

**STAFF USE ONLY**



**PROJECT NUMBER:** TR 066664  
**CASES:** RENT 200600078  
ROAKT 200900048

**\*\*\*\* UPDATED INITIAL STUDY \*\*\*\***  
**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**  
**GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>I.A. Map Date:</b>	<u>11/24/09 12/03/10</u>	<b>Staff Member:</b>	<u>Rudy Silvas</u>
<b>Thomas Guide:</b>	<u>596 F2</u>	<b>USGS Quad:</b>	<u>El Monte (#67)</u>
<b>Location:</b>	<u>8300 Longden Avenue, San Gabriel, CA</u>		
<b>Description of Project:</b>	<u>Tentative Tract Map No. 066664 is a proposal for a seven (7) lot subdivision for the development of seven single family residences. Project site is located in the unincorporated area of San Gabriel, within the East Pasadena/ San Gabriel Community Standards District (CSD). Entrance to the site will be directly from Longden Avenue, along the north property frontage, with <del>access driveway/ firelane proposed at 26' wide with one a forty (40) foot wide fully dedicated public street and a bulbhead turnaround-space.</del> Proposed lot sizes will range from <del>10,017</del> 8,607 sq. ft. gross to <del>14,609</del> 12,800 sq. ft. gross. Grading is proposed for import of 800 cu. yds. of fill. There are four oak trees on site of which three are County ordinance sized oak trees. An oak tree permit application has been filed for encroachment into the protective zones of three oaks.</u>		
<b>Gross Area:</b>	<u>1.72 Acres (74,711 square feet)</u>		
<b>Environmental Setting:</b>	<u>The project site is located in a suburban setting on a mildly sloping lot with oaks, citrus and other various trees.</u>		
<b>Zoning:</b>	<u>R-1-7,500 (Single Family Residential - 7,500 sq. ft. min. size lot area required) East Pasadena/ San Gabriel CSD</u>		
<b>General Plan:</b>	<u>Category 1 – Low Density Residential (1-6 units per acre)</u>		
<b>Community/Area Wide Plan</b>	<u>N/A</u>		

**Major projects in area:**

Project Number	Description	Status
OT/IS 00-88, TR 53186	Tract map for 13 single family lots at 8306-8318 Longden Ave.	Approved in 2001, Neg. Dec.
IS/ZC/CUP 98082, TR 52815	75 unit senior citizen condo dev. at 6212-6224 North San Gabriel Blvd.	Withdrawn in 2000

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

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

Responsible Agencies

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

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- City of San Marino
- City of Temple City
- City of San Gabriel
- Temple City Unified School District
- Gabrieleno Native American Tribal Representative
- Sunny Slope Water Company
- Angeles National Forest

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- Subdivision Committee
- DPW: Land Development Division, Waterworks & Sewer Maintenance Division, Traffic & Lighting Division, Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division, Grading and Drainage Division
- Health Services: Env. Health, Environmental Hygiene
- Sanitation Districts
- Fire Department: Fire Prevention Division, Forestry Division
- Sheriff Department
- Public Library

**IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX**

		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg			Potential Concern	
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Comply with County Noise Ordinance</i>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Implement conditions of Oak Tree Permit</i>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	8. Greenhouse Gas Em.	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Tract map conditions for ADA requirements</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pay connection fee to County Sanitation District</i>
	3. Education	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pay library mitigation fees</i>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	5. Utilities	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
OTHER	1. General	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Environmental Safety	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Land Use	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Mandatory Findings	26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)**

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS<sup>1</sup> shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: Urban: Conservation/Maintenance

2.  Yes  No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3.  Yes  No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

**If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.**

Check if DMS printout generated (attached)  
Date of printout: \_\_\_\_\_

Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

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

**Environmental Finding:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reviewed by: Rudy Silvas  Date: 5/26/10 2/09/11

Approved by: Paul McCarthy  Date: 5/26/10 2/09/11

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

Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

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

**HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- |    | Yes                      | No                                  | Maybe                               |   |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?<br><br><u>State of California Earthquake Fault Zone – El Monte Quadrangle Map; site is 1.4 mi. southeast of accurately mapped earthquake fault (Raymond Fault), 1.1 mi. southeast of special study zone; per Plate 1 Los Angeles County Fault Rupture Hazards and Historic Seismicity Map - site approximately 1.3 miles northeast of marked earthquake epicenter <math>5.0 \geq M &lt; 7.0</math>.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?<br><br><u>Plate 5 Los Angeles County Landslide Inventory Map; no indication of landslides.</u>  |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?<br><br><u>Plate 5 Los Angeles County Landslide Inventory Map; no slope instability.</u>   |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?<br><br><u>Not Located in Liquefaction Hazard Zone – State Seismic Hazard Zones Map, El Monte Quadrangle:(1999); Plate 4 Los Angeles County Liquefaction Susceptibility Map: (1990) no liquefaction potential indicated; Plate 3 Los Angeles County Shallow and Perched Ground Water Map: nothing indicated.</u>   |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?  |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?<br><br>_____   |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?<br><br><u>Verification will be completed by Public Works</u>  |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other factors? _____  |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size                       Project Design                       Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Comply with requirements of Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division of Public Works.

**CONCLUSION**

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

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

**HAZARDS - 2. Flood**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?  
USGS quadrangle El Monte
- b.    Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?  
Plate 6 - Los Angeles County Flood & Inundation Hazards Map
- c.    Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?  
Plate 5 - Los Angeles County Land Slide Inventory Map
- d.    Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f.    Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? \_\_\_\_\_

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size                       Project Design

Comply with the requirements of Public Works for approved drainage concept, LID standards.

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant                       Less than significant with project mitigation                       Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?  
Plate 7 – Los Angeles County Wild Land and Urban Fire Hazards Map
- b.    Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? \_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? \_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f.    Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Water Ordinance No. 7834  Fire Ordinance No. 2947  Fire Regulation No. 8
- Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Project Design  Compatible Use

Comply with all requirements from Fire Department

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant  Less than significant with project mitigation  Less than significant/No impact

**HAZARDS - 4. Noise**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?  
During Construction  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

- Title 12 Environmental Protection, Chapter 12.08 Noise Control
- Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

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

- Lot Size       Project Design       Compatible Use

Project shall comply with Los Angeles County Noise Control ordinance per Chapter 12.08 of Los Angeles County Code, Title 12.

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Industrial Waste Permit                       Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
- Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269                       NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

### MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size                       Project Design

Applicant will be required to comply with LID requirements per Municipal Code Chapter 12.84 (Low Impact development Standards), the County's LID Ordinance per Los Angeles County Code, Title 12.

### CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant     Less than significant with project mitigation                       Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance?  
*Project site located in South Coast Air Basin*  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?  
*Temporary generation of dust during construction period*  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f.    Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g.    Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- h.    Other factors: \_\_\_\_\_

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Health and Safety Code Section 40506

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Project Design

Air Quality Report

Comply with dust control requirements by Public Health and Public Works.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 3. Biota**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe

- a.    Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line located on the project site?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?  
Coast Live Oaks (Quercus agrifolia), non-heritage
- f.    Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g.    Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? \_\_\_\_\_

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

- Lot Size     Project Design     Oak Tree Permit     ERB/SEATAC Review

Project will require oak tree permit for encroachment of three ordinance sized oaks, and for mitigation of two oaks that were pruned without a permit. Applicant must comply with conditions set forth by the County Forester in letter dated August 19, 2010, will be reflected in oak tree permit.

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant     Less than significant with project mitigation     Less than significant/No impact



**RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe

a.    Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

c.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

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

Lot Size       Project Design

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

- Lot Size       Project Design
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b.    Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d.    Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? \_\_\_\_\_
- e.    Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f.    Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size       Project Design       Visual Report       Compatible Use
- \_\_\_\_\_

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GhGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (i.e., on global climate change)? Normally, the significance of the impacts of a project's GhG emissions should be evaluated as a cumulative impact rather than a project-specific impact.
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases including regulations implementing AB 32 of 2006, General Plan policies and implementing actions for GhG emission reduction, and the Los Angeles Regional Climate Action Plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/> <hr/>

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Lot Size       Project Design

---



---



---

**CONCLUSION**

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

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

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more, and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?  
Project is a 7 unit residential subdivision project.
  - b.    Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?  
Ingress and egress through a T-intersection
  - c.    Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
  - d.    Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
  - e.    Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
  - f.    Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
  - g.    Other factors? New driveway aprons and curb ramp must provide ADA compliant pedestrian paths along the public sidewalk. Tract map conditions will require applicant to meet ADA requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works prior to recordation of final map.

