Light Agriculture, but is designated Low Density Residential by the County General Plan and Urban-1 by the Rowland Heights Community Plan. The Project Site is currently developed with non-agricultural uses including a church and schools. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the Project Site. No Williamson Act contract applies to the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses.

c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The Project Site is bordered by residential and commercial uses, and is located within 250 feet of Colima Road, a heavily developed commercial corridor. No agricultural uses are present on the Project Site or in the Project area and the Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use

d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

_____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

_____

_____

_____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

The Project Site is located along Brea Canyon Cutoff Road, which is not designated by the Scenic Highway Element as a scenic highway, but is designated by the Rowland Heights Community General Plan as a limited secondary highway. This classification is designed to protect routes in rural areas and preserve a rural appearance through incorporation of extended building setbacks. However, the Project Site is located on a four-lane stretch of Brea Canyon Cut Off Road that passes through residential and commercial development in the Project area as it approaches the Pomona Freeway, and industrial development north of the freeway. The Project Site is also within 250 feet of Colima Road, a major highway and heavily developed commercial corridor. Accordingly, Project implementation would not obstruct views along a scenic highway, since the Project Site is located outside the limits of a locally designated scenic corridor and would not otherwise impact the viewshed from a scenic highway. The Project is expected to be visually compatible with existing residential development to the south and west along Brea Canyon Cut Off Road. However, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

The Puente Hills, which are located south of the Project Site, offer regional riding and hiking trails. Due to the height and mass of the proposed structures, the Project could be substantially visible from locations along such trails. Accordingly, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features?

The Project Site, which is presently developed with nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field and surrounded by urban uses, is not located within, nor does it contain, an undeveloped or undisturbed area. The Project vicinity is already developed with a mix of residential and commercial uses. As the Project is not expected to affect any undeveloped or undisturbed areas or any unique aesthetic features, no additional analysis in an EIR is required.

d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

The Project will be designed to step back from adjacent development to minimize perceived height impacts from off-site vantages, and will utilize the existing topography of the Project Site to minimize visual impacts to surrounding properties. However, the Project proposes buildings that would exceed the height and mass of the buildings currently on the Project Site, as well as the height and mass of multi-family residential buildings in the Project area. The residences immediately south of the Project Site are two stories in height (some situated higher than the Project Site), the commercial buildings immediately north of the Project Site are two stories in height, and the senior

housing complex immediately north of the Project Site is two to three stories in height. The Project proposes three-story townhomes, a four-story podium building, and a three- and four-story wrap-around building. As a result, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

Because of the height and mass of the proposed buildings, the length and duration of shadows cast by the Project could exceed those cast by existing buildings on the Project Site. Additionally, the introduction of new and taller buildings on the Project Site has the potential to result in new light and glare impacts on surrounding land uses. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration):

The Project proposes grading and excavation, which could substantially alter the existing topography. Additional analysis is required.

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?

The Project proposes 775 dwelling units. The Project Site is located along Brea Canyon Cutoff Road, which is used as a commuter route between the Pomona and Orange Freeways. While currently Brea Canyon Cut Off Road does not experience congestion problems, due to the volume of vehicles utilizing this route and other surrounding streets in the future, congestion during peak hours could potentially occur within the Project area. With the addition of trips associated with Project implementation, the Project could contribute additional trips to existing congested conditions. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?

The design of the Project, and the internal circulation systems on site, take safety into consideration. All development must comply with the County standards including those related to sight distance, roadway width, and turning radius. Site plans for the Project will be reviewed by County staff as part of the standard development review process to ensure compliance with County standards. Accordingly, the Project design would not result in hazardous conditions for vehicles entering and/or exiting the Project Site.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?

