

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



**Project title:** R2014-01018/ RTM TR072718 / RENV201400089.

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

**Contact Person and phone number:** Steven Jones (213)974-6433

**Project sponsor's name and address:** Efrem Joelson (310)314-5074, 2716 Ocean Park Boulevard, Suite 2025, Santa Monica, CA 90405

**Project location:** 16050 E San Bernardino Road, Covina, CA 91722  
*APN:* 8435027001 *USGS Quad:* Baldwin Park

**Gross Acreage:** 3.29 gross acres

**General plan designation:** Category 1— Low Density Residential (1 to 6 dwelling units/acre)

**Community/Area wide Plan designation:** N/A

**Zoning:** A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural Zone, 6,000 square foot minimum lot size)

**Description of project:** One multifamily lot for condominium purposes developed with 22 detached single-family residences within zone A-1. An infill request has been made to increase the density beyond the maximum of 6 dwelling units per acre allowed.

**Surrounding land uses and setting:** The property lies on 3.29 acres within zone A-1-6,000, and an area designated low-density residential where the existing use is a church and daycare that was authorized to be continued by conditional use permit 89162. The subject property is bounded by East San Bernardino road to the North fronted by single-family residential uses, Broadmoor Avenue and single-family residential use to the South, and single-family residential uses to the East and West.

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

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Major projects in the area:**

<i>Project/Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewing Agencies:**

*Responsible Agencies*

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

*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)

*Special Reviewing Agencies*

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area
- 

*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

*Regional Significance*

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

- Fire Department
  - Planning Division
  - Land Development Unit
- 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.

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions    | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest              | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality     | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning           | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources           | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (Approved by)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## 1. AESTHETICS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**                       

No Impact.

A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansion views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Aesthetic components of a scenic vista generally include (1) scenic quality, (2) sensitivity level, and (3) view access. No scenic resources exist on the project site or in the surrounding area therefore the proposed project will not impact those resources. The project is located entirely within the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles and will not affect any scenic resource in other jurisdictions. The project will not obstruct views to or from any scenic resource, degrade the character of a scenic highway, or disrupt a scenic vista.

- There are no designated scenic highways adjacent to or in proximity to the project site as identified by the State of California CalTrans Scenic Highway Mapping System (Updated 9/7/2011): [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm);
- There are no scenic highways, corridors, and resources designated by the County General Plan or in the County GIS-NET Scenic Highways layer (in the “Transportation” folder) and Significant Ridgelines layer (in the “Administrative Layers & Districts” folder);
- There are no borders of the subject property with cities adjacent to or near the project site; and
- No significant ridgelines are on or near the subject property identified in the County GIS-NET Topography layer.

No mitigation is required.

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

No Impact.

The project site is not visible and would not obstruct views from any regional riding or hiking trails. No riding or hiking trails are present in or near the site. The proposed project would not impact riding or hiking trails.

- No designated or proposed trails traversing, adjacent to, or in proximity to, the project site as identified in the County GIS-NET Trail sub-layer in the Transportation layer; and
- There are no borders of the subject property with cities adjacent to or near the project site.

The proposed project is not sited near any designated riding or hiking trails, therefore it will not result in any impacts related to having a substantial adverse effect on these resources. No subdivision trail requirements were imposed through Subdivision Committee Meetings.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

There are no scenic rock outcroppings located within the project limits. The project site contains several tall evergreen and deciduous trees located within the North portion of the parcel (adjacent to the existing church), varying in height from approximately 30-50 feet tall. These trees are proposed to be removed when the site is graded or otherwise prepared for new development. Although not protected species, these trees are visibly taller than other trees in the immediate surrounding area. Their removal will have a noticeable visual impact and could be considered damaging to views currently enjoyed by existing residents. In the event that the trees are removed, the mitigation measure MM-1 requires the project plant a sufficient size, number and type of similar trees that will re-establish the scenic tree view from the same vantage points along the adjoining streets. The new trees need not necessarily be of the same species as the existing trees.

- The County General Plan contains a conservation emphasis consisting of measures for the conservation of natural resources including a varied landscape;
- The existing distinctive scenery gives residents a sense of place, heightens the feeling of belonging, and instills a sense of uniqueness and civic pride;
- An objective of the conservation and open space element of the County General Plan is to preserve and protect biotic resources;
- The County General Plan recognized the need to promote landscaping to provide scenic beauty, make the urban environment more attractive and pleasant, improve air quality and separate and screen urban uses from noise and unsightly views and has policies to encourage the maintenance of landscaped areas and pollution-tolerant plants in urban areas, integrate landscaping and open space into housing and encourage tree planting programs to enhance the beauty of urban landscaping.
- The existing trees are also of value because of their beauty, age and unusual dimensions.

**Resources**

- The subject parcel or structure is not found on the list of Historic resources and points of interest designated by the State of California in unincorporated Los Angeles County, within the California Office of Historic Preservation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or on State Register of Historic Places.

**Mitigation Measures:**

***MM-1:*** a) Prior to final map approval, submit a tree planting plan that shows the number, size and type of tree species to be planted along E San Bernardino Road that will sufficiently recreate the existing view of "tall evergreen and deciduous trees" located in North portion of the project site in addition to required front yard trees, and trees throughout the project site. b) The selected trees shall meet LA County requirements for drought-tolerance, native and non-invasive species per the County Biologist. c) The selected trees shall be included in the project's "onsite/front yard tree" performance bond and subject to bond release inspection after installation.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Development of the project would result in the construction of 22 detached residential condominium units including an internal private streets connecting from San Bernardino Road. The detached units would be two stories in height and have a similar first-floor footprint size compared with homes in the surrounding area. Most of the units will have significantly less front and backyard space compared with surrounding homes. The surrounding homes are nearly all single-story “1950’s ranch-style”. Thus, the project will introduce distinctive building elements (taller homes, reduced yard sizes) into the community. The most visible proposed units, those fronting along San Bernardino Road, will have larger front yards that are more comparable with surrounding properties. The project’s illustrative site plan shows that the project includes the planting of a number of new trees of several different varieties onsite in various areas, specifically along San Bernardino Road, at the project entry, along the proposed internal private streets and walkways, around the park and in front yard areas. The project architectural elevations depict new homes that will be different in style than that of surrounding homes, but of a traditional and high-quality character. The project will also introduce some desirable distinctive visual elements such as numerous new street tree plantings beyond County Code requirements and a lack of garage-facing doors along San Bernardino Road. This will improve neighborhood aesthetics by allowing more pedestrian-oriented architectural façade features to be visible from the street, and will also eliminate front yard driveway pavement and driveway curb cuts along the street. The internal private street will not be gated at the entry along San Bernardino Road, thus helping to minimize the visually-segregated effect for the entire project. Moving into the project site from the San Bernardino Road entry, the internal streets will be loaded with individual private common drives that will provide garage parking access to individual units. These features already included as proposed will work to offset the moderate visual impacts expected by the new development. Thus, no further mitigation is needed.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The proposed project would introduce minimal nighttime lighting to the project site. Project lighting may include lighting along walkway paths, landscape lighting, low exterior residential lighting at front entrances, street lighting along the interior streets and San Bernardino Road, and back porch lighting. All lighting would be hooded or shielded to focus the light downward and to prevent light spillage onto adjacent properties. The project site could potentially be illuminated from sunset to sunrise, which would introduce new nighttime lighting; however, the project lighting would be similar in intensity, character and coverage as existing light sources in the surrounding residential neighborhoods surrounding the sites. No extraordinary lighting is proposed that would impact nighttime views. Mitigation Measures MM-2 requires the project applicant to prepare a site lighting plan. This measure is *intended* to minimize impacts of new sources of light and glare to adjacent land uses, limit nighttime lighting to that necessary for security, and ensure that lighting is shielded to reduce glare and spill lighting effects. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts related to new lighting to a less than significant level.

Glare generation can occur from sunlight reflected from glass and reflective materials utilized on buildings. Any glare experienced as a result of sunlight reflecting off buildings would be temporary, changing with the movement of the sun throughout the course of the day and the seasons of the year. Glare associated with

the proposed project would be minimal and no more than that typically associated with existing residential use in the surrounding area. The project landscaping would reduce the effect of any glare by screening glare sources such as windows. Therefore, potential glare impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

*MM-2: Prior to issuance of any building permit, the project applicant shall prepare a site lighting plan for review and approval by the County of Los Angeles Director of Regional Planning, or designee. The lighting plan shall be prepared by a licensed electrical engineer and shall be in compliance with applicable standards of the Los Angeles County Code. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that all exterior lighting has been designed and located so that all direct rays are confined to the property in a manner meeting the approval of the Director of Regional Planning, or designee.*

**2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>Would the project:</b>				
<b>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?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**No Impact.**

The project site consists of rectangular shaped piece of land located South portion of San Bernardino Road. The North portion of the site is developed with a church building and to the Southeast of the existing church are a parking lot and open lawn area/sports fields. The surrounding area is characterized by predominantly residential uses. The project site is not used for agricultural production and is not designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project would not convert any type of farmland to a nonagricultural use or contribute to environmental changes that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

<b>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site is currently zoned A-1-6,000 which allows light agriculture and single-family residential uses; however, the site has been developed with a church, daycare, parking lot and sports field. The site is not used for agricultural production and is not protected by, or eligible for, a Williamson Act contract. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

**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))?**

**No Impact.**

The main portion of the site is developed with a church, daycare, parking lot and sports field. The project site is currently zoned A-1-6,000 which allows light agriculture and single-family residential uses. The project site does not contain nor is it used or zoned for forest land or timberland production. No impacts to forest land or timberland resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.**

The main portion of the site is developed with a church, daycare, parking lot and sports field. The project site is currently zoned A-1-6,000 which allows light agriculture and single-family residential uses. The project site is surrounded by urban development. Trees on the project site are found near the structure area, along the North and West perimeters. The proposed project would not convert forest land to a non-forest use. Likewise, the project site would not contribute to environmental changes that could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts to forest land or timberland resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

**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 Impact.**

The project site is currently zoned A-1-6,000 which allows light agriculture and single family residential uses. The site is not located in a forest and does not have a land use designation or zoning as forest. It is also not used for agricultural production. The proposed project would not convert farmland to a nonagricultural use. Likewise, the project site would not contribute to environmental changes that would indirectly result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur, and no mitigation is required.

### 3. AIR QUALITY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

A project is consistent with the regional Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) if it does not create new violations of clean air standards, exacerbates any existing violations, or delays a timely attainment of such standards. The project is located within the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Air Basin. The SCAQMD develops rules and regulations; establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources; inspects emissions sources; and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The SCAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a sequence of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs).

The SCAQMD Governing Board adopted an updated 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on February 1, 2013 (SCAQMD 2013). The purpose of the 2012 AQMP is to set forth a comprehensive program that will lead the region into compliance with federal air quality standards for 8-hour ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and fine particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The 2012 AQMP is designed to accommodate expected future population, housing, and employment growth and is based on the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) 2012 regional population, housing and employment projections contained in their 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Projects such as the proposed San Bernardino residential project do not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing general development. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The change to regional air quality from the proposed action is immeasurably small due to the size of the project relative to the air quality basin and because the project does not exceed air quality standards. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with the region's AQMP. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The State's criterion for regional significance is 500 dwelling units for residential uses. The proposed project entails the subdivision and construction of twenty two buildings to be used as single family residences and a common area space. The project will not violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or projected air quality violation.

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)?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.**

There are no projects within a 500 foot radius coming on-line. The project will not cumulatively contribute to a pollutant that is considered “non-attainment” for the region. The proposed project would not contribute a significant amount of a criteria air pollutant in that it would not be combined with other projects resulting in a significant addition to a non-attainment criteria pollutant.

The project will not exceed the SCAQMD Air Quality Significant Thresholds.

Construction emissions would be less than the thresholds allowed with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure MM-3, below, is provided to address the possibilities from the Urbemis model

**Mitigation Measure:**

*MM-3: Prior to issuance of any building permits, applicant shall include in the construction drawings a note requiring that during construction activities, fugitive dust control measures are applied, which includes the following:*

- Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas;
- Prepare and implement a high wind dust control plan;
- Stabilize previously distributed areas if subsequent construction is delayed;
- Water exposed surfaces as needed for dust suppression (typically 3 times/ day);
- Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day or as needed;
- Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials;
- Minimize in-out traffic from construction zone;
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; and
- Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Sensitive receptors are adjacent to and within a ¼ mile to approximately ¾ mile of the property identified as playgrounds, schools, a senior citizen center, day care facilities and other residential neighborhoods. There would be a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated (MM-3 above). Construction of the project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates, as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e., usually diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). However, exhaust emissions associated with construction of a project this size are typically below SCQAMD CEQA thresholds during construction and construction contractors would be required to implement measures to reduce or eliminate emissions by following SCAQMD standard construction practices. Therefore, sensitive receptors are not expected to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction, and

potential short term impacts are considered less than significant. No further mitigation is required.

A Los Angeles County Department of Public Health memo of December 15, 2010, recommends separation between residences and freeways; however, this is not an adopted policy for Regional Planning. A potentially significant impact could occur where the proposed project would contribute substantial pollutant concentrations near an existing sensitive use, however, no sensitive uses exist near the project site, and therefore no impact would occur.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project of construction and subdivision of 22 units to be used as single family residences would not create objectionable odors that would be perceptible to a substantial number of people. The proposed project would not violate rule AQMD Rule 402, which states “a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or to the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury to damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.”

Some objectionable odors may emanate from operation of diesel-powered construction equipment during construction of the project. These odors, however, would be limited to the site only during the construction period and would dissipate quickly; therefore, would not be considered a significant impact. Project operation would not result in objectionable odors as the project is a typical residential subdivision that does not manufacture or store material, nor are uses allowed within the zone that would generate significant objectionable odors. No mitigation is required.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact**

This is an urban site. A nesting bird survey should be prepared prior to construction.

Biological resources are identified and protected through various federal, state, regional, and local laws and ordinances. The federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) state that animals and plants that are threatened with extinction or are in a significant decline will be protected and preserved. The State Department of Fish and Wildlife created the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), which is a program that inventories the status and locations of rare plants and animals in California.

The following has been identified on the site.

Vegetation / Land Cover	Acres
Turf grass and/or trees	1.76
Asphalt parking	1.22
Covered structures	0.32
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.3</b>

•  
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 CDFW or USFWS?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

The County's primary mechanism to conserve biological diversity is an identification tool and planning overlay called Significant Ecological Areas (SEA). SEAs are ecologically important land and water systems that are valuable as plant and/or animal communities, often integral to the preservation of threatened or endangered species, and conservation of biological diversity in the County. These areas also include nearly all of the wildlife corridors in the County, as well as oak woodlands and other unique and/ or native trees.

The project site is not located in or near a SEA or regional or local habitat conservation plan as designated by the state or County. The project would not have any impact on sensitive natural communities.

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 Impact.**

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act defines wetlands as "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

The Habitat Assessment (Ironwood 2013) confirms that the project site is not located on or near any federally or State protected wetlands. Accordingly, the project would have no impact on wetlands or waters of the U.S.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The project site is not located near any designated wildlife or migratory corridors. However, due to the presence of trees on-site, there is a potential for nesting habitat for birds species that are afforded protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Trees located on-site and utility poles located along San Bernardino Road may provide suitable nesting sites for birds, including raptors. A report should provide recommendations for the avoidance of nesting birds during construction activities at the site.

**Mitigation Measures:**

***MM-4:** Within five (5) days prior to land-clearing activities between February 1 through September 15, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting survey to identify any direct or indirect impacts to actively nesting birds. If direct or indirect impacts are identified, the biologist shall specify the appropriate mitigation measure(s) for these impacts. Such measures may include avoidance of occupied nests, staging work areas outside an established buffer area, modified scheduling of grading and clearing and monitoring of active nests during construction.*

With incorporation of Mitigation Measure MM-4, project impacts would be less than significant.

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.)?

**No Impact.**

The project site and surrounding properties do not support any oak trees or oak woodlands.

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)?

**No Impact.**

The project site is not located in or near a Wildflower Reserve Area, nor does the site support oak trees. The project would not conflict with policies or ordinances pertaining to those resources.

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

**No Impact.**

The project site is not located in or near a SEA or regional or local habitat conservation plan as designated by the state or County. The project would not have any effect on such plans.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p><b>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**No Impact.**

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines identifies both significant buildings and significant archeological resources as “historical resources”. Because Question 5(b), below, addresses archeological resources, this discussion focuses on historical resources and historic properties such as buildings, structures, objects, sites, or historic districts.

CEQA defines a “historical resource” as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020.1(k); (3) identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); or (4) determined to be a historical resource by a project’s Lead Agency (PRC Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)).

The church, daycare and associated features are not considered eligible under any of the four criteria for listing on the California Register. There are no historical resources present on site. In addition, based on the age of the surrounding residential homes, none of the adjacent structures would be eligible for listing in the California Register, and none is listed in a local register of historic places, identified, or determined to be a historic resource by the County. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and no mitigation is required.

<p><b>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**

A review was conducted of the National Register, the California Register, and the California Office of Historic Preservation. Additionally, further research was conducted through the Los Angeles County Assessor’s office and through various internet resources. The searches revealed no cultural resources within one-half mile of the project site boundaries.

Ground disturbing activities always have the potential to reveal buried deposits not observed on the surface during previous archaeological surveys. Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, field personnel should be alerted to the possibility of buried prehistoric or historic cultural deposits. As such, Mitigation Measure MM-5 is provided.

**Mitigation Measure:**

*MM-5: Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Director of Regional Planning, or designee that a qualified archaeologist has been retained. In the event that field personnel encounter buried cultural materials, work in the immediate vicinity of the find should cease and a qualified archaeologist should be retained to assess the significance of the find. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop or divert construction excavation as necessary. If the qualified archaeologist finds that any cultural resources present meet eligibility requirements for listing on the California Register or the National Register, plans for the treatment, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to the find would need to occur.*

**c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?**

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

Paleontological sensitivity is a measure of the potential for the discovery of significant fossils during development of an area. Sensitivity levels are predicated primarily for the underlying geological formations. It is not known if the proposed project would require excavations that penetrate through alluvial soils and into bedrock formations; however, since the area is sensitive for paleontological resources, unknown significant paleontological resources could be disturbed if excavations penetrate the bedrock formations in the project site. Implementation of mitigation measure MM-6 is required if excavations penetrate the bedrock formations in the project site. Mitigation Measure MM-6 requires the applicant retain a qualified paleontologist to monitor these excavations. The paleontologist would ensure any collected specimens be prepared, identified, cataloged, and donated to an accredited repository. Implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-6 would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure:**

*MM-6: Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Director of Regional Planning, or designee that a qualified paleontologist has been retained and either the paleontologist, or a representative, shall be onsite if excavations penetrate the bedrock formations.*

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

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The project site is not a formal cemetery and is not adjacent to a formal cemetery. The project site is not known to contain human remains interred outside formal cemeteries, nor is it known to be located on a burial ground. The project would involve ground disturbance during construction. It is highly unlikely that the proposed project would disturb any human remains during construction; however, should human remains be uncovered during construction, mitigation measure MM-7 would apply.

**Mitigation Measure:**

***MM-7:*** *If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be notified (California Public Resources Code §5097.98). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner, with the aid of the County-approved Archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, s/he will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials (California Health and Safety Code §7050.5). If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further subsurface disturbance (California Public Resources Code §5097.98).*

**6. ENERGY**

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

All new facilities would be built to comply with all current building codes, including the requirements of the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards, California Title 24, Part 11 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings and the Title 24 California Green Building Standards. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project does not involve any processes or features requiring excessive amounts of energy as compared to other residential uses throughout the County. Moreover, compliance with all pertinent State and local building codes for the conservation of energy resources would ensure that the proposed residential are more energy-efficient than older residential construction. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

## 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

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.

                                                                

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 prohibits the location of most structures for human occupancy across the traces of active faults, and lessens the impacts of fault rupture. The County General Plan prohibits new developments, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Act, within fault traces until a comprehensive geological study has been completed.