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Project Design
- Traffic Report
- Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Initiate all requirements from Traffic and Lighting, Road and Land Development Divisions of Public Works. Applicant must meet all tract map conditions, ADA requirements, prior to final map recordation.

CONCLUSION

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

- Potentially significant
- Less than significant with project mitigation
- Less than significant/No impact

**SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe

- a.    If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?

Project to be served by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District within the project area, and must connect to County Sanitation District No. 15, do not anticipate capacity problems based on current average flow measurements at San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) or at alternate Whittier Narrows WRP, both operating below design capacity.

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

Each detached unit will require a separate sewer lateral with connection to a new mainline sewer.

- c.    Other factors? Connection fee and will serve letter required by County Sanitation District.

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Comply with all requirements set forth by Public Works. Applicant must pay required sewer connection fee to County Sanitation District and obtain will serve letter.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

**SERVICES - 3. Education**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- |    | Yes                                 | No                                  | Maybe                    |  |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?<br><u>Temple City Unified School District</u>  |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?<br>_____   |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create student transportation problems?<br>_____   |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?<br><u>Project would create additional demand for library services</u> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____   |

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Site Dedication       Government Code Section 65995       Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

Applicant must pay current library facilities mitigation fees of \$5,600 (\$800 X 7 residential units) to the County Public Library, or the fee per residential unit in effect at the time building permits are issued, to mitigate impacts to library services.

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

**SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe4
- a.    Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?  
Temple City Sheriff Station 0.75 mi. to southeast, Fire Station 1.75 mi. to east, both in Temple City.
- b.    Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Fire Mitigation Fees

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant       Less than significant with project mitigation       Less than significant/No impact

**SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe

a.    Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?

Domestic Water to be provided by Sunny Slope Water Company

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

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

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

e.    Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?

f.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size

Project Design

Project shall comply with all requirements set forth by Public Works on tentative map conditions prior to recordation of final map.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

**OTHER FACTORS - 1. General**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

Yes No Maybe  
a.

Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?

Project must comply with Green Building Standards/ requirements

b.

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

c.

Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

d.

Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

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

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot size       Project Design       Compatible Use

Implement requirements for Green Building standards

**CONCLUSION**

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

**OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
- 
- b.    Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
- 
- c.    Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
- 
- d.    Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?
- 
- e.    Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- 
- f.    Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 
- g.    Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
- 
- h.    Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
- 
- i.    Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 
- j.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

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

Toxic Clean up Plan  
*Construction, demolition, and grading projects in the County's unincorporated areas are required to recycle or reuse a minimum of 50% of the construction and demolition debris generated by weight per the County's Construction and Demolition debris Recycling and Reuse Ordinance. A recycling and Reuse Plan must be submitted to and approved by Public Works' Environmental Programs Division before construction, demolition, or grading permit may be issued.*

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant     Less than significant with project mitigation     Less than significant/No impact

### OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

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

---

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

---

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

Hillside Management Criteria?

SEA Conformance Criteria?

Other? \_\_\_\_\_

---

d.    Would the project physically divide an established community?

---

e.    Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

---

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

#### CONCLUSION

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

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

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

- |    | Yes                      | No                                  | Maybe                               |  |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?<br><hr/>  |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?<br><hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?<br><hr/>   |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?<br><hr/>  |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?<br><hr/>   |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?<br><hr/>                                      |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other factors? _____<br><hr/>  |

MITIGATION MEASURES /  OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

**CONCLUSION**

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

- Potentially significant     Less than significant with project mitigation     Less than significant/No impact

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- Yes No Maybe
- a.    Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- 
- b.    Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
- 
- c.    Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- 

## CONCLUSION

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

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact