Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: "The Lanterns – Mixed Use Development", Project No. 2014-01598-(5)/Case No. RPP 201400584; RENV 201400126

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Rudy Silvas (213) 974-6438

Project sponsor's name and address: Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project location: 5213 Tyler Ave., Temple City (Unincorporated area)
APN: 8574-014-032 *USGS Quad:* El Monte

Gross Acreage: 14,000 sq.ft. net; 0.35 net acres

General plan designation: Countywide General Plan: Residential 30 (30du/1 net acre)

Community/Area wide Plan designation: N/A

Zoning: R-3 Zone (Limited Multiple Residence)

Description of project: The proposed project is the demolition of existing commercial structures and the subsequent construction of a new mixed use commercial/residential development. The new mixed use development is a proposed structure at 4 stories high, plus a 5th story for roof access and subterranean parking, with a commercial suite proposed at the first level, and 16 apartment units proposed at the second level to the fourth level. A total of 42 parking stalls are provided in the subterranean garage and first floor level, including required disabled parking stalls, guest stalls, plus one commercial loading space. Maximum height of the proposed structure is 55.25 feet. Grading is proposed for 5,700 cubic yards of cut and 200 cubic yards of fill, export of 5,500 cubic yards. The site location is at the west side of a T-intersection of Tyler Avenue and Arrowood Street.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The site, located in the unincorporated South Monrovia Islands area, is surrounded by multi-unit residential development, commercial, and single-family residential development. The area is highly urbanized, and although the site is within close proximity to the El Monte Airport, it is not located within an airport influence zone.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control	May be required for site cleanup due to previous commercial uses.

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
None listed	None listed.

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Forest
- ☒ Gabrieleno/Tongva Council
- ☒ City of El Monte; El Monte USD
- ☒ City of Temple City
- ☒ State Department of Toxic Substances Control
- ☐ Golden State Water Co.
- ☒ Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Regional Significance

- ☐ None
- ☒ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- ☐ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- ☐ State Lands Commission
- ☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Traffic and Lighting Division
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
  - Sewer Maintenance Division
- ☒ Fire Department
  - Forestry, Environmental Division
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
  - Health Hazmat
- ☒ Sanitation District
- ☒ Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- ☒ Sheriff Department
- ☐ Parks and Recreation
- ☐ Subdivision Committee

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture/Forest	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☒ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources	☒ Land Use/Planning	☒ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☒ Utilities/Services
☐ Energy	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☒ Geology/Soils		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by) — Date: 3-16-16

Signature (Approved by) — Date: 3-16-16

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is located in an urbanized area, adjacent to two-story multi-unit residential development, single-family residences, and some commercial use establishments. The view of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north from this urbanized location would be the only scenic vista in the area available to some properties with structures that have second floors. The proposed structure at 5 stories may partially obscure the view of the mountains for adjacent properties to the south and west of the project site, but would be considered a less than significant impact.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no riding and/or hiking trails adjacent to the project site.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no identified scenic resources at the project site or on adjacent properties.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The bulk and height of the proposed 5story structure would partially obstruct the view of the mountains to the north for adjacent properties to the south and west of the project site, but would be considered a less than significant impact. The project site itself has no visual quality or character to it.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The bulk and height of the proposed 5 story structure, up to 55.25 feet in height, may cast a larger shadow than other multi-story structures upon adjacent parcels. However, the impacts from the shadow of the proposed structure upon adjacent properties would be less than significant.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) 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 proposed project is located in an urbanized area and in a commercial zone. No impacts to farmland would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is located in a commercial zone. No conflict with agricultural uses.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project site is located in a commercial zone and in an urbanized area. No conflict or impact to forest land use.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area. No loss of forest land will result.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No changes to the existing environment of the project site could impact farmland or forestland. The project site is in an urbanized area.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not conflict with the requirements of the applicable air quality plans of the SCAQMD. The proposed development would comply with all requirements of the SCAQMD both during construction and after the project is built. Any slight increase in emissions related to the project would be considered less than significant.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed development would not result in a significant production of emissions that could affect air quality.

c) 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No significant amount of emissions, or any criteria pollutant, will result from the proposed project. No cumulative impact on air quality is expected.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No sensitive receptors will be exposed to substantial pollutant concentration as a result of the proposed project.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Surrounding residents and tenants would not be subjected to a significant level of objectionable odors during construction of the project or following its completion. Commercial use proposed as part of mixed use will not create and significant level of objectionable odors. Any automobile emission impacts related to the commercial use would be less than significant.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is in a built up urban area. No impact to any sensitive species is anticipated.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Project site is in a built up urban area. No impacts to any sensitive species or habitat communities will occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No impacts to any wetlands will occur as a result of the project. Project site located in a developed urban area.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will not interfere with any wildlife movement. Project located in a developed urban area.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees	☐	☐	☐	☒

(junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

The proposed project will not impact any oak woodland or other native plant species. Project site is in a developed urban area.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resource area due to project's location in a developed urban area.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not conflict with any adopted plans for habitat conservation due to project location in developed urban area.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not have an impact on any known historical resource. No such resources (i.e. historical landmark, sacred Native American grounds, etc.) are known to exist at the project site.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site has been previously developed. It is highly unlikely that any significant archaeological resource exists below the project site. Should any archaeological features be unearthed during grading, the project shall be conditioned for all work to stop and the discovery reported to proper authorities.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontologica1 221l resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not impact any known unique paleontological or geological features. No such features exist at the site.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site has been previously developed. No human remains are believed to exist below the project site. Should any human remains be unearthed during grading the work shall stop and the discovery reported to proper authorities.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project shall comply with the County's Green Building and Drought Tolerant Landscape Ordinances. County Public Works shall enforce the requirements of the ordinances.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is designed to implement the efficient use of energy resources. Roof top solar panels are to be used.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐

There is no mapped fault trace on-site. Nearest mapped fault trace is 3.4 miles to the northwest (California Geological Survey – Special Studies Zones, November 1, 1991).

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project site located in area subject to liquefaction, indicating potential for strong seismic ground shaking (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, March 25, 1999). Soils Engineering Report dated April 7, 2015, cleared by Public Works. No requirements for mitigation measures received. At the grading plan stage, applicant shall submit plans to the Soils Section at Public Works for verification of compliance with County codes and policies. Proposed structure will have to meet latest building code standards for development in area subject to liquefaction.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed site located in area subject to liquefaction. Project must comply with state and local laws regulating the placement of structures in areas identified as liquefaction zones. At the grading plan stage, applicant shall submit plans to the Soils Section at Public Works for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No potential landslide hazards are indicated on the project site or nearby on the Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, March 25, 1999).

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed project site is flat and located in an urbanized area. Very little to no potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil due to runoff during construction phase of project, no potential when project is completed.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed project site is located in liquefaction zone. Project shall comply with state and local laws, the local Title 26 County Building Code, regulating the placement of structures with residential units in relation to areas identified as seismic hazards on California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Maps. At the grading plan stage, applicant shall submit plans to the Soils Section at Public Works for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

d) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed project shall comply with state and local laws, the local Title 26 County Building Code, regulating the placement of structures with residential units in relation to areas identified as seismic hazards on California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Maps. At the grading plan stage, applicant shall submit plans to the Soils Section at Public Works for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Proposed project will connect to existing sewer lines. No need to place on-site waste water treatment systems on project site.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Proposed project site in a flat location in an urbanized area. Hillside management is non-applicable.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project's mixed residential/commercial development will have 42 parking stalls. Auto emissions will account for some minor impacts increasing GHG quantities, but considered to be a less than significant impact. The proposed structure shall also comply with required Green Building standards, further reducing the potential for GHG emissions to less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project's mixed residential/commercial development will not conflict with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for reducing GHG emissions. During construction, best management practices shall be used to control emissions from construction vehicles.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project's commercial use in the R-3 (Unlimited Commercial) Zone will not involve any use, storage, transportation or disposal of hazardous materials. During the construction phase, the use and storage of any hazardous construction materials (e.g. certain types of sealants, welding tanks) shall be properly managed on-site through best management practices.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project creates no significant hazard to the public with any potential release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment during the construction phase or after the project is completed.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is located in an urbanized area. Any handling of construction related materials that may be hazardous shall be properly stored and management through best management practices.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a Cortese list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site did not appear on the State DTSC "Cortese" list for Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is located 0.5 miles northeast of the El Monte Airport perimeter, 1 mile northeast of the airport annex. Although in close proximity to the airport, the project site is not located within the airport's land use plan or its influence zone. No safety hazards would result for people working or residing in the project area due to the project's location in close proximity to the airport. The proposed height of the structure at 55.25 feet will not be hazard for any approaching aircraft to the El Monte airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located in Fire Zone 4.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not in a high fire hazard area with inadequate access. Project site located in an urbanized area with adequate roads.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project site located in a developed urban area. Water pressure should meet fire flow tests for proposed development.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located near other land uses which present a dangerous fire hazard. The surrounding neighborhood consists primarily of residential use with some light commercial use mixed in.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project's mixed residential/commercial development is considered to be a very low fire hazard. The commercial and residential uses proposed shall meet all Fire Department requirements for safety. Should a use open in the commercial portion that requires extra safety (e.g. commercial kitchen), safety measures per the Fire Department shall be implemented.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project site is located in an urbanized area. Surrounding infrastructure is able to accommodate the proposed development. Sewer area study approved by Public Works September 14, 2015.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Water supply for the proposed project will be through a water supply agency. No on-site water well will be used. A water will-serve letter has been signed on March 17, 2015, by Golden State Water Company to serve the project site.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project will implement required on-site and off-site drainage requirements per County Public Works. No erosion issues will result from the completed project. A final drainage and grading plan must be approved by Public Works prior to issuance of any grading and/or building permits. Best management practices shall be used during the construction phase to control any potential runoff and erosion. Project site is flat.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would be developed with an approved drainage and grading plan by County Public Works. The new drainage pattern would be an improvement for the site over what is currently developed, and would better prevent flooding issues both on and off-site. All drainage devices are to be maintained by the owner, as indicated on sheet C-1 of the conceptual grading plan dated April 7, 2015.

e) Add water features or create conditions in which	☐	☐	☐	☒

standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?

The proposed project would not create conditions which would result in pools of water suitable for mosquitoes to breed.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project's scope would not create runoff that would exceed the stormwater capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. No additional sources of polluted runoff are likely to result from the project.

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project's construction phase will be managed under best management practices to control runoff . The completed project will comply with an applicable NPDES – MS4 permit requirements. No sources that could generate a significant amount of polluted runoff are anticipated.

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project shall comply with drainage requirements per Building and Safety and Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance requirements. Project will be required to comply with Chapter 12.84 of Title 12 of the Los Angeles County Code for Environmental Protection.

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project will not be a source of pollutant discharges, either directly or indirectly, into SWRCB designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Although project will have one commercial suite, it will not be for a service station or other type of commercial use that could involve polluted runoff. Such commercial uses would not fit in with the design of the structure.

j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project will not utilize on-site waste water treatment systems. Project will connect to sewer line.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Drainage from covered areas as well as storm water entering the subterranean floor must be treated for water quality. Drainage plan and sewer line connections are required to be approved which will ensure protection of water quality.

l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project site is not located within FEMA Flood Zone A or County floodway. *Source: County of Los Angeles CEO / ITS Emergency Management Systems: data recieved: 2/9/2010.*

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway or floodplain.

n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is in a mapped dam inundation area, at 3 miles to the southwest of Santa Fe Dam. (*Source: County of Los Angeles CEO / ITS Emergency Management Systems; data recieved: 2/9/2010.*) The project is required to have approval of a drainage and grading plan by Public Works. Proper distribution of drainage that includes contributory drainage from adjoining properties is required. Due to the location of the project site within and near the periphery of the mapped dam inundation area, the drainage plan will be required to accommodate for impacts related to dam failure to a level that is less than significant. Approval of the drainage and grading plan is required prior to issuance of grading permits.

o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is located in a flat urbanized inland area. There are no potential impacts to the project site by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would blend in to the established community, surrounded by multi-unit residences, single-family residences, and light commercial.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is a multi-unit residential development with a commercial suite, located in an area designated as Residential 30 (30du/1 net acre) under the Countywide General Plan. The number of units permitted under the General Plan would be less than the number of units proposed; however, because the application for the Director's review for the proposed mixed use development was filed when the property was in a C-3 Zone the number of units permitted for a mixed residential/commercial under County Code Section 22.28.200 pursuant to Part 18 of Chapter 22.52 is 50du/1 acre. The project density complies with the mixed use ordinance. Based on the project site's gross lot size of 0.39 acres, the maximum number of units permitted would be 19 units pursuant to Part 18 of Chapter 22.52 and the previous method for calculating density prior to the new Countywide General Plan update in November 2015. The project is proposed with 16 residential units, and one commercial suite, which is consistent with the mixed-use zoning ordinance density allowance

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is for a multi-unit residential development with a commercial suite located in an R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) Zone, with the application for mixed use development submitted when the property was zoned C-3 . Residential units are permitted for a mixed residential/commercial development under authority of the Director in the C-3 Zone per County Code Section 22.28.200 pursuant to Part 18 of Chapter 22.52. Because the application for Director's review of the mixed use was received prior to the zone change, the application has been processed in accordance with County Code Section 22.16.225.C under the original standards for such development in the C-3 Zone. The maximum density of dwelling units allowed pursuant to Part 18 of Chapter 22.52 is 50du/1 acre. The project's mixed use structure is proposed for a maximum height of 55.25 feet with the mixed use ordinance pursuant to Part 18 of Chapter 22.52 . The height would exceed the 35 foot height limit allowed for the new and current R-3 Zone but will be allowed due to the application submittal prior to the zone change in November 2015.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is located in an urbanized area that is flat in topography. No hillside management or significant ecological area policies apply.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) 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 and surrounding area consists of surficial alluvial materials identified as Hs (Holocene stream channel, alluvial fan, flood plain, and dune deposits, fine to medium-coarse grained). No significant loss of a known mineral resource of value to the region will result from the project.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project will not result in the loss of known mineral resources.

13. NOISE

Would the project result in:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Noise from the proposed project during the development phase shall be managed through best management practices and in accordance with the noise ordinance. Upon completion, minor noise impacts to surrounding apartment buildings and single family residences from parking in project structure first level area in connection with commercial use may result, but nothing significant. Project site is zoned R-3.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Control of temporary groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during the demolition and grading phases shall be managed by best management practices. No significant impacts will result.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project when completed may have some minor noise impacts related to parking for commercial use upon surrounding multi-unit and single family residential uses, but is not considered to be a significant impact. Project site is zoned R-3.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project should not involve the use of an amplified sound system on a routine basis, but may in the event of emergencies only.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not within an airport influence zone or land use plan, although located in close proximity to El Monte Airport. The project would not expose residents in the development and nearby residents to excessive noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located in close proximity to El Monte Airport, a public airport facility. The project itself would not expose residents in the development and nearby residents to excessive noise levels.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project will generate a slight increase in local population growth, but not significantly. No significant impacts to existing infrastructure should result from the project.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not result in the removal of existing housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project will not involve removal of existing housing units. Project will result in additional housing units for the area.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project will slightly increase the population of the area, but not significantly. No local or regional population projections will be exceeded as a result.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not anticipated to create service level problems for Fire and Emergency Service personnel. The surrounding area is developed with residential and commercial uses, part of an urbanized area. Fire Station No. 169, Division II, is located 0.8 miles directly east of the project site.

Sheriff protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not anticipated to create service problems for law enforcement personnel. The County Sheriff Department's Temple City Station is located 3 miles directly west of the project site.

Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project with its non-significant increase in area population would not impact area schools.

Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project with its non-significant increase in area population would not impact or create a higher demand for local or regional park services.

Libraries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project with its non-significant increase in area population would not impact or create a higher demand for local library services.

Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No other public facilities are anticipated to be impacted by the proposed project.

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The non-significant population increase due to the proposed project would not facilitate an accelerated deterioration on local and regional parks. The nearest County Park facility is Peck Road County Park, located 0.75 miles directly east of the project site.

b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project does not include the development or expansion of any park facilities.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is in an urbanized area and will not interfere with regional open space connectivity.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would not likely conflict with any plan, ordinance or policy for effective traffic circulation. Local bus service is provided nearby by El Monte Transit, and regional service by MTA Line 487 on Santa Anita Avenue to the west.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐

It is not anticipated that the proposed project will significantly impact the exiting level of traffic in the area and the congestion management program for it.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will impact the T-intersection with more vehicles that ingress and egress the project site, but not at levels that would be considered significant. The applicant has submitted to Public Works a site plan set dated May 22, 2014 and June 4, 2014 for submittal depicting on-site parking and circulation lanes. Public Works' Road and Grading Section has cleared the project with conditions for on-site and off-site street and sidewalk improvements. All potential impacts related to project will be less than significant with implementation of project conditions. County Public Works will impose any necessary traffic control measures to ensure traffic does not become a hazard in the area.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project is designed to have direct access from Tyler Avenue and will not present problems with

emergency access from the street. Parking areas are located in a subterranean and level one parking garage. Interior access requirements will be set forth by the Fire Department. There are no on-site easements as indicated on sheet C-1 of the conceptual grading plan dated April 7, 2015, and all fire lanes with no parking are clearly depicted.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will not conflict with policies or plans for public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The new development will have bike racks placed in the parking area.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project should not exceed requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. No significant impact to treatment requirements are anticipated as a result of the project. The applicant has received approval of a sewer area study for the site from Public Works on September 14, 2015. No call for mitigation measures were received. Project impact will be less than significant.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project is not likely to significantly impact capacity requirements for wastewater treatment. Due to the project site in an urbanized area, wastewater system capacity is very likely able to accommodate the project. The applicant has received approval of a sewer area study for the site from Public Works on September 14, 2015. No call for mitigation measures were received. Revised conceptual grading plan dated April 7, 2015, Sheet C-1, depicts 8" and 24" sewer lines along Tyler Avenue, with proposed 6" sewer lateral from site to 8" sewer line. Project impact will be less than significant.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project location in an urbanized area with its infrastructure for drainage is most likely capable to handle new drainage requirements as a result of the project. County Public Works will set forth all drainage requirements and review and approve the project's drainage and grading plan. A storm drain connection permit from Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) is required prior to construction if a connection is necessary to storm drain system Bl 0521-Line B on Tyler Avenue.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project is to be served by Golden State Water Company. A water will serve letter was signed by Golden State Water Company for the Southern California Water Company, Foothill District, to serve the project site on March 17, 2015.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located in an urbanized area served by existing energy utility infrastructure capable of serving the proposed development.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project should not create a significant impact on solid waste disposal services currently serving the urbanized area.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will comply with all level of government statutes and regulation for solid waste disposal.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, substantially 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 is located in an urbanized area. Existing commercial structures will be demolished on the project site to accommodate the proposed mixed use development. The proposed development would fit within the context of the surrounding community with no significant impact to the environment.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project will not have any potential significant impacts. Environmental goals will be maintained through the project development phase and after the project is completed.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a 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 will increase the number of vehicles to ingress and egress Tyler Avenue from the project site, and may be considered cumulatively with future projects that may be proposed in the area. Future cumulative impacts from traffic, including contributions from the proposed development, are likely to be less than significant.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No substantial adverse effects would be created as a result of the project. Some building shade patterns may slightly affect the residences of the adjoining properties, but not to a significant level.