A geotechnical engineering investigation for proposed residential housing prepared by GeoSoils Consultants, Inc. (GCI) and dated January 7, 2014 summarizes the findings and conditions of the site survey. The Geotechnical Evaluation (GCI 2014) states that active or potentially active faults are not known to exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The potential for exposing people or structures to the damaging effects of ground rupture is considered low since no active faults are known to cross the site. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

                                                                

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The report mentioned above goes on to say that although there are no active or potentially active faults on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site, the project would likely experience moderate to intense seismic ground shaking during its design life because of regional seismicity. The estimated design peak horizontal ground acceleration per the 2010 California Building Code (CBC) is 0.49g. Mitigation Measure MM-8 would result in potential project impacts related to seismic ground shaking being reduced to levels considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

***MM-8:** Mitigation shall be implemented in the form of strict compliance with all recommendations specified in the Geotechnical Evaluation (GCI 2014). The geotechnical recommendations are intended to maintain the structural*

*integrity of the proposed development and structures given the site geotechnical conditions, and serve as reasonable protection against the potential damaging effects of geotechnical phenomena such as expansive soils, fill settlement, groundwater seepage, etc. The geotechnical recommendations are intended to provide adequate protection for the proposed development to the extent required to reduce seismic risk to an “acceptable level,” as defined by California Code of Regulations Section 3721(a). However, the Geotechnical Evaluation’s recommendations are considered minimal from a geotechnical viewpoint, as there may be more restrictive requirements from the architect, structural engineer, building codes, governing agencies, or the County of Los Angeles. Further, all geotechnical recommendations must be confirmed to be suitable or modified based on the actual as-graded conditions.*

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

Liquefaction describes a phenomenon where cyclic stresses, which are produced by earthquake-induced ground motions, create excess pore pressures in cohesion-less soils. As a result, the soils may acquire a high degree of mobility, which can lead to lateral spreading, consolidation and settlement of loose sediments, ground oscillation, flow failure, loss of bearing strength, ground fissuring, and sand boils and other damaging deformations.

The project site is not located within a liquefaction zone, within a State of California Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction potential, or in an area susceptible to liquefaction. Based on the Geotechnical Evaluation, the field exploration indicates a mixture of fill and alluvial deposits. Up to four feet of fill was observed consisting of light to medium brown silty fine to coarse sand with a varied degree of rock fragments and the alluvium was medium brown , silty fine sands and fine to medium sands with rock fragments that were slightly moist and medium dense to dense. Subsurface water was not encountered in the test pits.

Soils subject to liquefaction are water saturated soils, frequently loosely packed and granular in nature, that when subjected to seismic activity lose their cohesion and act like a fluid. Liquefaction areas are usually found in areas with a water table near the surface. The project site is located within a dam inundation area. Mitigation Measure MM-9 would result in potential project impacts related to soils unsuitable for structural support being reduced to levels considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

***MM-9:** Remove the old fill and upper 4 to 5 feet of alluvium material. Removals should be excavated down a minimum five feet and extend a minimum of five feet laterally outside the areas of proposed development. Actual removal depths will be determined during grading. The removed material may be processed and replaced as compacted fill. Further, all geotechnical recommendations must be confirmed to be suitable or modified based on the actual as-graded conditions.*

**iv) Landslides?**                                                                               

**No Impact.**

A landslide is the movement or flow of soil, rocks, earth, water, or debris down a slope. Seismic activity can trigger landslides, especially on steep slopes or those with slide plains that will move easily. The California Geologic Survey maps potential landslide areas throughout California. These maps are updated periodically and usually in response to some geological event. These maps are the source of the landslide layer found in GIS-NET3. In GIS-NET 3, the property was not found to be located within a landslide zone.

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act requires the California Geological Survey to prepare Seismic Hazard Zone Maps that show areas where landslides have historically occurred, or where there is a high potential

for such occurrences. A landslide is a general term for a falling, sliding or flowing mass of soil, rocks, water and debris. In the County of Los Angeles, the General Plan Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance regulates development in hillsides of 25 percent slope or greater to address potential hazards associated with hillside development in hilly or mountainous terrain. Primary hillside hazards include mud and debris flows, active deep-seated landslides, hillside erosion, and development-induced slope instability.

The project would not expose people or property to landslide because the site terrain is flat and does not have topographic or geologic characteristics conducive to landslide hazard. The project does not have the potential to create landslides or other hillside hazards and no impact would result.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Construction runoff is regulated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit, which applies to all construction that disturbs an area of at least one acre. The project would prepare a SWPPP that includes standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and sediment control. Implementation of the SWPPP would minimize potential water and wind erosion during the construction phase.

The project site is a 3.29 acres urbanized parcel where the entire site will be graded. At least 1.47 acres of the site will be covered with buildings and 1.15 acres of the property is proposed to be open space, walkways and private yard space. The amount of grading proposed has not been required to obtain a discretionary permit. Any storm water runoff discharges would not cause or contribute to on-site or downstream erosion, impacts would be less than significant.

For all grading permits, the Department of Public Works requires compliance with their grading best practices manual, which includes best management practices for erosion control. This is not considered a mitigation measure for CEQA, as compliance is required.

The County’s Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance provides requirements for the management of storm runoff, which will lessen potential amounts of erosion activities resulting from stormwater. In addition, the Regional Water Quality Control Board issued a Municipal Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES Permit No. CAS004001) that requires new development and redevelopment projects to incorporate storm water mitigation measures. As such, a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) is required to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of rainfall runoff that leaves the site.

•  
**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?**                                                                                       

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

The Geotechnical Evaluation (GCI 2014, p. 5) states that the potential for lateral spreading is considered very low due to the fine-grained cohesive nature of the onsite soils. The Geotechnical Evaluation did not

identify subsidence as a potential on-site or local occurrence. Additionally, Question 7.a.iv) determined that there is no potential for landslide impacts.

As indicated in Question 7.a.iii), the site is not located in a State of California Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction potential, and the soils encountered during field evaluation are generally not considered susceptible to liquefaction or dynamic settlement. Soils encountered in the exploration test pits were silty fine sands and fine to medium sands with rock fragments not considered susceptible to liquefaction. The report references the Division of Mines and Geology Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Baldwin Park 7.5 minute Quadrangle, Seismic Hazard Zone Report to support the conclusion that the subject site is not located in an area susceptible to liquefaction. (GCI 2014).

The Geotechnical Evaluation includes specific recommendations for the removal, placement and compaction of fill materials. The evaluation specifies removal depths and over-excavation limits within building pad areas. Specific recommendations and specifications for optimal moisture conditioning and compaction are included for different types of slabs. Those and all other recommendations in the evaluation would be implemented consistent with Mitigation Measure MM-8. With implementation of those geotechnical recommendations, it is expected that impacts related to soil stability would be less than significant.

**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?**                       

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The Geotechnical Evaluation (GCI 2014) noted that pad drainage should be directed toward the street or any approved watercourse area swale via non-erosive channel, pipe and/or dispersion devices to avoid various geotechnical distress issues. As noted (GCI 2014, p. 16), “*water should not be allowed to pond or seep into the ground...*”

Expansive soils can undergo shrinkage during drying, and swelling during the rainy winter season, or when irrigation is resumed. This can result in distress to building structures and hardscape improvements. The Geotechnical Evaluation (GCI 2014) determined, based on the results of laboratory testing, assuming the material is recompacted to an average relative compaction of 92 percent, a shrinkage value of 10 to 15 percent should be applied to the project.

Geotechnical mitigation measures are required for foundations and site improvements, such as retaining walls, to minimize the impacts of expansive soils. The Geotechnical Evaluation (p. 16) indicates that the site foundation and grading plans, including foundation-loading details, should be forwarded to the Geotechnical Engineer for review and approval prior to finalizing design and that no deviation from recommended specifications would be allowed, except where specifically superseded in the preliminary geology and geotechnical report, or in other written communication signed by an appropriate engineer. The specific recommendations in the Geotechnical Evaluation would be implemented consistent with Mitigation Measure MM-8. With implementation of the geotechnical recommendations, it is expected that impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

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

**No Impact.**

The project would be served by the sanitary sewer system for the disposal of wastewater. Therefore, the ability of soils to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not relevant to the project.

**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?**

**No Impact.**

As indicated previously in Question 7.a.iv), the General Plan Hillside Management Area (HMA) Ordinance regulates development in hillsides of 25 percent slope or greater to address potential hazards associated with hilly or mountainous terrain. The project is not subject to the HMA Ordinance since the site terrain is flat. Since no hillside design standards apply, the project would have no impact relative to the HMA ordinance.

## 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p><b>a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The following response applies to Questions 8.a) and 8.b), below.

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate (such as average temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns) over a period of time. Climate change may result from natural factors, natural processes, and human activities that change the composition of the atmosphere and alter the surface and features of the land. Significant changes in global climate patterns have recently been associated with global warming, which is an average increase in the temperature of the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface; this is attributed to an accumulation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the atmosphere. GHGs trap heat in the atmosphere which, in turn, increases the Earth’s surface temperature. Some GHGs occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes, while others are created and emitted solely through human activities. The emission of GHGs through fossil fuel combustion in conjunction with other human activities appears to be closely associated with global warming (OPR 2008).

GHGs, as defined under California’s Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) (California Health and Safety Code §38505), include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). General discussions on climate change often include water vapor, ozone, and aerosols in the GHG category. Water vapor and atmospheric ozone are not gases that are formed directly in the construction or operation of development projects, nor can they be controlled in these projects. Aerosols are not gases. While these elements have a role in climate change, they are not considered by either regulatory bodies, such as CARB, or climate change groups, such as the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR), as gases to be reported or analyzed for control. Therefore, no further discussion of water vapor, ozone, or aerosols is provided. GHGs vary widely in the power of their climatic effects; therefore, climate scientists have established a unit called global warming potential (GWP). The GWP of a gas is a measure of both potency and lifespan in the atmosphere as compared to CO<sub>2</sub>. For example, since CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are approximately 21 and 310 times more powerful than CO<sub>2</sub>, respectively, in their ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, they have GWPs of 21 and 310, respectively (CO<sub>2</sub> has a GWP of 1). Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is a quantity that enables all GHG emissions to be considered as a group despite their varying GWP. The GWP of each GHG is multiplied by the prevalence of that gas to produce CO<sub>2</sub>.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (California Health and Safety Code §38501), recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions. The statute states that:

Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts

of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems.

In order to avert these consequences, AB 32 establishes a State goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which is a reduction of approximately 16 percent from forecasted emission levels, with further reductions to follow (CARB 2011).

In developing methods for GHG impact analysis there have been suggestions of quantitative thresholds, often referred to as screening levels, that define an emissions level below which it may be presumed that climate change impacts would be less than significant. Neither the SCAQMD nor the County of Los Angeles has adopted a significance threshold for the GHG emissions from non-industrial development projects. Consequently, the County has determined, pursuant to the discretion afforded by Sections 15064.4(a) and 15064.4(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, that the analysis quantify the GHG emissions from the proposed project based on the methodologies proposed by SCAQMD's GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group.

On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the staff proposal for a tiered threshold approach wherein Tier 1 determines if a project qualifies for an applicable CEQA exemption; Tier 2 determines consistency with GHG reduction plans; and Tier 3 proposes a numerical screening value as a threshold. At their September 28, 2010, meeting, the Working Group suggested a Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>) per year for all residential and commercial land use types.

In the absence of adopted thresholds, the County has determined to assess the significance of the project's GHG emissions using this SCAQMD proposed Tier 3 screening threshold (SCAQMD 2010). It is noted that the use of the SCAQMD's screening threshold is selected as a threshold for the proposed project because it is located in the South Coast Air Basin and these thresholds are based on the best available information and data at the time of preparation of this document. The development of CEQA project-level thresholds is an ongoing effort on State, regional, and County levels, and significance thresholds may differ for future projects based on further data and information that may be available at that time.

### ***Construction Activity GHG Emissions***

Construction GHG emissions are generated by vehicle engine exhaust from construction equipment, on-road hauling trucks, vendor trips, and worker commuting trips. Because impacts from construction activities occur over a relatively short period of time, they contribute a relatively small portion of the overall lifetime project GHG emissions. In addition, GHG emission reduction measures for construction equipment are relatively limited. Therefore, SCAQMD staff recommends that construction emissions be amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies (SCAQMD 2008).

### ***Project Operational GHG Emissions***

Estimated GHG operation emissions with the proposed residential project, are less than the 3,500 CO<sub>2e</sub>(e) threshold.

The estimated increase in annual GHG emissions is very unlikely to have GHG emissions of a magnitude to directly impact global climate change; therefore, any impact would be considered on a cumulative basis. Since there are no other projects proposed within the immediate area and because the proposed project's GHG emissions would be less than 3,500 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year, the emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. The impact would be less than significant; no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.**

As discussed above, the principal State plan and policy adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions is AB 32. The quantitative goal of AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Statewide plans and regulations, such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, are being implemented at the statewide level, and compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed project does not conflict with these plans and regulations. Additionally, all new facilities would be built to comply with all current building codes, including the requirements of California Title 24, Part 11 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, and the Title 24 California Green Building Standards.

**9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>			

Would the project:

**a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

                
 
                 
 
                 

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project involves construction of new residential units, which would require grading, installation of infrastructure to connect to existing power, water and sewer lines, and other construction associated with erecting the residential structures. The proposed project would not use a substantial amount of hazardous materials during construction. Hazardous materials that are used during construction would be transported, used, stored, and disposed of according to County, State, and federal regulations. Operation of the proposed project would not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would it result in generation of hazardous emissions, materials, or wastes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

**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?**

                
 
                 
 
                 

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project involves construction of new residential units, which would require grading, installation of infrastructure to connect to existing power, water and sewer lines, and other construction associated with erecting the residential structures. The proposed project would not use a substantial amount of hazardous materials during construction. Hazardous materials that are used during construction would be transported, used, stored, and disposed of according to County, State, and federal regulations. Operation of the proposed project would not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would it result in generation of hazardous emissions, materials, or wastes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

                
 
                 
 
                 

**No Impact.**

The project site is proposed on church and daycare campus. There are also residential units located immediately to the east and west of the site. However, as discussed above, the proposed project would not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would it result in generation of hazardous emissions. Additionally, hazardous materials used during construction would be used in accordance with all applicable County, State, and federal regulations. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures

would be required.

**d) Be located on a site which is included on a 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Based on a review of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor Database, the closest permitted underground storage tank site is off Sunset, which is nearly 1/5 mile away. The Water Board GeoTracker database identifies two potential cleanup sites located within two miles of the project site worth noting. The potential contaminant of concern for both sites is unknown hazardous material, and the status of assessment and/or remediation for each site is as follows:

1. ID 24539– This site is located at 15955 E San Bernardino Road, Covina, approximately 0.10 mile away from and north-west of the project site. It is currently a permitted underground storage tank.
2. ID 20672– This site is located at 901 N. Sunset Avenue, West Covina, approximately 0.20 mile away from and south-west of the project site. It is currently a permitted underground storage tank.
3. ID 11633– This site is located at 709 N. Sunset Avenue, West Covina, approximately 0.20 mile away from and south-west of the project site. It is currently a permitted underground storage tank.
4. ID 4B190324001 – This site the Manning Pit Sediment Placement Site, 0.6 mile from the project site, and is associated with 5155 Vincent, in the Irwindale area. The Manning Pit Inert Landfill was a former aggregate mine that was operated by the Manning Brothers Rock and Sand Company from the 1920's to the early 1970's. From the 1960's until September 1980, the Manning Brothers Rock and Sand Company disposed of inert solid wastes at the pit. The site is open for verification monitoring as of 1965. Monitoring and Reporting Program CI-6149 requires semi-annual groundwater sampling and quarterly reporting.
5. ID 4B192463001 – This site is the Manning Pit Quarry Site, located at 5155 Vincent, in the Irwindale area. It is approximately 0.6 mile from the project site. The Manning Pit Inert Landfill was a former aggregate mine that was operated by the Manning Brothers Rock and Sand Company from the 1920's to the early 1970's. From the 1960's until September 1980, the Manning Brothers Rock and Sand Company disposed of inert solid wastes at the pit. Monitoring and Reporting Program CI-6149 requires semi-annual groundwater sampling and quarterly reporting until at least 5/14/2029.
6. ID 19010016– This site is located at 3900 N. Puente Avenue, Baldwin Park, approximately 1.4 miles away from and south-west of the project site. It is a Department of Toxic Substances Control open clean-up site. Soil was monitored for elevated levels of arsenic and as of February 27, 2001, the Baldwin Park Unified School District made written request to terminate monitoring.

The Envirostor Database and the Water Board GeoTracker Database both confirmed that the project site is not known to contain any hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Additionally, the site has been developed as a church and daycare campus since prior to 1989, thus no hazardous materials would have been introduced to the site during this time. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

**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?**

**No Impact.**

The closest public airport is the El Monte Airport. However, it is about 6 miles away. Thus, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a public airport and is not located within an airport land use plan. Due to the project site’s distance from the El Monte Airport, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

**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?**                       

**No Impact.**

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project consists of residential uses and would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan. The proposed use is consistent with surrounding residential homes and would not impair or interfere with implementation of the County’s emergency response plan.

The County of Los Angeles has an Office of Emergency Management (OEM) that was established by Chapter 2.68 of the County Code, which covers the County’s Emergency Response Plan for Emergency Operations. The OEM is responsible for organizing and directing the preparedness efforts of the Emergency Management Organization of Los Angeles County. OEM is responsible for maintaining a current and approved Operational Area Emergency Response Plan, serving as the lead division for emergency preparedness, maintaining the County’s Emergency Operations Center, and implementing an emergency mass notification system called “Alert LA County”, to name a few. The County’s Emergency Response Plan establishes the emergency organization, tasks, and general procedures, and provides for coordination of planning efforts of the various emergency staff and resources, based on the nature of the emergency.

The County’s Fire Department and Sheriff’s Department provides emergency services to East Irwindale, and the nature of the emergency determines which Department or whether both Departments are involved. Emergency response services include fire protection and suppression, inspection services, paramedic emergency medical aid, hazardous materials protection and response, and a variety of public services.

Roads that are used as response corridors/evacuation routes usually follow the most direct path to or from various parts of the community. For the project site, the main corridor would be E San Bernardino Road. Access to and from the project site would be from E San Bernardino Road on the northern side of the

project site.

Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate measures to facilitate the passage of people and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Site-specific activities such as temporary construction activities would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis by the County and are formulated when development plans are submitted to the County.

During the operational phase of the proposed project, on-site access would be required to comply with standards established by the County. The size and location of fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants) and fire access routes would be required to conform to County’s Fire Department standards. The proposed project would be required to have a total of 1 new fire hydrant along the internal private street, 1 new fire hydrant along the public street, 1 relocation of a fire hydrant along a public street and sufficient access by fire-service vehicles per the County Fire Department’s requirements. As required of all development in the County, the operation of the proposed project would conform to applicable Uniform Fire Code standards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No mitigation is required.

**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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Per the Los Angeles County Fire Department’s subdivision review comments (Conditions of Approval dated September 24, 2014), the project is not located in an area described by the Fire Department as “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” (formerly Fire Zone 4). Therefore, a “Fuel Modification Plan” is not required, and the project would not require additional fire protection systems beyond suitable access and fire protection water (see Question iii, below). Project impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

- ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Per the Los Angeles County Fire Department’s subdivision review comments (Conditions of Approval dated September 24, 2014), the project is not located in an area described by the Fire Department as “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” (formerly Fire Zone 4). Therefore, a “Fuel Modification Plan” is not required, and the project would not require additional fire protection systems beyond suitable access and fire protection water (see Question iii, below). Project impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Per the Los Angeles County Fire Department's subdivision review comments (Conditions of Approval dated September 24, 2014), the project must comply with each of the following (project compliance description included), as well as any other outstanding holds and conditions that may be imposed:

- Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 503 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.  
**Project Compliance:** Access to the site and interior streets and driveways would all be paved with asphalt or include pavers, both of which are all weather surface materials.
- Driveways shall be unobstructed and a minimum of 20 feet in width.  
**Project Compliance:** All driveways would be of sufficient width for access by fire-serve vehicles.
- Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.  
**Project Compliance:** Interior streets would be designated as fire lanes and be of sufficient width for access by fire-serve vehicles.
- The driveways used for fire apparatus access shall provide a 32 feet centerline turning radius.  
**Project Compliance:** Interior streets would be designated as fire lanes, including the turning radius and be of sufficient width for access by fire-serve vehicles.
- A reciprocal access agreement is required  
**Project Compliance:**
- The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as "Private Driveway and Firelane" with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.  
**Project Compliance:** All private driveways would include a portion assigned as a fire lane with widths that would be sufficient for maneuvering of fire-service vehicles.
- Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.  
**Project Compliance:** Location of Fire hydrants would be determined in consultation with the Fire Department. All fire hydrants would be installed, tested, and accepted prior to construction. A condition of approval has been included to this effect.
- Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.  
**Project Compliance:** A condition of approval shall be included to require that street signs and building access numbers be approved and documentation shall be provided, prior to the issuance of any certificates of use and occupancy for the subject project.

Per the Los Angeles County Fire Department's subdivision review comments (Water System Requirements - Unincorporated dated September 24, 2014), the project must comply with each of the following (project compliance description included), as well as any other outstanding holds and conditions that may be imposed:

- The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at this location is 1250 gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 2 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 1 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.  
**Project Compliance:** A condition of approval shall be included to require compliance with fire

flow standards.

- Fire hydrant requirements are as follows: Install two new fire hydrant(s). Upgrade/Verify existing one public fire hydrant(s).

**Project Compliance:** A condition of approval shall be included to require compliance with fire hydrant requirements.

- All hydrants shall measure 6" x 4" x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal.

**Project Compliance:** A condition of approval shall be included to require compliance with fire hydrant requirements.

- All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.

**Project Compliance:** A condition of approval shall be included to require compliance with fire hydrant requirements.

The Fire Department would be consulted once details for the phasing of the proposed development are available. At a minimum, the project design would include the following, consistent with Fire Department conditions of approval:

- The proposed Private Street for this development would be designed to comply with the approved Private Drives and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines as approved by the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.
- A minimum paved unobstructed width of 24 feet would be provided at the proposed entry.
- No parking would be allowed within the proposed access drive. Prior to occupancy, approved signs and/or striping would be provided.
- No parking would be allowed within 15 feet of either side of a fire hydrant (CVC 22514). Approved red curb striping would be provided prior to occupancy.
- The proposed development would have no gate(s) at the entry.

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

**No Impact.**

The project site is surrounded by predominantly detached single-family homes. Single-family residential homes are located immediately east, south and west of site.

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

**No Impact.**

The proposed project itself would not be the source of a dangerous fire hazard. The use does not involve storage, use and/or transportation of flammable chemicals and other combustible materials. No use of any hazardous material or substances that have the potential to ignite a fire are designated as a permitted use

within the zone. No impacts would occur, therefore no impacts are expected as there is little likelihood of the project igniting a fire.

**10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

If left uncontrolled, a typical residential project has the potential to contribute to the degradation of existing surface water quality conditions, primarily due to: 1) potential erosion and sedimentation during grading phases; 2) automobile/street-generated pollutants (i.e., oil and grease, tire wear, etc.); 3) fertilizers and pesticides used in landscaping; and 4) particulate matter from dirt and dust generated on-site. However, compliance with the County stormwater requirements, as demonstrated in the Hydrology Report, would prevent the project from violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. With County approval of the Hydrology Report, including the LID and MS4 design components, and subsequent implementation by the project, impacts would be less than significant.

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

Domestic potable and landscape water needs would be met by service from Azusa Light and Water Systems. According to the Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region – Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (1994 Basin Plan), the project overlies the Central Basin portion of the Los Angeles coastal groundwater basins. Based on the project site’s slow infiltration rate, the project site does not contribute to groundwater recharge. A preliminary Hydrology, Hydraulics and Stormwater Low Impact Development Plan prepared by R.T. Quinn and Associates, dated April 11, 2014, references that the historic high groundwater is “on the order of 150 feet below existing ground surface” as indicated on the groundwater maps from the Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Baldwin Park 7.5 Minute Quadrangle published by a 2014 California Geologic Survey. (RQA, 2014) Given the intensity of development surrounding the site, it is not expected that the project would intercept a groundwater table during construction. Based on these factors, the project would have no impact on groundwater levels in any aquifer.

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

On-site runoff from development areas would drain to a basin near the central paseo/park area. Water Quality design flows drain from the catch basing to the underground infiltration gallery under the central park area. Peak flows that exceed the capacity of the infiltration gallery drain to Broadmoor Avenue at the south of the site and are collected in Los Angeles County Drain Bl 0519 (Project no. 519) (RQA, 2014). Existing peak flows drain in Broadmoor Avenue to Bl 0519 Since the project site's peak stormwater runoff discharges would not cause or contribute to on-site or downstream erosion, impacts would be less than significant.

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Hydrology Report confirms that post-development infiltration Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used to infiltrate runoff for a 0.75 inch 24-hour storm event on site, exceeding the pre-development condition. There would be no increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff; therefore, the project would not result in flooding, either on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed onsite storm drain facilities would consist of peak flow catch basins, stormdrain pipe, and an underground infiltration gallery consisting of an 8 foot diameter perforated corrugated metal pipe encased in pea gravel wrapped with non-woven geotextile filter fabric to help prevent sediment intrusion and provide water quality treatment in order to meet the L.A. County LID Ordinance. The design capacity is for greater than the increase in volume for a 10-year, 24-hour storm event. Excess storm water runoff is proposed to be discharged to Broadmoor Avenue and drain towards Bl 0519, to Big Dalton Wash, Walnut Creek Wash, the San Gabriel River and finally the Pacific Ocean. All onsite stormdrain facilities would be privately owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. Impacts would be less than significant.

**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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Hydrology Report confirms that post-development Peak flows that exceed the capacity of the infiltration gallery drain to Broadmoor Avenue at the south of the site and are collected in Los Angeles

County Drain BI 0519. The proposed onsite storm drain facilities would consist of peak flow catch basins, stormdrain pipe, and an underground infiltration gallery consisting of an 8 foot diameter perforated corrugated metal pipe encased in pea gravel wrapped with non-woven geotextile filter fabric to help prevent sediment intrusion and provide water quality treatment in order to meet the L.A. County LID Ordinance. All onsite stormdrain facilities would be privately owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. Impacts would be less than significant. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposed drainage concept and has cleared the project for public hearing.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

During the construction phase of the proposed project, the pollutants of greatest concern are sediment, which may run off the project site due to site grading or other site preparation activities, and oil or fossil fuel leakage from the construction equipment. Construction runoff is regulated by the NPDES Construction General Permit, which applies to all construction that disturbs an area of at least one acre.

The Hydrology Report described previously has also been prepared to address the project's BMPs and demonstrate compliance with LID standards. Implementation of the SWPPP and Hydrology Report, including the LID components, constitute compliance with the applicable NPDES permits. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposed drainage concept and has cleared the project for public hearing.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The LID Plan would comply with LID Standards in County Code Chapter 12.84 and must be approved prior to the tentative map approval. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**No Impact.**

Areas of Special Biological Significance are those areas designated by the State Water Board as "ocean areas requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable." The project site is not located in or near an Area of Special Biological Significance and does not propose any outlet structures or runoff discharges in such areas. No impact would result.

**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)?**

**No Impact.**

The project would be served by the sanitary sewer system for the disposal of wastewater. The project would not use septic tanks or other private sewage disposal system.

**k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**                                                                               

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

All potential sources of water quality degradation, and the project’s provisions for preventing such occurrences, are analyzed in Questions 10.a) through 10.h), above.

**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?**                                                                               

**No Impact.**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prepares hydrological studies throughout the country, called Flood Insurance Studies, in order to identify areas that are prone to flooding. An area that has been designated a 100-year flood plain is considered likely to flood during the 100-year storm event. According to Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) panel 06037C1700F, the project site is not located in a FEMA Flood Zone, floodway or floodplain, and does not propose any new structures in such areas. There are no surface waters on-site or in the vicinity and the project site is in FEMA Zone X, outside of the 0.2% annual chance (500-year) floodplain. The project would not place housing in a floodway or floodplain. Therefore, no impact would result.

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

**No Impact.**

The project would not place any structure in a floodway or floodplain. There are no surface waters on-site or in the vicinity and the project site is in FEMA Zone X, outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. No impact would result.

**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?**                                                                               

**No Impact.**

According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ website, Santa Fe Dam and Reservoir is a flood risk. This management project constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District

was completed in 1949 and is located on the San Gabriel River about four miles downstream from the mouth of the San Gabriel Canyon. The San Gabriel River originates on the southern slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains. It flows through precipitous canyons to the base of the mountains, thence across a broad alluvial cone to Santa Fe Reservoir, and through the San Gabriel Valley to Whittier Narrows Reservoir.

Santa Fe Dam is an essential element of the Los Angeles County Drainage Area flood control system. The primary purpose of the dam is to reduce the risk of flood damage for the densely populated area between the dam and Whittier Narrows Reservoir. Santa Fe Dam contains 16 six-foot wide by nine-foot high hydraulically operated slide gates. The combined maximum capacity of the sixteen outlets is 41,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). Santa Fe Dam's spillway structure is of an overflow concrete ogee type located in the right or northwestern abutment of the dam. The spillway has a crest length of 1,200 feet and a crest elevation of 496 feet. Immediately downstream of the overflow section of the spillway structure is a concrete lined stilling basin. The spillway channel is 1,200 feet wide and extends about 5,000 feet from the end of the stilling basin. During spillway flow, the gates are closed gradually to maintain the combination of the spillway flow and outlet works flow to 41,000 cfs.

### **Dam Safety Issues**

The USACE maintains public safety by making sure the dams owned and operated by the Corps are safe, and risks to the public are minimized. An integral part of the program is the risk-informed screening process. Dams are classified based upon confirmed or unconfirmed dam safety issues, the combination of life or economic consequences should failure occur and the probability of failure. This process enables the Corps to prioritize dam safety actions to correct deficiencies, which include interim risk reduction measures to be undertaken while further investigations are conducted and remedial actions are implemented.

### **Current Status**

Information obtained from the USACE website indicates Santa Fe Dam received a Dam Safety Action Class II, or DSAC II, rating based on a Screen Portfolio Risk Analysis, or SPRA, conducted in March 2009. A DSAC II rating is given to dams where failure could begin during normal operations or be initiated as the consequence of an event. The likelihood of failure from one of these occurrences, prior to remediation, is too high to assure public safety; or the combination of life or economic consequences with probability of failure is very high.

Santa Fe Dam received a DSAC II rating because of the potential for:

- Failure from embankment seepage and piping at outlet conduit
- Seepage and piping along the conduit and access gallery
- Transverse cracking that allows a subsequent high pool event to begin internal erosion leading to head cutting and overtopping resulting from a significant seismic event
- Internal erosion into open gravel foundation soils under the conduit (suffusion)
- Saturation of one or more liquefiable layers in the foundation causing liquefaction leading to settlement or deformation and overtopping resulting from a significant seismic event occurring while the pool is of long enough duration
- Channel jumping and/or overtopping of the levees upstream resulting from the hydraulic capacity of the inlet structure and upstream channel restricting flow into the dam

As a result of Santa Fe Dam's DSAC II rating, the Corps has implemented the following Interim Risk Reduction Measures, or IRRMs:

- Inspection and monitoring

- Flood mapping
- Updating the Emergency Action Plan
- Coordination with local interests/tabletop emergency exercise
- Installing piezometers adjacent to the outlet conduit

.Because of the IRRMs, the project would not expose people or structures to related hazards. No impact would result.

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

**No Impact.**

The project is not located near any large surface water bodies, the ocean, or in hillside or mountainous terrain. Therefore, there is no potential for impacts resulting from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

## 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) **Physically divide an established community?**                                                                               

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site is bound on all sides by residential uses immediately east, west and south, and north on the other side of E San Bernardino Road. The project development would not divide or separate any existing land uses or neighborhoods. Rather, it would improve connections between the surrounding residential uses with a non-gated infill residential development project with both automobile and pedestrian connections. The proposal would also be introducing an amenity to the community with the proposed park located south of the entryway, which would be non-gated and accessible to the public. The proposed project impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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?**                                                                               

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project has a County General Plan land use designation of Category 1 (Low Density Residential – 1 to 6 dwelling units/acre) and currently has a zoning designation of A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural zone, 6,000 square foot minimum lot sizes). The zoning, consistent with the existing uses on the project site, allows churches subject to permit. The Low Density Residential General Plan land use designation recognizes that property so designated may accommodate local serving uses, such as a church and daycare, provided that they are compatible with the surrounding uses in terms of scale intensity and design. Additionally, the church and daycare site received an approval of their request to continue the church and daycare uses and add a new hall in August, 1989.

The project does not propose to change the General Plan land use designation of the site, as there is an existing General Plan policy that supports a more concentrated form or urban development. The adopted General Plan Land Use Element (page III-31) states that the Residential Infill provision “*encourages residential infill at densities compatible with and slightly higher than those of surrounding uses*” and that “*new residential development within existing urban areas, not covered by a more detailed community or areawide plan, may be permitted at densities exceeding those depicted on the Land Use Policy Map...*” with conformance to criteria.

The proposed residential development would consist of detached condominium units that incorporate healthy design features to comply with the County’s recently adopted Healthy Design Ordinance. The proposed project area is suitable for detached housing units, using the Low-Mid Density Residential General Plan land use designation, while maintaining the character of existing low density residential neighborhoods and also providing an additional area to accommodate future market demand. Using Residential Infill, the project allows for a higher density and non-standard design layout of the dwelling units without requiring a zone change request.

The density range applicable to the “1” Low Density Residential General Plan Land Use designation; allows up to 6 dwelling units per gross acre and the current A-1-6,000 zone would allow up to 23 dwelling units with an average 6,000-square-foot lot size, or about 7.26 dwelling units per gross acre. The project proposes 22 dwelling units with multiple detached residential units on one residential lot. The proposed density is approximately 6.7 dwelling units/acre, which is comparable to the surrounding residential uses. Calculation of the density for the 22 homes in the project yields 6.68 dwelling units/acre (22 homes/3.29 acres). Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Title 22, Planning and Zoning, of the Los Angeles County Code is the County’s planning document that applies to the entire unincorporated County area. It serves as the implementation tool for the County’s General Plan Land Use Element. The current zoning designation for the site is A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture – 6,000 square foot minimum lot sizes). The proposed project does not conflict with any provisions of the County’s Zoning Code,

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

**No Impact.**

The entire project site is not located within any Hillside Management Criteria or SEA Conformation Criteria areas, or any other applicable land use criteria areas. The project site and surrounding community is adjacent to highways, roadways and urban development, and is relatively flat in topography. The project site is not located within any reserve systems. The project would not conflict with any management plans associated with Hillside Management Criteria or SEA Conformance Criteria areas, and no impacts would result. No mitigation measures are required.

**12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>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?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**No Impact.**

According to the County of Los Angeles General Plan, major local mineral resources consist of oil, rock deposits, and sand and gravel. These resources are located in the alluvial fans of the Big Tujunga Wash toward the San Fernando Valley area and in the San Gabriel River area around Monrovia and Irwindale. Other extraction areas are located in northern Los Angeles County in other washes. There are no extraction areas within the project site vicinity.

There is no active drilling within close proximity to the project site and the site is surrounded by residential and a school related use. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region. Also, the project would not 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. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

<b>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?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

As stated above, no known commercially valuable mineral resources exist on or near the project site. In addition, the project site is not identified on a local General Plan, Specific Plan, or other land use plan as the location of a locally important mineral resource. The proposed project would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource. No significant impacts related to mineral resources would result from project implementation, and no mitigation is required.

**13. NOISE**

	<i>Less Than Significant</i>			
	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the project result in:

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Noise impacts are considered significant if they expose persons to levels in excess of standards established in local general plans or noise ordinances. Impacts may also be significant if they create either a substantial permanent or temporary increase. Noise from project-related traffic increases are not expected to have effects that are below the +3 dB significance threshold. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project is a request to construct 22 detached condominium units in the midst of a highly developed single-family residential community. Condominium development is not a substantial noise-producing land use. Noise from the project site would be effectively impeded by planned perimeter walls, landscaping and by the buildings themselves. Noise from project-related traffic increases are shown in Question 13.a) above to have effects that are below significance thresholds. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors or existing residents to excessive noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

As discussed previously in Question 13.a), noise impacts are considered significant if they expose persons to levels in excess of standards established in local general plans or noise ordinances. Impacts may also be significant if they create either a substantial permanent or temporary increase. In most environmental analyses, "substantial" is taken to mean a level that is clearly perceptible to humans. The project proposes to house vehicles within enclosed garages and the guest parking areas are buffered by buildings within and surrounding the project. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

**Construction Noise**

All project-related construction activities would be conducted according to best management practices, including maintaining construction vehicles and equipment in good working order by using mufflers where applicable, limiting the hours of construction, and limiting the idle time of diesel engines. Noise from construction equipment would be limited by compliance with the Noise Control Ordinance (County Code Chapter 12.08) and County Code Chapter 12.12 (Building Construction Noise). The Noise Control Ordinance restricts and regulates hours of construction operation and levels of construction noise. In Section 12.08.440, construction noise is restricted from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. weekdays and at any time on Sundays or holidays when it creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line.

Despite compliance with County requirements, noise generated by construction equipment during the construction phase of the project may result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The Noise Control Ordinance standard for construction is stated in terms of a “not-to-exceed” level, which is generally understood to be the peak hourly value (Leq). During most intensive heavy equipment operations, the peak hourly average noise level from several pieces of equipment in simultaneous hourly operation is 85 dB Leq at 50 feet from the activity. In close proximity to heavy equipment operations, the County Ordinance standard in Section 12.08.040.B may be exceeded.

Mitigation Measure MM-8 requires compliance with the County’s construction activity time limits, the use of distance buffers for certain heavy equipment or powered hand tools, and the installation of contiguous 10-foot sound curtains along the eastern site boundary. The curtains would result in 13.0 dB of noise attenuation, which exceeds the 10 dB reduction needed to meet County standards. Construction noise can be mitigated to within the code threshold by this measure.

**Mitigation Measures:**

***MM-10:** During site grading and construction, County of Los Angeles Noise Standards shall be fully implemented and shall include the following site-specific requirements:*

- *Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday. Construction shall not be permitted on any national holiday or on any Sunday.*
- *All construction equipment shall use properly operating mufflers.*
- *Any powered equipment or powered hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding 75 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from said source shall be prohibited unless a means exists to reduce such noise below 75 dBA. The use of a temporary noise barrier during construction is considered a reasonable and feasible measure, as described below, if the 75 dBA Noise Ordinance requirement cannot be achieved by other means.*
- *A temporary noise barrier shall be installed along the eastern site boundary when heavy equipment is being used within 160 feet of said boundary. The barrier height shall be 10 feet above grade. If sound blankets are installed on a support framework, the edges shall overlap sufficiently to cover any gaps, and the areal density of the framework and fabric shall be at least 3.5 pounds per square foot to provide adequate stiffness to the array.*

## Construction Vibration

The NIA also evaluated the potential for construction activities to cause excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Construction activities generate ground-borne vibration when heavy equipment travels over unpaved surfaces or when it is engaged in soil movement. Vibration is most commonly expressed in terms of vibration decibels (VdB). The range of vibration decibels is as follows:

65 VdB	-	threshold of human perception
72 VdB	-	annoyance due to frequent events
80 VdB	-	annoyance due to infrequent events
94-98 VdB	-	minor cosmetic damage

Typical background vibration levels in residential areas are usually 50 VdB or lower, below the threshold of human perception. Construction equipment produces various levels of vibration according to the distance between source and received. The NIA evaluated the likely mix of project construction equipment and determined that a large bulldozer would create the maximum potential vibration on-site of 81 VdB at 50 feet from the source. The threshold for structural damage such as cracked stucco is typically 100 VdB. Groundborne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that can damage structures.

Applying Los Angeles County's vibration standard (Ordinance 11778 Section 12.08.560) of 0.01 inches per second, which equates to 80 VdB for vibration annoyance, a large bulldozer would exceed that standard within 56 feet of a residential structure. Sixteen existing homes are within 15-30 feet of the east and west property lines and four existing homes are within 5-15 feet of the south property line and therefore within the 56-foot threshold distance.. Recreational uses (i.e., rear and side yards) at residences east, west and south of the site are closest to the project, and groundborne vibration is almost never annoying to people who are outdoors. Additionally, large bulldozers would not likely operate directly at the shared property line with the perimeter homes since any fine grading at the property line would be performed with small bulldozers, which have 30 VdB less vibration potential and would not exceed the County's vibration annoyance threshold. Nevertheless, vibration perception such as rattling windows could occur in those residential structures if large bulldozers are permitted to operate within the 56-foot threshold distance. Therefore, mitigation measure MM-11 requires a buffer to be maintained along the eastern property boundary to preclude large bulldozers and to ensure adequate vibration protection.

Although vibration levels from heavy equipment may be noticeable at times at the nearest single-family homes to the east, west and south of the project site, they would not cause any structural damage. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-11, vibration levels would not exceed the Los Angeles County vibration threshold and impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measure:

***MM-11:*** *During site preparation and grading activities, only small bulldozers shall be permitted to operate within 56 feet of the nearest residences to the east, west and south. To maintain a minimum 56-foot separation from adjacent residences, an exclusionary setback from homes along the entire eastern, western and southern site boundaries shall be established and delineated on grading plans. Delineation shall be made by buffering residential buildings using aerial photography, planimetric survey data, or similar methods. It is preliminarily estimated that large bulldozers shall be restricted from operating within 18 to 36 feet of the entire eastern, western and southern site boundaries.*

*If this measure is infeasible and use of larger equipment is required, structural surveys shall be conducted before and after grading and any structural damage (stucco cracks, etc.) attributed to adjacent heavy equipment operations shall be remediated at the contractors expense.*

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?

**No Impact.**

El Monte Airport is located about 6 miles west of the project site. The project site is not located in an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a public airport; therefore, there is no impact associated with these issues.

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?

**No Impact.**

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, there is no impact associated with this issue.

## 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project proposal includes a request for approval of a Residential Infill request to allow for the construction of 22 detached condominium units. Based on the US Census Bureau’s estimate of 3.12 persons per household for the Covina City area for 2009-2013, the project would increase the population in the Covina City area by 69 people. This population increase would be insignificant for the Covina City area and Countywide. It is less than one (.001) percent of the overall population for the Covina City area and is far less than one percent of the County population in unincorporated areas. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for infrastructure including roadways or water and wastewater facilities to be extended other than into the site by the project; therefore, the project would not result in indirect population growth.

Construction of the project may employ people who choose to move to the City for the purposes of working during project construction; however, most employees are expected to come from the existing City population and that of the surrounding communities. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly or indirectly, and no mitigation is required.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

The site consists of a church, daycare and open area for use associated with the church campus. No housing units are located on site, and housing displacement would not occur as a result of project development. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact related to housing displacement, and no mitigation is required.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**No Impact.**

The site consists of a church, daycare and open area for use associated with the church campus. No housing units are located on site, and housing displacement would not occur as a result of project development. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact related to housing displacement, and no

mitigation is required.

**d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

As discussed in response 14.a) above, the anticipated population increase associated with development of the project would be less than one percent of the existing estimated population for the area. The project would not exceed any official regional or local population projects and no mitigation is required.

**15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>			

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?

                
 
                 
 
                 

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project is located in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County that is served by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, which is a regional fire service agency that serves 58 District Cities and all unincorporated areas. The Department is broken into nine Divisions and protects more than 3.9 million residents in over 1.2 million housing units from its 170 fire stations located throughout Los Angeles County (Fire Department’s 2012 Statistical Summary). There are currently five fire stations within approximately three miles of the project site. These include fire stations located at the following locations:

- 15546 East Arrow Highway
- 807 West Cypress Street
- 14334 East Los Angeles Street
- 401 North Second Avenue
- 605 North Angeleno Avenue

The project would result in either 69 or 88 new residents, depending on whether utilizing the generation rate that the US Census Data reports for 2007-2011, or the general rate that the County’s Parks and Recreation Department uses to calculate parkland requirements. This increase is minimal, compared to the 3.9 million residents currently served by the Fire Department through the entire County. Prior to final plan approval, the Fire Department would verify that the proposed project has been designed to comply with all applicable Fire Code requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered a fire hazard and would not exceed the capacity of the fire department to serve the site or other areas with existing fire protection services and resources. The proposed project would not result in the need for additional fire protection services and would not reduce the response time for existing fire protection services. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Sheriff protection?

                
 
                 
 
                 

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LASD) is the local law enforcement agency that provides general service law enforcement to unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County as well as incorporated cities within the County who have contracted the agency for law-enforcement services. There are approximately 42 cities within the County that have contracted the Sheriff’s Department to provide local

police services. The LASD is the largest sheriff's department in the United States. It is broken into three regions and is comprised of 23 stations. The Walnut/Diamond Bar Sheriff's Station is in Region 3 and is located about 8.8 miles away at 21695 Valley Boulevard in Walnut. The Walnut/Diamond Bar Sheriff's Station serves the Cities of Walnut and Diamond Bar and the unincorporated areas of Rowland Heights, Covina Hills and West Covina. The San Dimas Sheriff's Station is also in Region 3 and is located about 8.1 miles away at 270 South Walnut Avenue in San Dimas. The San Dimas Sheriff's Station serves the City of San Dimas and the unincorporated communities of Covina, Azusa, Glendora, La Verne, Claremont, Azusa Canyon, Mount Baldy and the Angeles National Forest (State Route 39).

The proposed project would not exceed the Sheriff's Department's capacity to serve the site or other areas with existing Sheriff's police services. It would not reduce the response time for existing local police services. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

**Schools?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

East Irwindale is located in the Covina Valley Unified School District service boundaries. The Covina Valley Unified School District currently serves about 13,000 students at ten elementary schools, three middle schools, three comprehensive high schools, an alternative education high school, a Children's Center program and adult education centers. According to enrollment data projections for grades K-12 of the School District's 2014-2015 First Interim Report, there is a decline in student population much to do with the current economic conditions, affordable housing and available employment. Continual declines in student enrollment are expected at least through 2021-22.

The student generation rates included in the study are as follows:

**Table 6**  
**Enrollment Data Projections**

School Level	14-15	'15-'16	'16-'17
Elementary School	5,248	5,107	5,041
Middle School	3,112	3,098	2,953
High School	5,328	5,130	4,966
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,688</b>	<b>13,335</b>	<b>12,960</b>

Utilizing the above, the total decline in student enrollment is expected to reach 2,578 students. By the time the project is completely constructed, it can be assumed that the number of school-aged students generated by the project would be negligible. Pursuant to Section 65996 of the Government Code, the applicant is required to pay developer fees to the Covina Valley Unified School District. Section 65996 designates Section 17620 of the Education Code (the mitigation fees authorized by SB 50) and Section 65970 of the Government Code to be the exclusive method for considering and mitigating development impacts on school facilities. With payment of these fees potential school impacts are considered less than significant.

**Parks?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The existing project site is part of a church and daycare campus and is improved with structures, an asphalt parking lot, landscaping and open space. The landscaping and open space would be removed for the proposed development.

Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation prepared a Park Obligation Report dated October 20, 2014. Pursuant to County of Los Angeles Code, Title 21, Subdivision Ordinance, the County must determine whether the development's park obligation is to be met by:

- 1. the dedication of land for public or private park purpose or,
- 2. the payment of in-lieu fees or,
- 3. the provision of amenities or any combination of the above.

The specific determination of how the park obligation would be satisfied is based on the conditions of approval by the advisory agency as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation. The subdivision ordinance provides a ratio of 3.0 acres of park land for each 1,000 people generated by the development in Park Planning Area #15 (Charter Oak Islands/Glendora Heights). According to the Park Obligation Report, the project would generate 4.04 people per dwelling unit, or 88.88 residents for the 22-unit development, with a total local park space obligation of 0.27 acre. The additional 89 residents that are estimated based on the Department of Parks and Recreation's generation rate is about 1.8 percent of the overall population in census 4054, which was at 4,795 in 2010. The 0.27-acre park obligation for Tentative Map # 072718 would be met by the payment of \$71,265 in-lieu fees.

In addition to payment of in-lieu fees to comply with park obligation requirements, the project is designed to include an approximately 0.42 acre portion of the site immediately adjacent to the main entryway off San Bernardino Road, dedicated to landscaped pedestrian accessways and connection points, a tot lot, and a community gathering area.

**Libraries?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

As mentioned earlier, the project would result in about a .02 percent increase in population over existing conditions for the 2010 census tract 4054. As such, while the proposed project would generate an increased demand for library facilities, this increase would not be substantial, and the project would not require the construction of a new library. There are presently two libraries located within two miles of the project site, and six additional libraries located within five miles of the project site. Future residents have eight existing libraries available for use. This impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Other public facilities?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project would result in about a 1.8 percent increase in population over existing conditions for the 2010 census tract 4054. As such, while the proposed project would generate an increased demand for other public facilities, this increase would not be substantial, and the project would not require the construction of new facilities. While the proposed project would likely create a slight increase in the demand for other public facilities, given the size of the project and the proposed residential use, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

## 16. RECREATION

- |  | <i>Potentially<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact with<br/>Mitigation<br/>Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</i> | <i>No<br/>Impact</i>     |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| <p><b>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?</b></p> | <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>         | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

According to the Park Obligation Report, the project would generate 4.04 people per dwelling unit, or 88.88 residents for the 22-unit development, with a total local park space obligation of 0.27 acre. The additional 89 residents that are estimated based on the Department of Parks and Recreation’s generation rate is about .02 percent of the overall population in census 4054, which was at 4,795 in 2010. The 0.27-acre park obligation for Tentative Map # 072718 would be met by the payment of \$71,265 in-lieu fees.

The applicant intends to pay the \$71,265 in-lieu fees to satisfy the park obligation requirements. In addition to payment of in-lieu fees to comply with park obligation requirements, the project is designed to include an approximately 0.42 acre portion of the site immediately adjacent to the main entryway off San Bernardino Road, dedicated to landscaped pedestrian accessways and connection points, a tot lot, and a community gathering area that would all be available to residents for recreational use. With the project’s on-site recreation facilities and payment of the in-lieu fees, the potential effects on existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities is considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p><b>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?</b></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Please refer to the discussion for Question 16.a), above. The proposed project includes an approximately 0.42 acre portion of the site immediately adjacent to the main entryway off San Bernardino Road, dedicated to landscaped pedestrian accessways and connection points, a tot lot, and a community gathering area that would all be available to residents for recreational use and all would be available amenities to future residents of the project. While the proposed project would result in population growth within the community, it would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that would result in adverse effects on the environment and impacts would be less than significant. The project would remove an open lawn areas as part of the church and daycare campus that may have been used as sports fields in the past. While there may be some loss of a community recreational resource and mature trees, this fields was developed when the site was used as a church and daycare. Presently, the church and daycare campus there is no evidence that the fields are utilized for neighborhood community recreation. No mitigation is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

In 2004, the County’s Department of Parks and Recreation prepared the Strategic Asset Management Plan for 2020 (SAMP) to provide the County and the public information that would enable prioritization of the allocation of limited economic resources for the provision of parks, recreation facilities, and open space. The SAMP includes park inventories, identifies needs, and provides recommendations for each Planning Area and each Supervisorial District.

The applicant intends to pay in-lieu fees of \$71,265 to comply with the park obligation requirement, in addition to the recreational amenities that are incorporated into the project design. Payment of this fee would contribute to the economic resources available to provide parks, recreation facilities, and open space. It is consistent with the SAMP and the County’s General Plan standards for the provision of parkland and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

## 17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p><b>Would the project:</b></p> <p><b>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?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Department of Public Works has not chosen to determine the effectiveness of the mobility system with regard to this project.

There are several plans that provide guidance for the County’s myriad transportation options. The County is currently updating the General Plan and Mobility Element for the unincorporated communities, and there are regional transportation plans at SCAG and Metro. In general, projects accounted for in General Plans are accounted for in regional plans. The general trend among all these plans is a move toward a multi-modal solution to our congestion problems. In response to the Healthy Design Ordinance, the project is not a significant impact on current traffic and transportation plans and policies and would encourage non-automotive transit or alternative modes.

The project, however, would be required to comply with all applicable transportation ordinances.

<p><b>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?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was created statewide as a result of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). The CMP for Los Angeles County requires that the traffic impact of individual development projects of potential regional significance be analyzed.

The closest CMP intersection monitoring location to the project site is CMP Station 159, located at La Azusa Avenue at Workman Avenue in West Covina.

The CMP guidelines require that arterial monitoring intersection locations must be examined if the

proposed project would add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours (of adjacent street traffic) at CMP monitoring intersections. Based on the proposed project's trip generation potential, trip distribution and trip assignment, the project would not add 50 or more trips at the identified CMP intersection during either the weekday AM peak hour or PM peak hour. Therefore a CMP intersection traffic impact analysis is not required.

There are no CMP freeway monitoring locations in the vicinity of the project site, thus a CMP freeway traffic impact analysis is not required. There are no impacts associated with the project and no mitigation is required.

**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?**                       

**No Impact.**

El Monte Airport is the closest public airport and it is over 6 miles away. The project would not affect air traffic patterns, nor would it result in substantial safety risks. There would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project would not introduce any new roadways or introduce a land use that would conflict with existing land uses in the surrounding area. Vehicular access to the site would be provided from San Bernardino Road via a single full-access unsignalized driveway. The curb cuts would be constructed to County standards. Internal vehicle circulation, including queuing and stacking would not impact ingress and egress to the site because driveway the private streets, guest parking and throat lengths have been designed to adequately support anticipated traffic for the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), and no mitigation is required.

**e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**                       

**No Impact.**

Impact to the project site would be provided via one unsignalized driveway located along San Bernardino Road. The entrance driveway is proposed as an un-gated access point that would be designed as a private street and fire lane. Emergency access is not proposed to be impeded.

With adequate emergency access from the proposed project entryway and adequate internal circulation, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access and no mitigation is required. The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed development for adequate emergency access and has cleared it for public hearing.

**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?**

**No Impact.**

The project would not conflict with the Bikeway Plan, Pedestrian Plan, TOD, or any other adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation and would be subject to compliance with policies, plans, and programs of the County and other applicable agencies regarding alternative modes of transportation. Pedestrians accessing the project may utilize pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks and crosswalks) that connect to the surrounding street system. A sidewalk is located along an interior private street and can be used to access the site. The project would not remove or relocate any alternative transportation access points. Therefore, the project does not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and no mitigation is required. Approximately 500 feet from the proposed development, a class II bike path is proposed for Irwindale Avenue according to the 2012 Master Plan of Bikeways that will connect to an existing class III bike path on the same street.

**18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impa ct</i>
--	---	--	---	---------------------------

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Wastewater treatment requirements for the proposed project would be the same as those for all residential development in the surrounding area. There are no unique chemical or waste constituents in project wastewater that would exceed current wastewater treatment requirements. Impacts would 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health - Environmental Health Division recommended approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map 072718 based on the use of public water and public sewer as proposed.<sup>1</sup> No sewer area study was required.

The proposed water system would connect to an existing water line in San Bernardino Road. There are no known capacity issues that would require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Based on proposed street and grading designs, all facilities would be constructed on-site and would meet County-mandated capacity requirements. The project would not create drainage system capacity problems,

---

<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Department of Public Health - Environmental Health Division. Tract Map No. 072718 (Tentative Tract Map Date: September 24, 2014) review memo dated October 17, 2014.

or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

**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?**                       

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Domestic potable and landscape water needs would be met by service from Azusa Light and Water via existing water lines in San Bernardino Road. Azusa Light and Water has issued a will-serve letter and has sufficient reliable water supplies to serve the project demands. No new entitlements or water resources are necessary.

**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?**                       

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project site is currently provided electricity by Southern California Edison and natural gas by Sempra Gas Company. The proposed project would continue to use both power sources by tying into existing electrical transmission lines and natural gas lines adjacent to the project site. All new facilities would be built to comply with all current building codes, including the requirements of California Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, and the Title 24 California Green Building Standards. As such, the proposed project would not be expected to require significantly greater supplies of energy resources that would result in capacity problems, or require construction or expansion of energy utility facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Trash collection services would be provided by Athens Services

According to the Los Angeles County Solid Waste Information Management System (SWIMS), solid waste from the project area is sent to the Industry Transfer and Processing Facility, which is located in unincorporated Los Angeles County next to the City of Industry.

Recyclable materials including various grades of paper and cardboard are recovered through a combination of manual and mechanical methods. Residual waste is placed into large capacity trailers for transfer to permitted landfills. Currently, residual waste from the Puente Hills MRF is hauled to the landfill in trucks. The facility is permitted to accept 4,400 tons per day and 24,000 tons per week of municipal solid waste. Any portion of the project-generated solid waste that is diverted from landfill disposal through recovery

and recycling efforts at the MRF extends the life of County landfills.

According to data collected in SWIMS, Los Angeles County diverted 55 percent of its municipal solid waste in 2009, so residents and businesses disposed of approximately 9 million tons of municipal solid waste, or 4.8 pounds per capita per day in 2009.<sup>2</sup> The project would result in approximately 69 to 88 residents, depending on the generation rate used (see Question 16.a). At 4.8 pounds per capita after diversion, the proposed project would generate an estimated maximum of 422.4 pounds per day, or approximately 69.9 tons annually. Compared to the nearly 5,000 tons of permitted daily intake at the processing center, the project contribution is individually inconsequential.

Project impacts are considered less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project is required to comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Further, the project does not propose uses that would be unable to comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would result.

---

<sup>2</sup> Source: 2009 Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Annual Report.

**19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The project proposes a private park site that includes an open lawn recreation area, tot lot and central gathering area that can encourage physical activity. The site served as a campus for a church and daycare and has been subject to grading in the past to level the elevation of the open area and asphalt parking lot. The site is entirely surrounded by urban development areas. Development of the project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the natural environment. The existing trees may, however, provide suitable habitat for nesting birds. Disturbing or destroying active nests that are protected is a violation to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Hence, mitigation measure MM-4 is included to ensure that the project complies with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and reduces any potential impacts related to biological resources to less than significant.

While the site has no known historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources identified within the project boundaries, Mitigation Measure MM-6 is included to require a qualified paleontologist be onsite if excavations penetrate the bedrock formations. Mitigation Measure MM-7 is included to establish protocol in the event that human remains are encountered. Mitigation Measures MM-5, MM-6 and MM-7 would reduce any potential impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological, cultural or paleontological resources to less than significant.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

The project is requires approval of a Residential Infill request. It would be consistent with the County’s current A-1-6,000 zoning designation for the site. The project would contribute to loss of privately owned open areas, lawns and mature trees that could be used for recreation purposes. Because the open areas and lawns are privately owned, there is no guarantee that the open areas and lawns would be maintained as recreational fields or remain open for public use. The open area and lawns would be replaced with a residential community within the unincorporated East Irwindale community that includes a neighborhood park and other onsite amenities. In addition, the applicant would be required to pay park in-lieu fees that would be used to acquire and improve new park areas in the county, which would reduce the cumulative

impact to less than significant.

The site is surrounded by predominantly existing residential development. No other projects are proposed within the immediate vicinity of the project site within the unincorporated County of Los Angeles. Cumulative impacts of the project and surrounding development proposals were analyzed in and discussed in the above sections of this Initial Study and determined to be less than significant or can be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures MM-1 through MM-11. Therefore, the project's contribution to any significant cumulative impacts would be cumulatively less than considerable.

**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)?

**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

Cumulative impacts of the project and surrounding development proposals were analyzed in and discussed in the above sections of this Initial Study and determined to be less than significant or can be reduced to less than significant levels with incorporation of mitigation measures MM-1 through MM-11. Therefore, the project's contribution to any significant cumulative impacts would be cumulatively less than considerable.

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