The proposed Project is residential in nature. Part 11 of Chapter 22.52 of the Los Angeles County Code requires residential developments, in general, to provide parking based on the number of bedrooms in a residence. However, the Applicant is requesting a Residential Planned Development (RPD) zoning designation for the Project. Under this designation, the parking provisions outlined in Chapter 22.52 do not apply where a Conditional Use Permit has been issued. In such circumstances, the Planning Commission requires automobile parking in an amount adequate to prevent traffic congestion and excessive off-street parking. In no instance shall less than one covered parking space per dwelling unit be provided. The Project proposes a total of 1,544 parking spaces on-site, which is in excess of the minimum standard for an RPD zone and conforms to the County's general apartment parking requirements. While the Project is anticipated to provide an adequate number of parking spaces to serve the proposed Project, further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?

Modifications to existing Project Site access and on-site circulation are proposed. However, building and site plans will be provided to the Los Angeles County Fire Department for review and approval. Through Department review and approval, adequate emergency access designs will be incorporated into the Project, and compliance with these standards will ensure the Project provides adequate emergency access.

e.	☐	☐	☒	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?

No CMP highway intersections are located in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, implementation of the Project would not exceed the threshold of 50 peak hour trips vehicles added to a CMP highway system intersection. However, traffic generated by the Project may impact existing circulation patterns, and the traffic load and capacity of the existing street system, which may significantly affect, either cumulatively or individually, levels of service (LOS) through the addition of 150 peak hour trips added to a mainline freeway link. As such, further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required

f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The Project Site is located in close proximity to several public transit options including Metro Bus, Foothill Transit and Metrolink which will encourage the use of public transportation. Adopted policies, plans, or programs supportive of alternative transportation that affect transportation planning in the vicinity of the Project Site include the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County. The EIR will further analyze the consistency of the Project with these adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

_____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

_____

_____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?

The Project Site is currently served by a sanitary sewer system, and effluent generated by the Project would be treated at facilities operated by the Sanitation District of Los Angeles County However, the Project could increase the quantity of wastewater currently generated on the Project Site. Therefore, further analysis of treatment capacity in the EIR is required.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?

The Project could increase the quantity of wastewater currently generated on the Project Site. Currently, sewer lines are in place to serve existing uses on the Project Site. However, implementation of the Project could increase the quantity of wastewater entering sewer lines serving the Project Site. Therefore, further analysis of local sewer capacity is required.

c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?

The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for schools within the Rowland Heights Unified School District (RHUSD). Therefore, further analysis of the current and planned capacity of the RHUSD school system is required in an EIR.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?

The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for RHUSD schools serving the Project Site. Further analysis of the current and planned capacities of these schools in an EIR is required.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create student transportation problems?

The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for student transportation services. Therefore, further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

The Project would be served by the Los Angeles County Public Library system. The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for local library services. Therefore, further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

---

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for fire and sheriff's services. The Los Angeles County Fire and Sheriff's Departments shall be consulted during preparation of the EIR to determine the Project's impacts to staffing and response time. The nearest fire station is located approximately 1 mile away from the Project Site (20480 Pathfinder Road, Rowland Heights, CA 91748) and the nearest Sheriff's substation is located approximately 2.3 miles from the Project Site (1737 Fullerton Rd. Rowland Heights, CA 91748). The increase in demand for fire and sheriff's services represents a potentially significant impact. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is necessary.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

The Los Angeles County Fire and Sheriff's Departments will be consulted during preparation of the EIR in order to assess any fire and law enforcement issues associated with the Project and general area. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is necessary.

c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

The Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD) provides domestic water service to the Project Site. The WVWD obtains its water supply from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). The proposed construction of 775 residential units could increase the demand for water within the WVWD service area. The WVWD will be consulted during preparation of the EIR to assess the Project's impact on the current and planned water supply. Due to uncertainties related to the amount of water that MWD will be able to supply to Southern California in the near future given the recent federal court decision Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Kempthorne, et al. (NRDC), further analysis of this issue in an EIR is necessary. Furthermore, State of California Senate Bill (SB) 610 and SB 221 became effective January 1, 2002, amending Sections 10910-10915 of the State Water Code, and requiring that counties and cities consider the availability of adequate water supplies for residential development with more than 500 dwelling units. These statutes require that cities and counties obtain from the local water supplier written verification of sufficient water supply to serve proposed large development projects in their jurisdiction. As a result, further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

The Los Angeles County Fire Department will be consulted during the preparation of the EIR to assess the fire flow requirements for the Project. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?

Utilities such as electricity and natural gas currently serve the Project Site and surrounding area. The Project could increase the demand on these existing utility services, which represents a potentially significant impact. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works provides sanitary sewer service to the Project Site. The Project could increase the quantity of wastewater discharged into the local sanitary sewer system. The Department of Public Works will be consulted during preparation of the EIR in order to assess the Project's impacts on sewer capacity. Solid waste service is managed by the County of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation Districts. Implementation of the Project could result in an increase in the quantity of solid waste generated from the Project Site; as such the Bureau of Sanitation Districts will be contacted during preparation of the EIR in order to assess the Project's impacts on solid waste. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or

facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

The Project could increase the demand for fire and police protection, school facilities, recreational facilities, and other public services. The construction of additional facilities due to Project-generated or cumulative increase in demand may be required to maintain acceptable performance standards. Further analysis of this topic in an EIR is required.

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

_____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

The Project is expected to exceed the energy efficiency standards required by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Additionally, the Project would implement design features that incorporate the "California Build It Green Multifamily Greenpoint Checklist." Additionally, the Project would comply with any applicable ordinances which may be adopted by the County imposing green building techniques, low impact development principles and drought tolerant landscaping. Specific energy-conserving features of the Project have not been finalized at this time, but may include: permeable pavement surfaces; energy-efficient heating and air conditioning systems; energy-efficient lighting; reuse of gray water for on-site landscaping irrigation; recycled water in on-site water features; insulated building walls and roof; and timer controls for lighting, power and water features. Therefore, the Project would not result in an inefficient use of energy resources. .

b.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?

The Project will be designed to step back from adjacent development to minimize perceived height impacts, and the Project will utilize the existing topography of the Project Site to minimize visual impacts to surrounding properties. However, the Project proposes buildings that would exceed the height and mass of the buildings currently situated on the Project Site as well as the height and mass of the buildings in the Project area. The residences immediately south of the Project Site are two stories in height, the commercial buildings immediately north of the Project Site are two stories in height, and the senior housing complex immediately north of the Project Site is two to three stories in height. The Project proposes three-story townhomes, a four-story podium building, and a three- and four-story wrap-around building. Therefore, the Project may result in a major change in the scale or character of the general area. Additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

The Project Site, which is currently developed with a school and church and is located in an urbanized area, is not being used for agricultural production. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not result in a reduction in agricultural land.

d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

_____

_____

_____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

Based on the above information, the Project could result in a significant impact on the physical environment both on a project-specific and cumulative level.

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?

According to the Asbestos Survey Report prepared for the Project Site, the earliest built structures of the nine stand-alone and interconnected buildings on the site were constructed in 1970. According to samples collected from the structures on the site, exterior stucco, drywall joint compound and adhesive under hardwood floors contain asbestos. To remove the asbestos containing materials (ACMs) on the Project Site, the Report recommends that any ACMs and ACCMs identified at the Project Site, which may be disturbed during renovation/demolition activities, be removed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor utilizing state-of-the-art work procedures and in accordance with all state, federal, and local regulations. (Source: LFR Asbestos Survey Report, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, California, 91789, September 25, 2007).

No other hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public are used, transported, produced, handled or stored on-site. Hazardous materials currently used and stored on the Project Site are limited to one-gallon containers of paint, cylinders of helium, one-gallon containers of gasoline for power hand tools and small containers of cleaning agents. The use and storage of these materials are typical to school operations. These materials are generally disposed of at non-hazardous Class II and III landfills (along with traditional solid waste) and are not considered an environmental concern. (Source: LFR, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, California, 91789, September 6, 2007).

Additionally, groundwater and soil gas samples were collected from the Project Site. Tests indicated that volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are not present above the laboratory detection limit, with the exception of very low concentrations of toluene and m,p-xylene. The concentrations of these substances are below the California Department of Health Services maximum contaminant levels and are not considered an environmental concern. No additional subsurface investigation is required. (LFR, Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Walnut, California, November 15, 2007)

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?

Construction and operation of the proposed residential uses do not require the extensive or ongoing use of materials or pressurized tanks that would create a significant hazard to the public. The occasional use or disposal of hazardous materials generally associated with residential uses include unused paint, aerosol cans, cleaning agents, automotive fluids, landscaping-related chemicals, and other common household substances. These materials are generally disposed of at non-hazardous Class II and III landfills (along with traditional solid waste). Therefore, the impact of the Project on the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is less than significant, given that appropriate procedures and guidelines are followed during Project construction and throughout Project operation . (Source: LFR, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, California, 91789, September 6, 2007

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and

potentially adversely affected?

Residences are located within 500 feet of the Project Site. However, these uses would not be adversely affected by the Project, which would utilize the same substances commonly used in households.

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?

Prior to construction of the existing structures on the Project Site, the site was used for agricultural purposes. Given the past use, groundwater and soil gas samples were collected from the Project Site. Tests indicate that VOCs are not present above the laboratory detection limit, with the exception of very low concentrations of toluene and m,p-xylene. The concentrations of these substances are below the California Department of Health Services maximum contaminant levels and are not considered an environmental concern. No additional subsurface investigation is required. Therefore, the Project Site is not subjected to residual soil toxicity. (Source: LFR, Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Walnut, California, November 15, 2007)

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?

An asbestos survey report found that several materials, including exterior stucco, adhesive under hardwood floors and drywall joint compound, which exist within structures on the Project Site, contain asbestos. Construction activities shall comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403 – Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities. This rule is intended to limit asbestos emissions from the demolition or renovation of structures and the associated disturbance of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) generated or handled during these activities. The rule requires that SCAQMD be notified before demolition or renovation activity occurs. This notification includes a description of structures and methods utilized to determine the presence or absence of asbestos. All ACMs found on the Project Site shall be removed prior to demolition or renovation in accordance with the requirements of Rule 1403. (Source: LFR, Asbestos Survey Report, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, California, September 25, 2007.

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The Project Site is not located within one-quarter mile of any existing or proposed school. No further analysis is required.

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?

An environmental database report for local, state and federal listings for the Project Site and properties within one-mile of the Project Site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 was reviewed. The Project Site is not listed on any environmental databases; however, several off-site facilities are listed within either federal or state databases. According to the conclusions within the Phase I prepared for the site, none of the listed facilities that would present an environmental concern for the Project Site. . (Source: LFR, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Southlands Church International, 1920 Brea Canyon Cut Off Road, Rowland Heights, California, 91789, September 6, 2007)

h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located

within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?

The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

l. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The Project Site would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further analysis is required.

j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?

The current land use designation for the Project Site is U-1 (Urban 1), which allows for single-family residences at a density of 1.1 to 3.2 dwelling units per gross acre. The Project proposes the construction of 775 new multi-family residences, which is inconsistent with the current land use designation. Following approval of the Applicant's requested entitlements, including a zone change, a conditional use permit, a general plan amendment, an oak tree permit, and other necessary permits, the Project would be consistent with the plan designation for the site. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

The current zoning designation for the Project Site is A-1-20,000 (Light Agriculture) which does not allow multi-family residences. The Project proposes the construction of 775 new multi-family residences, which is inconsistent with the current zoning designation for the site. Following approval of the Applicant's requested entitlements, including a zone change, a conditional use permit, a general plan amendment, an oak tree permit, and other necessary permits, the Project would be consistent with the zoning designation of the Project. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:

☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?

The Project Site is not located within a Hillside Management Area. As such, no further analysis is required.

☐ ☒ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?

The Project Site is not located within a designated Significant Ecological Area. As such, no further analysis is required.

☐ ☐ ☐ Other? _____

d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?

The Project would limit development to the Project Site and would not modify any off-site properties or roadways as to physically divide an established community.

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

_____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Continued growth in population is predicted to occur throughout unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County and the San Gabriel Valley. For instance, according to the County's draft General Plan Housing Element (which cites the Southern California Association of Government's data), in 2005, the San Gabriel Valley population totaled 364,836 people, and this population growth is expected to grow by another 13% (up to 411,629) by 2014. Further, the population in unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County is expected to increase by 16% between 2005 and 2014, or from 1,086,077 to 1,263,045. The Project 775 dwelling units, and would provide new housing within the Rowland Heights community. While the Project itself would not increase the community's population to an extent that exceeds projections by the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) or County of Los Angeles, further analysis is required to address whether the Project could have a cumulatively considerable contribution to exceedance of official regional or local population projections.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

While the Project is not located in an undeveloped area or extending any major infrastructure, the Project does include changes in land use and zoning designations that historically allowed single-family residences but would now permit the construction of multi-family residences, thereby inducing population growth in the Rowland Heights community. As such, additional analysis in an EIR is required.

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

The Project Site is currently developed with schools and a church, which would be removed as part of the Project. Therefore, no housing would be displaced with implementation of the Project. No further analysis is required.

d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?

The Project would introduce new multi-family housing, which could result in a job/housing imbalance within the immediate Rowland Heights community. However, the Project Site is located in close proximity to job centers within the San Gabriel Valley, is within easy access of the Pomona Freeway as well as mass transit services, and is within walking distance of community and commercial services. According to the San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership, there currently are over 600,000 jobs in the San Gabriel Valley. The Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation's 2007-2008 Economic Overview and Forecast reports that Rowland Heights alone is home to over 2,022 business establishments and the San Gabriel Valley as a whole housed over 42,416 businesses in 2005. Several large companies and corporations are also housed in near-by cities such as City of Industry, Diamond Bar, Pomona, and Brea. Thus, the Project Site's location in close proximity to Colima Road, a major roadway and public transportation corridor running the length of Rowland Heights, will give residents easy access to local employment. Further, its proximity to two major freeways via Brea Canyon Cut Off Road and Fairway Drive (Brea Canyon Cut Off Road becomes Fairway

Drive north of Colima Road) will allow access to jobs in the broader San Gabriel Valley and Northern Orange County areas with minimal impact to local streets. While the Project Site is located within close proximity to jobs, services and public transit, the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project would exceed the number of trips currently generated by present uses on the Project Site, resulting in an increase in VMT. As such, additional analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?

The Project would include recreational amenities for Project residents; however, additional facilities may be required to meet the applicable County of Los Angeles ratios of open space to population. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is required.

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The Project would not displace any existing housing or residents. As such, the Project would not result in the displacement of residents such that new replacement housing would need to be constructed. No further analysis of this issue is required.

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? _____

_____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

_____

_____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment**, or **recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The Project Site, which is located within an urbanized area, does not contain habitat for any known sensitive species. Nine single-story buildings, two paved surface parking lots and an athletic field currently occupy the site. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Additionally, no important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory would be eliminated. No further analysis is required.

b.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

The Project has possible environmental effects which may be cumulatively considerable. A list of related projects shall be obtained during preparation of the EIR. The EIR will include an analysis of both individual and cumulative impacts for each environmental topic.

c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The EIR will discuss Project impacts to the public and the environment. Further analysis is required to determine the severity of the impacts and the mitigation measures to address these impacts.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact