Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Richard J. Bruckner
Director

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
PROJECT NUMBER: R2008-01137

1. DESCRIPTION:
The proposed Hacienda Heights Community Plan is an outgrowth of an extensive community-driven process to update the existing Hacienda Heights General Plan, which was adopted in 1978. The Community Plan articulates the community's desired vision for Hacienda Heights and sets specific, action oriented goals and policies to achieve that vision over the next 20 years. The Community Plan Update addresses the issues of community services, health and safety, housing, land use and development, maintenance and appearance, open space and recreation, and transportation in a comprehensive and holistic way. The Community Plan Update also adjusts for changes in the population and development that has transpired since the original Plan was adopted in 1978 and accommodates projected population increases in a manner consistent with the community's vision. The project also includes proposed zone changes to implement the land use policy in the Community Plan and to ensure that any existing inconsistencies between zoning and land use are corrected.

2. LOCATION:
Hacienda Heights is an unincorporated community in Los Angeles County of approximately 11 square miles and population of approximately 60,000 located north of the Cities of Whittier and La Habra Heights, south of the City of Industry, east of the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights, and west of the unincorporated community of North Whittier.

3. PROPONENT:
County of Los Angeles

4. **FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**
BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT WITH MITIGATION AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROJECT MITIGATIONS FORM INCLUDED AS PART OF THE INITIAL STUDY

5. **LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**
THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Veronica Siranosian, AICP, LEED GA (Regional Planner) and Lisbeth Sinclair (Senior Regional Planner), Community Studies East Section, Department of Regional Planning

REVIEWED BY: Susana Franco-Rogan (Acting Supervising Regional Planner), Community Studies East Section, Department of Regional Planning

DATE: March 16, 2011

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *R2008-01137*
CASES:

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

Map Date:

Staff Members: Veronica Siranosian, AICP
Lisbeth Sinclair

Thomas Guide: 637, 638, 677, 678

USGS Quad: El Monte, Baldwin Park, Whittier, La Habra

Location: Hacienda Heights is an unincorporated community in Los Angeles County of approximately 11 square miles and population of approximately 60,000 located north of the Cities of Whittier and La Habra Heights, south of the City of Industry, east of the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights, and west of the unincorporated community of North Whittier

Description of Project: The proposed Hacienda Heights Community Plan is an outgrowth of an extensive community-driven process to update the existing Hacienda Heights General Plan, which was adopted in 1978. The Community Plan articulates the community's desired vision for Hacienda Heights and sets specific, action-oriented goals and policies to achieve that vision over the next 20 years. The Community Plan Update addresses the issues of community services, health and safety, housing, land use and development, maintenance and appearance, open space and recreation, and transportation in a comprehensive and holistic way. The Community Plan Update also adjusts for changes in the population and development that has transpired since the original Plan was adopted in 1978 and accommodates projected population increases in a manner consistent with the community's vision. The project also includes proposed zone changes to implement the land use policy in the Community Plan and to ensure that any existing inconsistencies between zoning and land use are corrected.

Gross Acres: Approximately 7,040 acres

Environmental Setting: Hacienda Heights is bounded by the City of Industry to the North, the Cities of Whittier and La Habra Heights to the South, unincorporated Rowland Heights to the east, and unincorporated North Whittier to the west. Surrounding land uses include industrial areas in the City of Industry to the North; open space recreational areas in the Puente Hills to the South; open space areas, the Rose Hills Cemetery, and residential uses in North Whittier to the west; and residential and commercial uses in Rowland Heights to the east. Portions of the Puente Hills Native Habitat Preservation Authority lands exist within the community as do Los Angeles County Designated Special Management Areas (formerly named Significant Ecological Areas). The community is developed predominantly with single-family residences and a few commercial areas. North and south of the 60 Freeway the community is generally flat. The topography begins to slope gently and then steeply south of Colima Road.

Zoning: The majority of Hacienda Heights is zoned R-1 (Single-Family Residence Zone) and R-A (Residential Agricultural Zone). Several residential areas concentrated around Colima Rd. are also zoned RPD (Residential

Planned Development Zone). A few R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence Zone) areas exist along the 60 Freeway. A-1 and A-2 (Light Agricultural and Heavy Agricultural) zoned parcels exist mostly in the western portion of the community, with additional areas of A-1 and A-2 zoning along the southern edge of the community, the northeastern portion of the community south of the 60 Freeway and north of the 60 Freeway abutting the City of Industry. Small pockets of C-1, C-2, C-3, C-H, and CPD (Restricted Business, Neighborhood Commercial, Unlimited Commercial, Commercial Highway, and Commercial Planned Development) zoned parcels exist mostly along Hacienda Blvd and at the intersection of Colima Road and Azusa Ave.

Community Standards District: None

General Plan: The Los Angeles County General Plan land use map designates the majority of the Hacienda Heights Community as 1 (Low Density Residential). Several small pockets of the community are designated as C (major commercial) and 2 (Low/Medium Density Residential). On the western edge of the community a large area is designated as R (Non-Urban). Two areas of the community are designated as SEA (Significant Ecological Areas). The Sycamore-Turnbull Canyon SEA (#44) is in the southwest portion of the community, and the Powder Canyon – Puente Hills SEA (#17) is in southeast corner of the community.

Community/Area wide Plan: The Hacienda Heights Community General Plan designates the majority of the land in the community as U1 (Urban 1, 1.1-3.2 unit per acre) or U2 (Urban 2, 3.3-6.0 units per acre). The southwest and southeast portions of the community are designated as N2 (Non-urban 2, 0.3-1.0 units per acre). Several pockets of Commercial designated parcels exist along Hacienda Blvd. and at the intersection of Colima Rd. and Azusa Ave. A small portion of the community located north of the 60 Freeway is designated as Industrial. Open Space areas are located at the western edge and southeastern corner of the community, with several Open Space designated areas dispersed throughout the community.

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
N/A	*The Hacienda Heights Community and Recreation Center will be located on nine acres of land currently owned by the Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District at 1234 Valencia Avenue in Hacienda Heights. In 2009, the Board of Supervisors dedicated $220,433 towards planning, design, and other architectural services required to develop a master plan for the community center site.*
Tract # TR51153	*Approved (by Regional Planning Commission, October 21, 2009) subdivision located in the southeast portion of the community immediately west of Schabarum Regional Park currently accessible by Apple Creek Road. Developed by Pacific Communities Builder, Inc., the subdivision proposes 53 units (47 single family, 4 open space, 1 parking and 1 public lot) on 114.03 acres. This site is within the Powder Canyon Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA #17)*
Tract # TR060358	*Pending subdivision located immediately north of the 60 freeway currently accessible by Galemont Ave. Developed by LA County Community Development Commission, the L-shaped lot is comprised of 6 assembled lots (total acreage not available). Proposes 24 condominiums. Reduced setbacks and density bonus for affordable housing.*

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

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ LA Regional Water Quality Control Board
- ☐ Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Check if septic system proposed)
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☒ City of Whittier
- ☒ City of Industry
- ☒ High School District- Hacienda La Puente Unified School District
- ☒ Elementary School District- Hacienda La Puente Unified School District
- ☒ Local Native American Tribal Council
- ☒ Hacienda Heights Improvement Association
- ☒ Metropolitan Water District
- ☒ Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority
- ☒ City of La Habra Heights
- ☒ Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ Sanitation Districts
- ☒ DPW: Land Development Division
- ☒ Fire : Planning Division
- ☒ DHS: Land Use Program (Septic Wells)
- ☒ Sheriff Department
- ☒ Department of Public Health
- ☒ Department of Parks and Recreation

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	6	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	8	☐	☒	☐	
	3. Fire	10	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	14	☐	☒	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	18	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	20	☐	☒	☐	
	3. Biota	24	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	27	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	29	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	30	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	31	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	33	☐	☒	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	35	☐	☒	☐	
	3. Education	36	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	37	☐	☒	☐	
	5. Utilities	38	☒	☐	☐	
OTHER	1. General	40	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	42	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	45	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	46	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	48	☒	☐	☐	
	Mitigation Measures	49				

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

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

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

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

☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much 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**. As needed, future applicants will agree to modification of each of their projects so that they will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modifications to mitigate potential impacts are identified on the Project Mitigations Form included as part of this Initial Study.

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

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

Reviewed by: *Veronica Siranosian, AICP, LEED GA (Regional Planner)*
Lisbeth Sinclair (Senior Regional Planner)
Community Studies East Section

Signed and Dated: 4/13/2011 4/13/2011

Approved by: *Susana Franco Rogan (Acting Supervising Regional Planner)*
Community Studies East Section

Signed and Dated: 4/13/2011

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

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

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project located in an active or potentially **active fault zone**, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *The Whittier Fault crosses the southern section of the community. The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects in active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Riolo Earthquake Fault Zone.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area containing a **major landslide(s)**? *The southern and western edges of the community are in a Landslide Zone. However, the proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects in an area containing a major landslide.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having **high slope instability**? *The southern and western edges of the community are in a Landslide Zone. The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects in an area containing a Landslide Zone.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site subject to high **subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction**, or hydrocompaction? *The north, central, and eastern portions of the community are located in a Liquefaction Zone. The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects in an area containing a Liquefaction Zone.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a **sensitive use** (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a **significant geotechnical hazard**? *The proposed project is a Community Plan and does not entail the construction of sensitive land uses, such as schools, hospitals, or public assembly sites. The proposed Community Plan supports the development of a community center. The proposed location is not in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail **substantial grading** and/or alteration of topography including **slopes of over 25%**? *The Community Plan is a land use policy document. It does not entail any grading. The Community Plan sets goals and policies that would guide future grading in the community to minimize impacts on the natural topography. Specifically, Goal LU-4: Protected hillsides and ridgelines; Policy LU 4.1: Minimize alteration of the hillside caused by development; Policy LU 4.2: Promote contour grading in hillside areas (areas above 25% slope) to mimic the appearance of a natural hillside, unless it has a negative impact on slope stability or drainage; and, Policy LU 4.3: Locate new structures off the top of a ridgeline (as shown on Ridgelines Map), when determined by the reviewing agency to be possible, to preserve undeveloped ridges.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on **expansive soil**, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? *The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document and does not grant entitlements for any project. It does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County Codes and policies.*

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

The Community Plan contains Policy LU 5.2: Restrict the intensity of development in areas with hazards, including landslide, high fire hazard, seismic, flood, and liquefaction areas.

A Maybe response indicates that a portion of the community may be within a hazard area, as described in each setting. In those instances, future development projects within those areas of the community will be scrutinized for potential environmental impacts during the project review proceedings, which are neither defined nor altered in the Draft Community Plan, which is the project this Initial Study evaluates. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case by case basis whether and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review.

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 110, 111, 112, and 113, and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the **major drainage course**, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Several major drainage courses exist in the Puente Hills, located in the southwest portion of the community. Major drainage courses also run along Hacienda Boulevard and Stimson Avenue in the central portion of the community. However, the Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. Future development projects in these areas will require compliance with County Code requirements for setbacks or other measures to avoid flood hazard impacts, as well as General Plan policies that discourage development in flood prone areas.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within or does it contain a **floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone**? *One small portion in the center of the community, located south of the intersection of Hacienda Boulevard and Newton Street, contains a FEMA 100 and 500 year floodplain. However, the Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. Future development projects in these areas will require compliance with County Code requirements for setbacks or other measures to avoid flood hazard impacts, as well as General Plan policies that discourage development in flood prone areas.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in or subject to high **mudflow** conditions? *The southern portion of the community slopes significantly. However, the Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. Future development projects in these areas will require compliance with County Code requirements for setbacks or other measures to avoid mudflow impacts.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project contribute or be subject to high **erosion and debris** deposition from run-off? *Some portions of Hacienda Heights are subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off. However, the proposed project is a Community Plan and no grading is entitled by the Plan.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project substantially alter the existing **drainage pattern** of the site or area*?* *The Community Plan is a policy document that does not grant entitlements for any project. Furthermore, it does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County Codes. The Community Plan also supports low-impact development, which seeks to minimize alteration of existing drainage patterns caused by new development. Specifically, Goal C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources; and, Policy C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency, the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, and low-impact development.*

f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

A Maybe response indicates that a portion of the community may be within a flood area, as described in each setting. In those instances, future development projects within those areas of the community will be scrutinized for potential environmental impacts during the project review proceedings, which are neither defined nor altered in the Draft Community Plan, which is the project this Initial Study evaluates. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case by case basis whether and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review.

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Code, Title 26 – Section 110.1 (Flood Hazard)
☐ Health and Safety Code, Title 11 – Chapter 11.60 (Floodways)

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in a **Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone** (Fire Zone 4)? *The hilly portions of the community located in the southwest, south, and southeast are located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The proposed Community Plan decreases allowable development in these areas (as indicated on the Proposed Land Use Map in the Community Plan) as compared to what is currently allowed and contains goals to minimize fire hazard risk, specifically, Goal LU-5: New development with minimal risk from natural hazards.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by **inadequate access** due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? *The Fire Department has not indicated that areas served by inadequate access exist.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have **more than 75 dwelling units on a single access** in a high fire hazard area? *The proposed project is a Community Plan. It does not grant entitlements for any project. Furthermore, it does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County Codes. Within the high fire hazard areas, the Plan does not allow for additional development that was not already allowed with the adopted Plan.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having **inadequate water and pressure** to meet fire flow standards? *The Fire Department has not indicated that areas with inadequate water and pressure exist.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project located in close **proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard** conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *The community consists almost entirely of residential and commercial uses that are not considered a potential dangerous fire hazard. However, neighboring industrial uses in the City of Industry close to the Hacienda Heights border include chemical and allied products; paints, varnishes, lacquers and enamels; calcium-based alkaline products; and, secondary smelting and refining on nonferrous metals.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed **use** constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? *The proposed project is a Community Plan and does not grant entitlements for any projects that would constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. Furthermore, it does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County Codes.*

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

A Maybe response indicates that a portion of the community may be within a fire area, as described in each setting. In those instances, future development projects within those areas of the community will be scrutinized for potential environmental impacts during the project review proceedings, which are neither defined nor altered in the Draft Community Plan, which is the project this Initial Study evaluates. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case by case basis whether and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review.

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Utilities Code, Title 20 – Section 20.16.060 (Fire Flow & Fire Hydrants Requirements)
☒ Fire Code, Title 32 – Sections 902.2.1 & 902.2.2.1 (Access & Dimensions)
☒ Fire Code, Title 32 – Sections 1117.2.1 (Fuel Modification Plan, Landscape Plan & Irrigation Plan)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located near a **high noise source** (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *The 60 Freeway runs through the northern portion of the community. Future projects proposed near high noise sources must comply with existing County codes and policies, including the County Noise Ordinance.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposed use considered **sensitive** (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *There are noise sensitive uses located in Hacienda Heights, including senior citizen facilities and schools. However, the Community Plan Update does not grant entitlements for the development of sensitive uses and will not result in the direct increase in ambient noise levels affecting sensitive land uses. Future projects will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance.*
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? *The proposed project is a Community Plan, which does not grant entitlements for the development of sensitive uses and will not result in the direct increase in ambient noise levels affecting sensitive land uses. Future projects will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance. The Plan contains goals and policies to address noise. Specifically, Goal PH-1: A community free of nuisance-causing noise; Policy PH 1.1: Encourage the use of walls, earth berms, landscaping, setbacks, or a combination of these strategies, to mitigate noise-related disturbances; and, Policy PH 1.2: Locate sensitive receptors including schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes in areas sufficiently removed from high noise generators.*
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? *The proposed project is a Community Plan, which does not grant entitlements for the development of sensitive uses and will not result in the direct increase in ambient noise levels affecting sensitive land uses. Future projects will be required to meet current noise standards and comply with the County Noise Ordinance.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *A Maybe response indicates that a portion of the community may be located near a noise source, as described in each setting. In those instances, future development projects within those areas of the community will be scrutinized for potential environmental impacts during the project review proceedings, which are neither defined nor altered in the Draft Community Plan, which is the project this Initial Study evaluates. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case by case basis whether and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review.*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Environmental Protection Code, Title 12 – Chapter 12.08 (Noise Control)
☒ Building Code, Title 26 – Sections 1208A (Interior Environment – Noise)

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

The Community Plan is a policy document that does not entail any direct physical changes, although it provides for the possibility of direct physical changes through future development projects, some of which would be reviewed individually for potentially significant environmental impacts.

Construction of future new land uses would result in greenhouse gas emissions. At this time, construction project-specific information is not known, including demolition requirements, construction phases, start dates, end dates, project size, and work days/weeks and no specific projects are proposed as part of the Community Plan Update. Therefore, construction related emissions cannot be quantified at this time. Construction related greenhouse gas emissions would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for future projects that are subject to CEQA review.

Potential long-term impacts to GHG emissions were evaluated using the Urban Emissions model (URBEMIS v9.2.4), released by the California Air Resources Board. Three scenarios were calculated: existing development, maximum build-out of the adopted Plan, and maximum build-out for the proposed Plan. Based on this analysis, the proposed Plan results in net GHG emissions of ~~46,289~~67,122 MT of CO_2 equivalent when compared to the baseline and ~~18,766~~39,599 MT of CO_2 equivalent when compared to the adopted Plan. These net increases are below the 100,000 MT significance threshold set by CARB for regional transportation projects, which is the most relevant available threshold. Therefore, the Community Plan has a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions. Details related to the methodology, data inputs, assumptions, threshold of significance, and outputs can be found in Appendix 1.

The proposed Plan also contains goals and policies that have the potential co-benefit of offsetting GHG emissions of future development. For example, Policy LU 1.3: Encourage mixed-use in commercial areas; Policy M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists; Policy M 4.2: Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects; Policy C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency through the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, low-impact development and sustainable construction materials; Policy C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices; and Policy C 4.4: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices. The Plan's land use map and associated zone changes reinforce these policies by increasing allowable density in areas with access to transit service and existing utilities and decreasing allowable density in sparsely developed areas with no access to transit.

b	☐	☐	☒	Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? *Currently, there is no comprehensive greenhouse gases reduction plan in place for the community or Los Angeles County, although the County's Green Building Ordinances (Green Building, Drought-Tolerant Landscaping, and Low-Impact Development) do include regulations that have the potential co-benefit of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically, the Green Building Ordinance (Section 22.52.2100 of the LA County Code) intends to conserve water, conserve energy, conserve natural resources, divert waste from landfills, minimize impacts to existing infrastructure, and promote a healthier environment. The Community Plan supports this intent through its goals and policies as discussed above as well as through implementation strategy Conservation 1: "Ensure that new development proposals are consistent with the guidelines established in the County Green Building ordinance." Applicable future development projects within the community are also required to comply with the Green Building Ordinance requirements.* *In the absence of a local adopted plan to reduce greenhouse gases, the project is evaluated against State and regional plans. Specifically, the Southern California Association of Governments Compass Blueprint Principles, the California Attorney General's Office "Sustainability and General Plans: Examples of Policies to Address Climate Change" (2010), and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association "Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans" (2009). The Plan was evaluated for consistency with the above documents' goals and policies. A complete comparison table and discussion is included in Appendix 1. The analysis found that the Plan contains numerous goals and policies that support efficient future development that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In cases where the Plan was found to be deficient, model goals, policies, or mitigation measures were refined or added to ensure consistency.* *Additionally, Air Quality Mitigation Measures 6, 7, and 8 require that future projects within Hacienda Heights that are subject to CEQA review incorporate mitigations to lessen any potential environmental impacts to less than significant. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation Measures 2, 3 and 4 require that future projects within Hacienda Heights that are evaluated and may have a potentially significant impact on emissions incorporate GHG reduction features into the project design, implement onsite measures that provide direct GHG emission reductions onsite, and implement neighborhood mitigation measure projects. Finally, Mitigation Measure 5 requires the Los Angeles County Internal Services Department to develop, adopt, and implement of a Climate Action Plan including an emissions inventory, targets, and monitoring as well as mechanisms to allow for revisions to the Climate Action and Community Plan as necessary. With these mitigation measures the Community Plan is consistent with applicable greenhouse gas reduction plans, policies, and regulations.* *To ensure that projects subject to CEQA review comply with these mitigation measures, the entire Mitigation Monitoring Program is contained within to the*

Community Plan. The mitigation measures will therefore be adopted with the Plan and when future projects undergo review for consistency with the Community Plan they will also be reviewed for consistency with the mitigation measures.

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

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **greenhouse gas emissions**?

☐ 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**? *The vast majority (90%) of Hacienda Heights is adequately served by San Gabriel Valley WC or Suburban Water Systems, which must comply with State standards. The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects in areas with known water quality problems. Projects proposed in areas with known water quality problems or that propose the use of individual water wells shall comply with County codes and policies, including the County Public Health Department's standard for private wells.* (See: San Gabriel Valley Water Company *Urban Water Management Plan for Operations Within the Boundaries of Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (2005) and* Rowland Water District *Water Sources (2008)*.)
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a **private sewage** disposal system? *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. Some future residential development may require private sewage disposal systems, which must comply with the County Health Code and Plumbing Code.*
	☐	☐	☐	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? *N/A*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the **quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff** to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects and does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County Codes pertaining to groundwater quality or water runoff. The Countywide Low-Impact Development Ordinance contains requirements that would minimize impacts of new construction on storm water runoff. Furthermore, the Community Plan encourages low-impact development. Specifically, Policy C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency, the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, and low-impact development.*
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? *No development is entitled as part of the Community Plan update. Developments allowed under the Community Plan have to comply with County Codes pertaining to water discharges and storm water, including the Low-Impact Development Ordinance.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health & Safety Code, Title11 – Chapter 11.38 (Water & Sewers)
☒ Environmental Protection, Title 12 – Chapter 12.80 (Storm-water & Runoff Pollution Control)
☒ Plumbing Code, Title 28 – Chapter 7; Appendices G(a), J & K (Sewers & Septic Systems)

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use
☐ Septic Feasibility Study ☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit

---

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely 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 users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? *The proposed Community Plan seeks to accommodate projected population increases in a manner consistent with the community's vision and the Los Angeles County General Plan. Based on a calculation of gross acres and not taking into account current parcel sizes, streets and other easements, or existing development, the proposed Community Plan increases the total maximum allowable units that can be developed within the community to ~~20,645~~22,095 as compared to 17,078~~4~~ units currently built (Los Angeles County Assessor, 2010) and 20,151 maximum units allowed under the adopted 1978 Community General Plan. Based on gross acres per land use category, an additional 3,073 units could be built under the adopted Plan compared with an additional ~~3,567~~5,017 units that could be built under the proposed Plan. Therefore the proposed Plan allows a maximum~~n~~ additional 1,944~~494~~ units over its 30 year planning horizon compared with the adopted Plan, or an average of 61 units per year over the life of the Plan.~~.~~ Recent development patterns indicate that development should not exceed half this maximum potential. According to Los Angeles County Assessor data, there has been an average of 30 units developed per year for the last 30 years, a steady and steep trend of decreasing development per year for the last 40 years, and no current pending subdivision is over 50 units in size.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposal considered a **sensitive use** (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? *The proposed Community Plan establishes goals and policies to guide future development in Hacienda Heights and does not entail the construction of schools, hospitals, parks, or other sensitive uses located near a freeway or heavy industrial use. Specifically, Policy LU 5.1: Locate new uses with hazardous emissions away from existing sensitive receptors, including but not limited to housing and schools. The proposed Community Plan ~~land use map~~ allows the continuance of existing educational facilities and parks in their current locations. Some existing schools and the proposed Hacienda Heights Community and Recreation Center are in close proximity to the 60 Freeway. The Community Plan does not expand sensitive uses near freeways or heavy industrial uses. Mitigation measure 7requires that projects adhere to minimum separation recommendations outlined in the California Air Resources Board Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (2005) and that projects that cannot meet these recommendations be designed to minimize air quality impacts.*
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?

The maximum build-out of the proposed Plan will increase emissions relative to the adopted Plan, but will significantly decrease emissions of CO, VOC, and NOx relative to existing conditions, due to the anticipated decrease in the future emission rates for vehicular sources. However, the net increases for PM10 and PM2.5 for the proposed Plan as compared to existing conditions are above the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore the project may result in significant air quality impacts if maximum build-out is achieved. Although this level of future development is unlikely based on historical trends, mitigation measures are required to bring potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 10 requires compliance with applicable Air Quality Management District Rules to minimize impacts of future development to less than significant levels.

d.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious **odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions**? *Hacienda Heights contains portions of the Puente Hills Landfill, which operates under the regulatory structure of CalRecycle, SCAQMD, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and others. While odors and dust are infrequently detected offsite, these nuisance odors and dust are rare and localized. If these events do occur, they are short-term and transient in nature. The landfill has a "state-of-the-art" gas control system and is in full compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1150.1. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts conducts routine monitoring of the landfill surface, below ground along the perimeter, and the ambient air to ensure maximum gas collection efficiency. Puente Hills Landfill will perform final closure activities under the regulatory structure of CalRecycle, SCAQMD, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and others. These activities will include the placement of final cover on the site, as well as installation and continuing maintenance of environmental control systems. The landfill is operated in an environmentally sound manner, and will continue to do so through closure and the post closure maintenance period. The 60 Freeway also runs through the community. Vehicles traveling along the freeway may generate hazardous emissions. The Landfill is scheduled to close in 2013 during the planning period for the Community Plan. Consistent with the Conditional Use Permit that regulates operations of the landfill (CUP No. 02-027-(4)), the proposed Community Plan supports the creation of a park at the site of the landfill after closure, which would decrease a source of dust and odor in the community. Furthermore, the Plan does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards or procedures to ensure compliance with County codes and policies.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable **air quality plan**? *The proposed Community Plan establishes goals and policies to guide future development and would not alter or have any other effect on the implementation of applicable air quality plans. Specifically, Goal M-4: Community circulation plans consistent with regional and state transportation goals. In accordance with the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan by AQMD, the Plan helps the County to coordinate its efforts and to work cooperatively with other responsible agencies to address issues of air quality in land use (e.g., policies to site sensitive receptors away from potential contaminants) and transportation planning (e.g., reducing vehicle miles traveled by promoting alternate modes).*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project violate any **air quality standard** or contribute substantially to an existing or projected **air quality violation**?

				Hacienda Heights is located in Los Angeles County, which is a nonattainment area, and development in the community will continue to contribute to air quality conditions in the region that currently do not fully comply with State and Federal standards. As can be seen in Appendix A, based on a model that evaluated the maximum development potential the Plan would exceed thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5. While this level of future development is unlikely based on historical trends, mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure 10 requires compliance with applicable Air Quality Management District Rules to minimize impacts of future development to less than significant levels. Plan Policy C4.4 also promotes air resource management best practices. To offset these potential emissions, the Community Plan furthermore contains goals and policies to encourage alternative modes of transportation, which may offset increases to air quality impacts caused by new development. Specifically, Goal LU-1: Well designed, walkable residential neighborhoods that provide various housing types and densities; Policy LU 1.2: Concentrate new higher density (H9 and above) residential development along existing commercial corridors, near transit routes and close to other community serving facilities; Goal M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community; Policy M 1.6: Promote Dial-a-Ride or other senior paratransit service; Goal M-2: Safe and well-maintained bike routes and facilities; and, Goal M-3: Safe and well-maintained pedestrian pathways.
g.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable **net increase of any criteria pollutant** for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which would exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *Hacienda Heights is located in Los Angeles County, which is a nonattainment area, and development in the community will continue to contribute to air quality conditions in the region that currently do not fully comply with State and Federal standards. As can be seen in Appendix A, based on a model that evaluated the maximum development potential the Plan would exceed thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5.While this level of future development is unlikely based on historical trends, mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure 10 requires compliance with applicable Air Quality Management District Rules to minimize impacts of future development to less than significant levels.*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ State of California Health and Safety Code – Section 40506 (Air Quality Management District Permit)

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

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

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

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within a **Significant Ecological Area** (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *The majority of Hacienda Heights is developed with residential, commercial, park, public, and semi-public uses. Relatively undisturbed and natural areas exist in the southern portion of the community in the Puente Hills. Portions of two adopted SEAs (currently proposed in the Community Plan Update to be combined into the Puente Hills SEA are located in the community. On the western edge of the community is the Sycamore-Turnbull Canyons SEA #44 while the eastern edge of the community contains part of the Powder Canyon-Puente Hills SEA #17. The proposed Community Plan would not alter existing Countywide policies relating to SEAs. Future development projects within those areas of the community will be scrutinized for potential environmental impacts during the project review proceedings, according to the County's SEA protocols, which are neither defined nor altered in the Draft Community Plan. At that time, reviewing agencies will determine on a case by case basis whether and which conditions are necessary to mitigate potential environmental impacts, should any be identified through that review. The Plan also includes specific goals and policies to protect these valuable undisturbed natural areas. Specifically, Goal C-1: Open space conservation areas that are protected and accessible; Policy C 1.2: Promote planting of locally-indigenous vegetation consistent with the Los Angeles County Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance in areas adjoining conservation areas; Policy C 1.3: Whenever possible, mitigate any impacts of development that would impede access to or reduce net acreage of conservation areas; Policy C 1.4: Site structures to minimize the extent of fuel modification zones and degradation of locally-indigenous vegetation; Policy C 2.3: Screen Significant Ecological Areas from direct and spillover lighting and noise from adjoining uses.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial **natural habitat areas**? *The proposed Community Plan is a policy document. It does not grant entitlements for any projects involving grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements. It does not revise, replace, or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with County codes. Furthermore, the Community Plan contains goals and policies specific to protecting remaining natural habitat areas in Hacienda Heights. Goal C-2: Wildlife that is respected and protected; Policy C 2.1: Ensure continuity of wildlife corridors and wildlife access to corridors; Policy C 2.2: Protect streams and riparian habitat by requiring a 20-foot buffer for all new development; and, Policy C 2.4: Require fence materials and design that allow wildlife movement and limit other potential blockages adjacent to habitat areas.*

c.	☐	☐	☒	Is a **drainage course** located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral **river, stream, or lake**? *Several major drainage courses exist in the Puente Hills, located in the southwest portion of the community. Major drainage courses also run along Hacienda Boulevard and Stimson Ave. in the central portion of the community. Future development in Hacienda Heights in the vicinity of major drainage courses will continue to be required to comply with County Code requirements and General Plan policies relating to flood hazard avoidance and mitigation.*
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.)? *According to the Natural Diversity Database, an inventory maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game's Habitat Conservation Division, the southeast corner of Hacienda Heights may contain many-stemmed dudleya. The Database indicates that the species is possibly extirpated. According to the Habitat Authority's Resource Management Plan, sensitive habitats and species within the project site may also include riparian, oak woodland, walnut woodland, and coastal sage scrub. The Community Plan contains goals and policies specific to protecting remaining sensitive natural habitat areas in Hacienda Heights. Specifically, Goal C-2: Wildlife that is respected and protected; Policy C 2.1: Ensure continuity of wildlife corridors and wildlife access to corridors; and, Policy C 2.4: Require fence materials and design that allow wildlife movement and limit other potential blockages adjacent to habitat areas.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain **oak or other unique native trees** (specify kinds of trees)? *Portions of Hacienda Heights, most notably the southwestern area of the community near the Puente Hills Landfill, contain oak. The Community Plan contains goals and policies specific to protecting remaining sensitive natural habitat areas in Hacienda Heights. Specifically, Goal C-2: Wildlife that is respected and protected; Policy C 2.1: Ensure continuity of wildlife corridors and wildlife access to corridors; and, Policy C 2.4: Require fence materials and design that allow wildlife movement and limit other potential blockages adjacent to habitat areas. Future development in Hacienda Heights would continue to be required to comply with County Code requirements, including the Oak Tree Ordinance.*
f.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site habitat for any known **sensitive species** (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *According to the California Natural Diversity Database, an inventory maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game's Habitat Conservation Division, the coastal California gnatcatcher has been noted in Schabarum Park, a portion of which is in Hacienda Heights. According to the Habitat Authority's Resource Management Plan, other non-listed sensitive species, including Plummer's Mariposa lily, have been noted in the upper Turnbull Canyon area, a portion of which is in Hacienda Heights.*

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

The Puente Hills, located south of Hacienda Heights, contain the Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Area, which provides a wildlife corridor and links adjacent open space. The Community Plan contains goals and policies specific to protecting wildlife corridors and open space linkages in Hacienda Heights. Specifically, Goal C-2: Wildlife that is respected and protected; Policy C 2.1: Ensure continuity of wildlife corridors and wildlife access to corridors; and, Policy C 2.4: Require fence materials and design that allow wildlife movement and limit other potential blockages adjacent to habitat areas.

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ ERB/SEATAC Review

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Oak Tree Permit

☐ Biological Constraints Analysis

CONCLUSION

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

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

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in or near an area containing known **archaeological** resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *While archaeological resources may exist, they are not readily known. Archeological resources are identified and considered on a project-specific basis. Doing so is part of the development application process and part of future applicants' responsibilities.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential **paleontological** resources? *While paleontological resources may exist, they are not readily known. Paleontological resources are identified and considered on a project-specific basis. Doing so is part of the development application process and part of future applicants' responsibilities.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain known **historic** structures or sites? *The Rancho El Valle Felice, a single-family property built in 1930 has been received by the California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation for evaluation to determine whether it is a historic property. The property has not yet been fully evaluated. The community also contains the Hsi Lai Temple, located at 3456 Glenmark Drive. Constructed in 1988, the 15 acre property includes buildings, gardens, and a sanctuary of traditional Ming and Ching dynasty architecture.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? *The Community Plan does not entitle any development projects that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Rancho El Valle Felice or any other potentially historical or archeological resource. Furthermore, the Community Plan contains goals and policies to protect such resources. Specifically, Goal C-3: Protected unique cultural, archeological, and historic resources; and, Policy C 3.1: Conserve significant archaeological artifacts and paleontological resources when identifies.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a **unique paleontological resource** or site or unique geologic feature? *While paleontological resources may exist, they are not readily known. Paleontological resources are identified and considered on a project-specific basis. Doing so is part of the development application process and part of future applicants' responsibilities.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Cultural Resources Records Search (Quick Check)

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design

☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

CONCLUSION

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

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

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known **mineral resource** that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? *According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Hacienda Heights contains oil deposits. The Los Angeles County Building Code Section 110.4 requires that buildings or structures located adjacent to or within 25 feet of active, abandoned, or idle oil or gas well (25 feet to 200 feet without certificate of proper abandonment from Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources) shall not be issued a permit unless designed according to recommendation prepared by licensed Civil Engineer and approved by building official. Public Works' Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for issuance of necessary clearance/approval. Hacienda Heights does not contain other mineral resource areas as designated by the LA County General Plan.*
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? *Hacienda Heights does not contain mineral resource areas as designated by the LA County General Plan.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ 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? *Hacienda Heights does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a **Williamson Act** contract? *Hacienda Heights does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, the Community Plan land use map does propose changing the land use designations of some rural designated areas to open space designations to reflect lands purchased by the Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Restoration Authority and to accurately depict the future planned use of a portion of the filled areas of the Puente Hills Landfill as public open space, as depicted in the attached map. The Community Plan Update also includes a zoning consistency program that will change existing agriculturally zoned areas to other zones to achieve consistency with the proposed land use designations and accurately reflect existing uses. Parcels within these zones are developed with single-family residences and no known agricultural uses are currently performed on them that could be disrupted by the proposed zone changes. There are no Williamson Act contracts for any land within Hacienda Heights.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature could result in **conversion of Farmland**, to non-agricultural use? *Hacienda Heights does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.*
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ 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**? *Hacienda Heights does not contain designated scenic highways or corridors. The Community Plan contains goals and policies to protect existing areas considered scenic by community members. Specifically, Goal LU-4: Protected hillsides and ridgelines; Policy LU 4.1: Minimize alteration of the hillside caused by development; Policy LU 4.2: Promote contour grading in hillside areas (areas above 25% slope) to mimic the appearance of a natural hillside, unless it has a negative impact on slope stability or drainage; Policy LU 4.3: Locate new structures off the top of a ridgeline (as shown on Ridgelines Map), when determined by the reviewing agency to be possible, to preserve undeveloped ridges; and, Policy LU 4.4: Encourage architectural styles and design that are compatible with the natural landscape in hillside areas.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct **views from a regional riding or hiking trail**? *The Schabarum Recreation Trail, also known as the Skyline Trail, is a multipurpose trail that traverses portions of Hacienda Heights in the southwest and southern edges of the community. There is also the Hacienda Hills Trail, which can be accessed at Orange Grove and 7th Avenue in Hacienda Heights. Both trails are maintained by the Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority. Future projects would continue to be required to mitigate visual impacts and protect views from the Schabarum Trail through the implementation of existing Codes and General Plan policies.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains u**nique aesthetic features**? *The majority of land in Hacienda Heights is developed with residential, commercial, public, and semi-public uses. The Community Plan contains goals and policies to protect remaining undisturbed areas that contain unique aesthetic features, such as hillsides and ridgelines. Specifically, Goal LU-4: Protected hillsides and ridgelines; Policy LU 4.1: Minimize alteration of the hillside caused by development; Policy LU 4.2: Promote contour grading in hillside areas (areas above 25% slope) to mimic the appearance of a natural hillside, unless it has a negative impact on slope stability or drainage; Policy LU 4.3: Locate new structures off the top of a ridgeline (as shown on Ridgelines Map), when determined by the reviewing agency to be possible, to preserve undeveloped ridges; and, Policy LU 4.4: Encourage architectural styles and design that are compatible with the natural landscape in hillside areas.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use **out-of-character** in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

				The proposed Community Plan proposes goals and policies to guide future development in Hacienda Heights in a way that is compatible with the height and bulk of existing features. Specifically, Policy LU 1.1: Protect the character of existing single-family neighborhoods; and, Policy A 3.3: Promote residential development that includes transitional design features between different housing types and densities through the use of setback variation, massing, or other design features. Additionally, the proposed land use map was developed in part based on existing uses and features in the community with a goal of maintaining the character of existing stable neighborhoods and preserving hillsides.
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial **sun shadow, light or glare problems**? *The proposed Community Plan proposes goals and policies to guide future development in Hacienda Heights in a way that is compatible with the height and bulk of existing features. Specifically, Policy A 3.3: Promote residential development that includes transitional design features between different housing types and densities through the use of setback variation, massing, or other design features. Even in cases where zone changes may be proposed, the height limit will remain 35 feet in all residential and commercial zones, according to Title 22, except for C-3, which is not found in the community. Therefore, the Plan will not cause additional sun shadow, light, or glare problems.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

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

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

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)? *Per the Los Angeles County Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines (1997), projects that propose to amend the County's General Plan Land Use must provide an analysis of the project at current planned land use versus proposed land use in the build out condition for the project area. Based on a calculation of gross acres and not taking into account current parcel sizes, streets and other easements, or existing development, the proposed Community Plan, which is part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, proposes to amend land use to increase the total allowable units that can be developed within the community to 22,095~~20,645~~ at build-out as compared to 17,078 units currently built (Los Angeles County Assessor, 2010) and 20,151 units at build-out under the adopted 1978 Community General Plan. Based on ~~current parcel sizes and existing development~~gross acres per land use category, an additional ~~3,567~~5,017 units can be built under the proposed land use map as compared with 3,073 units under the adopted community plan for the planning period (approximately 20 to 30 years). Therefore the proposed Plan allows an additional 1,944~~494~~ units compared with the adopted Plan. Future projects would continue to be subject to existing code requirements and the provisions of the Community Plan and General Plan policies, which require compliance with all applicable County requirements.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any **hazardous traffic conditions**? *Based on a calculation of gross acres and not taking into account current parcel sizes, streets and other easements, or existing development, the proposed Community Plan increases the total allowable units that can be developed within the community to ~~20,645~~22,095 as compared to 17,078 units currently built (LA County Assessor, 2010) and 20,151 units allowed under the adopted 1978 Community General Plan. However, the Plan does not issue any approvals of plans, proposed or future. The Plan promotes multi-modal transit to proactively offset increases in traffic, among other benefits. Specifically, Goal M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community; Policy M 1.3: Ensure that the stops are easily and safely accessible by foot, bicycle, or automobile; Policy M 1.4: Create a community shuttle service and designate shuttle routes to link residential neighborhoods to commercial areas and community facilities; Goal M-2: Safe and well-maintained bike routes and facilities; Policy M 2.4: Educate riders and motorists on how to safely share the road, for example through Share the Road signage and educational campaigns; Goal M-3: Safe and well-maintained pedestrian pathways; and, Policy M 3.4: Provide adequate street lighting along arterials and collector streets.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in **parking problems** with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?

The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects. However, the land use map increases the total number of dwelling units that could be built within the community. New residential development would be subject to the parking requirements in Title 22. Commercial and industrial areas are not significantly expanded in the proposed land use plan such that they would result in parking problems.

d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate **access during an emergency** (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *The proposed Community Plan proposes goals and policies to guide future development in Hacienda Heights and does not grant entitlements for any projects. It will not alter any existing standards or requirements for maintaining adequate vehicle and resident/employee access.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Will the **congestion management program** (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? *Based on a calculation of gross acres and not taking into account current parcel sizes, streets and other easements, or existing development, the proposed Community Plan increases the total allowable units that can be developed within the community to ~~20,645~~22,095 as compared to 17,078 units currently built (LA County Assessor, 2010) and 20,151 units allowed under the adopted 1978 Community General Plan. The addition of these units could add peak hour vehicle trips.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? *The proposed Community Plan supports and reinforces adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. Goals and policies contained in the Plan encourage alternative transportation. Specifically, Goal M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community; Goal M-2: Safe and well-maintained bike routes and facilities; and, Goal M-3: Safe and well-maintained pedestrian pathways.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

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

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

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

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

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create **capacity problems** at the treatment plant? *The Community Plan increases the total allowable number of residential units that could be built within the community. The Sanitation District lines are all located outside of the community, and Hacienda Heights is served by local sewer lines that connect to these lines at four points north of the community in the City of Industry. Additional units could create capacity problems at the treatment plant. However, the Community Plan will not alter existing standards and procedures to ensure that adequate sewage treatment capacity is available to serve proposed developments.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems in the **sewer lines** serving the project site? *The Community Plan increases the total allowable number of residential units that could be built within the community. Additional units could create capacity problems in sewer lines serving the project site. The Sanitation Districts' Infrastructure Capacity Study of Hacienda Heights from 2008 shows two of the four lines as needing relief, but the lines are located outside of the community, and the Sanitation District has no specific plans at this time to relieve the lines. However, the Community Plan will not alter existing standards and procedures to ensure that adequate sewer line capacity is available to serve proposed developments. Availability of sewer capacity depends upon project size and timing of connection to the sewerage system and should be verified as projects advance. Although there is no relief sewer scheduled for construction at this time, as additional flows are generated and the Districts' trunk sewer nears capacity, construction of a relief sewer will be scheduled, depending on the availability of relief project funding.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Utilities Code, Title 20 – Division 2 (Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste)
☒ Plumbing Code, Title 28 – Chapter 7 (Sanitary Drainage)
☐ California Health Safety Code – Section 5474 (Sewer connection mitigation fee)

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

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

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

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create **capacity problems** at the district level? *The Community Plan proposes increases in the total allowable housing that could be built within the community. This could cause an increase in students within the Hacienda La Puente School District.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create **capacity problems** at individual schools that will serve the project site? *The Community Plan proposes increases in the total allowable housing that could be built within the community. This could cause an increase in students within the Hacienda La Puente School District.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create **student transportation problems**? *The Community Plan proposes increases in the maximum number of housing units that could be built within the community. This could cause an increase in students within the Hacienda La Puente School District, and therefore could cause an increase in student transportation problems. The Community Plan proposes specific traffic improvements, sidewalk maintenance, and a community shuttle which could improve student transportation.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create substantial **library impacts** due to increased population and demand? *The Community Plan allows an increase in the maximum number of residential units within the community. This additional population could create substantial impacts on Hacienda Heights' existing single library. The Community Plan proposes expansion of library services in the community to meet current and future needs. Specifically, Goal PS-1: Library services that meet community needs.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ State of California Government Code – Section 53080 (School Facilities Fee)
☒ Planning & Zoning Code, Title 22 - Chapter 22.72 (Library Facilities Mitigation Fee)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Site Dedication

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

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

on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

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

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create **staffing or response time** problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? *Hacienda Heights is served by the Industry Sheriff's Station located at 150 North Hudson Avenue in the City of Industry and Fire Station 91 located at 2691 S. Turnbull Canyon Road in Hacienda Heights. Population increases could create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving Hacienda Heights; however, the Plan contains goals and policies to ensure that public safety resources adjust commensurate with population changes. For example, Policy PH 5.1: Ensure that law enforcement and fire protection assets adjust commensurate with significant changes in population, density, traffic and calls for emergency services.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? *There are not any special law enforcement problems associated with the community. According to Sheriff, law enforcement needs are at a stable level and have not increased in 30 years. The Fire Department has not indicated any special fire problems associated with the community; however, it notes that portions of the community are located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Revenue & Finance Code, Title 4 – Chapter 4.92 (Fire Protection Facilities Fee)

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an **inadequate public water supply** to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *The vast majority (approximately 90%) of Hacienda Heights is adequately served by San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District through the San Gabriel Valley Water Company or Suburban Water Systems. The eastern portion of Hacienda Heights is in the Rowland Water District, where the water supply is currently imported from Metropolitan Water District. Some residences in Hacienda Heights are served by onsite wastewater treatment systems. The Urban Water Management Plans of Hacienda Heights' water purveyors indicate sufficient capacity now and in the future* (See: San Gabriel Valley Water Company *Urban Water Management Plan for Operations Within the Boundaries of Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (2005) and* Rowland Water District *Water Sources (2008)*). *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects that propose the use of individual water wells. Ensuring sufficient capacity (e.g., quantity) to meet the needs of all residents in the future will necessitate evaluation on a project by project basis. In general, the plan supports water conservation in an effort to help prevent water capacity challenges in the future. Specifically, Goal C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources; Policy C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency, the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, and low-impact development; Policy C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices; and, Policy C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an **inadequate water supply and/or pressure** to meet fire fighting needs? *The Fire Department has not indicated that inadequate water supply and/or pressure hinders its ability to fight fire.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing **utility services**, such as electricity, gas, or propane? *The Community Plan is a policy document that does not grant entitlements for any project. The proposed Community Plan also contains goals and policies to ensure that infrastructure and utilities are adequate to support future development projects. Specifically, Goal PS-6: Growth in line with infrastructure capacity; Policy PS 6.1: Ensure adequate water supply and quality; Policy PS 6.2: Ensure adequate sewage or septic systems; and, Policy PS 6.3: Ensure adequate energy from both traditional and alternative sources whenever available while promoting more sustainable alternatives.*

d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known **service problem areas** (e.g., solid waste)? *There are no known service problem areas. The Community Plan is a policy document that does not grant entitlements for any project. Hacienda Heights is currently served by the Puente Hills Landfill. The landfill is scheduled for closure in 2013, and plans for a new waste-by-rail system are already underway to ensure adequate solid waste services for the community. The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts is already planning to absorb the capacity that will be lost when the site closes and to accommodate future solid waste disposal needs.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in substantial **adverse physical impacts** associated with the provision of new or physically altered **governmental facilities**, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *The proposed Community Plan contains goals and policies that would improve government services, such as increased library services, which would be established in already developed areas and would enhance, not adversely impact, public services. The Plan also supports—but does not approve—the establishment of a new community center facility. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, construction of these facilities would be evaluated on a project level to determine the significance of potential environmental impacts.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Plumbing Code, Title 28 – Chapters 3, 6 & 12
☒ Utilities Code, Title 20 – Divisions 1, 4 & 4a (Water, Solid Waste, Garbage Disposal Districts)

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Water Purveyor Will-serve Letter

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

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

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of **energy resources**? *The proposed Community Plan contains goals and policies to support efficient use of energy resources. Specifically, Goal C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources; Policy C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency, the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, and low-impact development; Policy C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices; Policy C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home; Policy C 4.4: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices; and, Policy C 4.5: Promote and encourage the use of sustainable, environmentally-friendly paving materials on exercise walking paths.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the **patterns, scale, or character** of the general area or community? *The Community Plan contains a proposed land use map that changes allowable uses and densities within the community. Changes in use are minor and largely reflect existing uses. Changes in density are limited to increases or decreases of up to 3 allowable units per acre in most areas of the community. Neighborhood patterns, scale and character were considered while determining proposed densities in order to maintain the existing community character while accommodating potential growth in strategic areas within the community.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of **agricultural land**? *The Community Plan includes proposed zone changes to achieve consistency between land use and zoning and to reflect existing uses. Approximately 1,935 acres of land previously zoned as A-1 or A-2 (Light and Heavy Agricultural) are proposed to be changed to other zones. The majority of this (approximately 1,091 acres) is a proposed change from Agricultural zones to the Open-Space zone on properties currently used for the Puente Hills Landfill to reflect the planned transition to open space in the fill areas after the landfill's closure. Additional zone changes are proposed to accurately reflect existing schools, residential areas, and utility easements where no known agricultural uses currently exist. While the amount of land zoned for agriculture is proposed to be reduced, the impact to agricultural uses is minimal since these lands are already developed with non-agricultural uses..*
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

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

☐ 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? *The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document that does not grant entitlements for any activities associated with hazardous materials. Furthermore, the Community Plan contains goals and policies to promote emergency preparedness and ensure protection from hazardous materials. Should any operation within the subject property include the construction, installation, modification, or removal of industrial waste treatment or disposal facilities, the DPW Environmental Programs Division must be contacted for required approvals and operating permits.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any **pressurized tanks** to be used or any **hazardous wastes** stored on-site? *The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document that does not grant entitlements for any activities associated with hazardous wastes or pressurized tanks. If any excavated soil is contaminated by or classified as hazardous waste by an appropriate agency, the soil must be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable Federal, State and local laws and regulations. Public Works' Environmental Programs Division shall be contacted for required approvals and operating permits for all future projects that include the construction, installation, modification or removal of underground storage tanks, industrial waste treatment or disposal facilities.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Are any **residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet** and potentially adversely affected? *The Plan contains goals and policies to provide for and prepare residents for hazardous materials protection. The proposed Community Plan does not propose locating any schools or hospitals within 500 feet of potentially hazardous materials. However, in the neighboring City of Industry, an existing use (Hills Brothers Chemical Company at 15017 E Clark) is less than 500 feet from existing residential uses, with a strip of commercial uses separating the industrial use from residential.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate **residual soil toxicity** of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?

The Puente Hills Landfill, located in the western portion of the community, may indicate residual soil toxicity. Puente Hills Landfill will perform final closure activities under the regulatory structure of CalRecycle, SCAQMD, the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board, and others. These activities will include the placement of final cover on the site, as well as installation and continuing maintenance of environmental control systems. However, according to the Sanitation Districts, toxic soil conditions that require remediation do not currently exist. The landfill is operated in an environmentally sound manner, and will continue to do so through closure and the post closure maintenance period. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has not indicated that there are issues with watershed contamination.

e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental **release of hazardous materials** into the environment? *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any activities associated with hazardous materials. The Plan has goals and policies to provide for a public emergency preparedness and hazardous materials protection program. Specifically, Goal PH-4: A community prepared for emergencies and protected from hazards; Policy PH 4.1: Promote emergency preparedness, such as but not limited to CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) training; and, Policy PH 4.2: Protect against hazardous materials from industrial uses and commercial uses.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit **hazardous emissions** or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within **one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school**? *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any activities associated with hazardous materials. The Plan has goals and policies to provide for a public emergency preparedness and hazardous materials protection program. Specifically, Specifically, Goal PH-4: A community prepared for emergencies and protected from hazards; and, Policy PH 4.2: Protect against hazardous materials from industrial uses and commercial uses.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that 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**? *Hacienda Heights does not include any hazardous materials sites as listed in the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStar Database.*
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**? *Hacienda Heights is not 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**? *The proposed Community Plan contains goals and policies that support adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plans and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with adopted plans. Specifically, Goal PH-4: A community prepared for emergencies and protected from hazards; and, Policy PH 4.1: Promote emergency preparedness, such as but not limited to CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) training*

j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Phase 1 Environmental Assessment

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

CONCLUSION

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

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

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be **inconsistent with the plan designation**(s) of the subject property? *The proposed Plan will supplant the existing Plan and all designations therein; therefore, the new plan cannot be inconsistent with the existing plan. The proposed Plan alters the land use designations of every parcel in the community to be consistent with the 2008 Draft General Plan and the 2010 Draft Land Use Legend.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be **inconsistent with the zoning designation** of the subject property? *In order to achieve consistency between land use and zoning as required by California law, the Community Plan Update includes a zoning consistency program. Approximately 3,348 parcels will be changed to other zones to achieve consistency with the Plan.*
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable **land use criteria**:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other? *The Plan explicitly defers hillside and SEA management to the respective Countywide ordinances.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project **physically divide** an established community? *The Community Plan Update does not include the approval of any development project.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local **population projections**? *The Plan is linked to a blended regional/ local population projection, which is the basis for estimating future housing needs, which the Plan aims to provide for.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project induce substantial **direct or indirect growth** in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? *The Plan aims to direct anticipated natural growth in the population into areas that are already developed and contain existing infrastructure, as depicted in the Proposed Land Use Map and corresponding policies. Potential development is restricted in relatively undeveloped areas with less existing infrastructure.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project **displace existing housing**, especially affordable housing? *The proposed Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any development project that would displace existing housing. Furthermore, the Plan calls for the development of additional affordable housing and contains goals and policies to ensure affordability for varying levels of income and need through the community.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project result in substantial **job/housing imbalance** or substantial increase in **Vehicle Miles Traveled** (VMT)? *The proposed Community Plan proposes increases to allowable residential development while maintaining existing commercial and industrial areas which could contribute to an increase in vehicle miles traveled. The Plan contains goals and policies to support alternative modes of transportation with the intent of decreasing Vehicle Miles Traveled. Specifically, Goal M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community; and, Goal M-4: Community circulation plans consistent with regional and state transportation goals.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project require new or expanded **recreational facilities** for future residents? *The Community Plan goals and policies support the maintenance and expansion of recreational facilities. Currently, the community contains approximately 298 acres of park (including the portion of Schabarum Regional Park that is in Hacienda Heights). According to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Hacienda Heights had 6.5 park acres per 1,000 persons in 2007. Per the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, this exceeds the County's 2008 standard of 4 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents in the unincorporated areas. By coordinating efforts between the Department of Regional Planning and the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Plan seeks to accommodate projected population increases, which could require new or expanded recreational facilities.*

f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project **displace** substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *The proposed land use and zone changes would allow the continuance of existing housing. The Community Plan Update proposes residential land use designations for all parcels currently developed with residential uses. The Community Plan does not grant entitlements for any projects that would displace substantial numbers of people.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the **quality of the environment**, substantially reduce the **habitat** of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a **plant** or **animal** community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California **history** or prehistory? *The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document and does not grant entitlements for any projects. Furthermore, the Community Plan contains goals and policies that protect the environment and wildlife habitats and corridors. Specifically, Goal LU-4: Protected hillsides and ridgelines; Goal LU-5: New development with minimal risk from natural hazards; Goal C-2: Wildlife that is respected and protected; and, Goal C-3: Protected unique cultural, archeological, and historic resources.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project have possible **environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable**? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. *The proposed Community Plan entails changes to land use and zoning that restrict development in certain areas of the community while increasing allowable development in other parts of the community. Overall, there is minimal change proposed in the types of uses allowed in the community, although there is an overall increase in allowable residential units. However, the changes are anticipated to be implemented very slowly over 30 years or so. Further, the Plan contains goals and policies to limit environmental impacts, for example, by promoting conservation. Specifically, Goal C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources; Policy C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices; Policy C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home; and, Policy C 4.5: Promote and encourage the use of sustainable, environmentally-friendly paving materials on walking paths.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial **adverse effects on human beings**, either directly or indirectly? *The proposed Community Plan is a land use policy document and does not grant entitlements for any projects and therefore would not result in a change in potential adverse effects on human beings in comparison to the impact of not updating the Community Plan. Furthermore, the Community Plan includes goals, policies, and a land use map that restrict development in areas that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.*

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

Mitigations Form

Hazards 2- Flood

1. Applicants for all development and redevelopment projects which fall into one of the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans project types, characteristics, or activities, must obtain Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plans approval by the appropriate agency during project review. [See Initial Study response to Hazards 2.d and 2.e]

Hazards 5 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions

2. Incorporate GHG reduction features into the project design. For example, increase a boiler's energy efficient and/or use materials with lower global warming potential then conventional materials. [See Initial Study response to Hazard 5.b]

3. Implement onsite measures that provide direct GHG emission reductions onsite. For example, replace onsite combustion equipment (boilers, heaters, steam generators, etc.) with more efficient combustion equipment and/or install solar panels on the roof, eliminate or minimize fugitive emissions. [See Initial Study response to Hazard 5.b]

4. Implement neighborhood mitigation measure projects. For example, install solar power, increase energy efficiency through replacing low efficiency water heaters with high efficiency water heaters, increase building insulations, use fluorescent bulbs, and/or replace old inefficient refrigerators with efficient refrigerators using low global warming potential refrigerators. [See Initial Study response to Hazard 5.b]

5. Develop, adopt and implement a Climate Action Plan that incorporates and is consistent with the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals of the state, county and South Coast Air Quality Management District by 2015. An acceptable CAP shall include an emissions inventory, emissions targets, enforceable greenhouse gas control measures, monitoring and reporting and mechanisms to allow for revisions of the CAP and Community Plan, if necessary, to stay on target. [See Initial Study response to Hazard 5.b]

Resources 2- Air Quality

6. Require projects that exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses) to mitigate potential impacts to air quality to less than significant. Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects. [See Initial Study response to Air Quality 2.a]

7. When siting new sensitive land uses, such as residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds or medical facilities, project applicants shall comply with the Advisory Recommendations contained in the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective by the California Environmental Protection Agency California Air Resources Board, and consult the Air Resources Board's statewide risk maps, and applicants shall review their findings with the appropriate agency during project review. For projects that cannot feasibly meet the recommended minimum separation distance requirements, require that the project be designed to minimize potentially significant air quality impacts. For example, through enhanced building ventilation, filtering systems, landscaping, regular watering for dust, or chemical treatments for dust. [See Initial Study response to Air Quality 2.b]

8. Require projects that will contribute to a significant impact on emissions through traffic congestion to mitigate potential impacts to air quality to less than significant. Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects. [See Initial Study response to Air Quality 2.c]

9. Require that projects that will conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans be redesigned to be consistent with and supportive of such plans. [See Initial Study response to Air Quality 2.e]

10. Require projects that will contribute to a significant impact on air quality comply with all applicable Air Quality Management District Rules, including Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), Rule 404 (Particulate Matter-Concentration), and Rule 405 (Solid Particulate Matter, Weight) and utilize all best available control measures to reduce criteria pollutant emissions. Measures to be enforced include, but are not limited to: maintain construction equipment to reduce operational emissions; utilize electric or clean fuel-powered equipment; reduce vehicle idling and traffic congestion by providing adequate ingress and egress, dedicated turn lanes, and scheduling trips during off-peak hours; synchronize traffic signals; pave roads and road shoulders; and restrict truck traffic on sensitive routes.

Services 1- Traffic/Access

11. Require projects of 25 units or more that are found during the environmental review process to have a potentially significant impact on traffic congestion to mitigate such impacts to less than significant. Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects. [See Initial Study response to Traffic/Access 1.a]

12. Applicants for all development projects that generate over 500 trips per day shall prepare a traffic impact analysis report, according to the specifications provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, to ensure that traffic generated by that project, either alone or when combined with existing traffic, will not exceed certain capacity thresholds of an intersection or roadway, contribute to an unacceptable level of service, or exacerbate an existing congested condition. The Trip Generation Analysis, Level of Service Analysis and Significant Impact Threshold Analysis shall use the methodology provided in the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines. If impacts will be significant, the project applicant shall identify feasible mitigation measures which would mitigate the project's significant impacts to a level of insignificance during project review. Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects. [See Initial Study response to Traffic/Access 1.e]

13. Applicants for all development projects that are required to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be subject to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Land Use Analysis Program, according to the specifications provided in the Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County by Metro, and shall incorporate into the project EIR a CMP Transportation Impact Analysis, as defined in the CMP Land Use Analysis Program. [See Initial Study response to Traffic/Access 1.e]

Services 2- Sewage Disposal

14. Applicants for all development projects shall submit copies of proposed project build-out schedules to the Facilities Planning Department of the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts to ensure the projects are considered in planning future sewerage system relief and replacement projects. The applicant shall verify availability of capacity within the Districts' sewerage system as proposed projects develop. [See Initial Study response to Sewage Disposal 2.a and 2.b]

Services 4- Fire/Sheriff

15. Applicants for all new residential or mixed-use development projects over 20 units shall include a study and projection of law enforcement deployment for the area, taking into account the amount of growth and traffic flow through the area, and verify the Sheriff Department's capacity to provide law enforcement services. [See Initial Study response to Fire/Sheriff 4.a]

16. Applicants for all development projects must comply with all applicable code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants. [See Initial Study response to Fire/Sheriff 4.a]

17. Applicants for all development within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone must comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire hydrants, fire flows, brush clearance and fuel modification plans. [See Initial Study response to Fire/Sheriff 4.b]

Sources

CEQA Guidelines Sections Proposed to be Added or Amended
http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/PA_CEQA_Guidelines.pdf

2007 Air Quality Management Plan
http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/07aqmp/07AQMP.html

Emissions Factors & AP 42, Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors
http://www.epa.gov/ttnchie1/ap42/

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form
http://www.califaep.org/resources/Documents/CEQA_Appendix%20G_2010.pdf

Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning, May 6, 2005
http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/aqguide/aqguide.html

Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority Website
http://www.habitatauthority.org/

2010 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines
http://www.califaep.org/resources/Documents/FINAL%20CEQA%20Handbook%20HighQuality.pdf

Office of Historic Preservation Website
http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1056

E-Net
http://10.2.8.229:8080/imf51/sites/e/jsp/launch.jsp

Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Land Use Report
http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/general/E_HHCPU_LandUseReport_and_Maps_040110.pdf

Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Background Report
http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/general/F_HHCPU_BackgroundReport_and_Maps_040110.pdf

County of Los Angeles Draft General Plan
http://planning.lacounty.gov/generalplan

County of Los Angeles Green Building Ordinances
http://planning.lacounty.gov/view/green_building_program

California Attorney General's Office, *Sustainability and General Plans: Examples of Policies to Address Climate Change*
http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GP_policies.pdf

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*
http://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/ilgbackup.org/files/resources/CAPCOA_Model_Policies_for_Greenhouse_Gases_in_General_Plans_-_June_2009.pdf

California Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*
http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm

California Air Resources Board, *Climate Change Scoping Plan*
http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/adopted_scoping_plan.pdf

South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Air Quality Handbook.* 1993.

Appendix 1
Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update
Greenhouse Gas and Air Quality Analysis

Overview

The proposed Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update (the Plan) was evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively to determine potential impacts to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Specifically, to determine whether potential significant impacts exist the following were evaluated:

- Does the proposed plan generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; and,
- Will the proposed plan conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The Plan was also evaluated to determine potential impacts for other criteria pollutants in the air quality analysis.

Los Angeles County currently does not have any threshold to determine the significance of potential greenhouse gas emissions resulting from land use plan projects, nor does it have an adopted plan for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases. In the absence of local thresholds or plans, State and regional resources were referenced.

California Assembly Bill 32 establishes a state-wide target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the lead agency for implementing AB 32. In this role, CARB has set a threshold of 100,000 MT of CO_2 equivalents per year for transportation sources. Since the Community Plan is an area-wide plan similar to most transportation projects, and since most of the Plan's associated emissions impacts are from transportation sources, the CARB metric is the most relevant threshold available to evaluate the impacts of the Plan against.

In the absence of an adopted plan for reducing greenhouse gases specific to Los Angeles County, plans and policies from the Southern California Association of Governments, California Attorney General, and California Air Pollution Control Officers Association were referenced as applicable greenhouse gas reduction plans. The methodology for evaluating the Plan for each type of potential impact is explained below.

Project Emissions Calculation Methodology

The Community Plan was evaluated to determine potential long-term emissions associated with implementation of the Plan. Short-term (construction-related) emissions were not calculated because construction project-specific details—demolition requirements, construction phases, start dates, end dates, project size, and work days/weeks, etc.—are not known; and, no specific projects are proposed as part of the Plan. Construction related greenhouse gas emissions are evaluated on a case-by-case basis for future projects that are subject to CEQA review.

Long-term GHG emissions associated with the Plan were calculated using the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS, v. 9.2.4) released by the California Air Resources Board. Inputs for the model were derived from Los Angeles County Assessor data (2010) for existing uses and Los Angeles County Regional Planning data for

adopted and proposed land use designations. Emissions were calculated using URBEMIS default variables for all land use types, except Habitat Conservation areas, which are not included in the model. For these areas the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook 8th Edition trip estimate for State Parks was identified as the most similar land use type. Finally, correction was made to account for pass-by trips.

Three development scenarios were calculated. First, current existing land uses were evaluated to generate a baseline. Second, the adopted (1978) Community Plan was calculated to evaluate the maximum build-out. Third, the proposed Plan was calculated to evaluate the maximum build-out. For all residential uses, build-out was calculated based on the maximum allowable units per acre per land use category. While historic growth trends suggest that development will not occur at these levels, the maximums were used to determine the "worst case scenario." For potential future industrial, commercial, and public uses, an average project size was used based on existing development patterns, which provides the best approximation for the most likely future development. Open space calculations used total acreage. Most industrial, commercial, and public designated areas are already developed and any future redevelopment is unlikely to differ significantly from established developments. Existing drainage facilities, utility easements, and streets are constant and were excluded from all three scenarios. Attachment A includes a summary table of inputs for each of the three scenarios, including dwelling units, square footage, and acreage for existing and maximum build-out scenarios.

URBEMIS calculates annual average emissions in tons per year. CO_2 emissions were converted into CO_2 Equivalent Metric tons per year using the US Environmental Protection Agency's Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator. Non- CO_2 GHG emissions, such as CH_4, N_20, and fluorinated gases represent a very small percentage of total greenhouse gas emissions and are not included in the model.

Table 1 depicts the total emissions expressed in CO_2 equivalence metric tons per year for each of the three scenarios. The detailed URBEMIS outputs for all three scenarios are contained in Attachment B.

Table 1. URBEMIS Outputs

Total Emissions (CO_2e MT/Year)	**Existing**	**Adopted Community Plan**	**Proposed Community Plan**
Source			
Vehicular Emissions	354,820	376,009	409,059~~391,544~~
Natural Gas Combustion	63,384	69,399	75,643~~72,513~~
Hearth	2,008	2,303	2,597~~2,426~~
Landscaping	175	199	210~~193~~
Total Emissions	**420,387**	**447,910**	**~~466,676~~487,509**
Net Increase Over Baseline		***27,523***	***67,122~~46,289~~***
Net Increase over Adopted Plan			***39,599~~18,766~~***

Note: Urbemis v9.2.4 model does not include other GHG emissions (such as CH_4, N_20, and Fluorinated Gases). These non- CO_2 represent a very small percentage of the total GHG emissions.
Source for CO_2 MT/Year Conversion: US EPA GHG Equivalencies Calculator http://www.epa.gov/cleanenergy/energy-resources/calculator.html, accessed 9.16.10.

As can be seen in Table 1, the GHG emissions are projected to be 420,387 MT (metric tons) for existing development, 447,910 MT for the maximum build-out of the adopted Community Plan, and ~~466,676~~487,509 MT for the maximum build-out of the proposed Community Plan. The proposed Plan results in net emission increases of ~~46,289~~67,122 MT when compared to the baseline and ~~18,766~~39,599 MT when compared to the

adopted plan. 84% of the Plan's GHG emissions are projected to be from motor vehicles. Natural gas consumption accounts for 15%, while hearth and landscaping emissions are negligible.

The net emissions increases for the proposed Plan are below the 100,000 MT threshold set by CARB for regional transportation projects, which is the most relevant available threshold. Therefore the GHG impacts of the proposed Plan are less than significant. However, recognizing the potential for an increase in emissions, mitigation measures have been included to proactively plan for greenhouse gas reduction. Additionally, the model does not quantify potential reductions to greenhouse gas emissions that are likely to result from the Plan or other ongoing Los Angeles County programs and requirements. These include: the Community Plan's goals, policies, and implementation measures related to greenhouse gas reduction; the Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinances (2008); and, the forthcoming Los Angeles County Climate Action Plan. These plans and programs, along with the mitigation measures and likely future development that is less than the maximum evaluated in the model will further contribute to less than significant GHG emissions.

Project Consistency Evaluation with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

The Plan seeks to direct future growth to maximize existing infrastructure and transit facilities and preserve sparsely developed, hazardous areas. Additionally, the Plan contains numerous goals and policies to ensure that future development is efficient and reduces potential greenhouse gas emissions.

As shown in Table 2, the Plan is consistent with regional and state plans adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. The Plan is evaluated for consistency with the Southern California Association of Governments' *Compass Blueprint Principles*, the California Attorney General's *Sustainability and General Plans: Examples of Policies to Address Climate Change* (2010), and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans* (2009).

Table 2. Summary of the Plan's Consistency with Adopted Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans and Policies

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
SCAG Compass Blueprint Principles	
Mobility: • Encourage transportation investments and land use decisions that are mutually supportive • Locate new housing near existing jobs and new jobs near existing housing • Encourage transit-oriented development • Promote a variety of travel choices	LU-1: Well designed, walkable residential neighborhoods that provide various housing types and densities. LU 1.2: Concentrate new higher density residential development along existing commercial corridors, near transit routes and close to other community serving facilities. M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. M 1.2: Promote the integration of multi-use regional trails, walkways, bicycle paths, transit stops, parks and local destinations.
Livability: • Promote in-fill development and redevelopment • Promote development with a mix of uses • Promote "people-scaled," walkable communities • Support the preservation of stable neighborhoods	LU 1.3: Encourage mixed-use in commercial areas. LU 2.1: Allow vertical expansion of commercial and mixed-use development on existing commercial sites.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Prosperity: • Provide a variety of housing types • Support educational opportunities • Ensure environmental justice • Support local and state fiscal policies that encourage balanced growth • Encourage civic engagement	LU 1.4: Distribute low- and moderate-income units equitably throughout the community and encourage provision of such units in all new developments. H-1: A diverse housing supply that accommodates all income levels, ages and needs.
Sustainability: • Develop strategies to accommodate growth that uses resources efficiently and minimizes pollution and GHG emissions • Preserve rural, agricultural, recreational and environmentally sensitive areas • Focus development in urban centers and existing cities • Use "green" development techniques	LU 1.2 Well designed, walkable residential neighborhoods that provide various housing types and densities. LU-5: New development with minimal risk from natural hazards. LU 5.1: Locate new uses with hazardous emissions away from existing sensitive receptors, including but not limited to housing and schools. LU 5.2: Restrict the intensity of development in areas with hazards, including landslide, high fire hazard, seismic, flood, and liquefaction areas. C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources. C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency through the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, low impact development and sustainable construction materials. C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices. C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home. C 4.4: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices. C 4.5: Require the use of sustainable, environmentally-friendly paving materials on new exercise walking paths.
California Attorney General's Examples of Policies to Address Climate Change (2010)	
Smart growth, jobs/housing balance, transit-oriented development, and infill development through land use designations, incentives and fees, zoning and public-private partnerships	LU-1: Well designed, walkable residential neighborhoods that provide various housing types and densities. LU 1.2: Concentrate new higher density residential development along existing commercial corridors, near transit routes and close to other community serving facilities. M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Land Use Map: increases density in existing developed areas with access to transit and commercial areas, decreases density in sparsely developed areas with hazards and no transit. Zoning Map: Zone changes proposed to implement land use changes.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Create transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connections through planning, funding, development requirements, incentives and regional cooperation; create disincentives for auto use	M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community. M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. M 1.2: Promote the integration of multi-use regional trails, walkways, bicycle paths, transit stops, parks and local destinations. M 1.4: Create a community shuttle service and designate shuttle routes to link residential neighborhoods to commercial areas and community facilities. M 1.5: Promote Dial-a-Ride or other senior paratransit service. M-2: Safe and well-maintained bike routes and facilities. M 2.1: Upgrade existing Class III bike lane designations to Class II and make all new bike lanes Class II or better, where infrastructure permits. M 2.3: Add and maintain new bike racks and lockers at major bus stops in commercial areas, and at all community facilities. M-3: Safe and well-maintained pedestrian pathways.
Energy- and water-efficient buildings and landscaping through ordinances, development fees, incentives, project timing prioritization, and other implementing tools	C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources. C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency through the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, low-impact development and sustainable construction materials. C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices. C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home. C 4.4: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices. C 4.5: Require the use of sustainable, environmentally-friendly paving materials on new exercise walking paths. PS 6.3: Ensure adequate energy from both traditional and alternative sources whenever available while promoting more sustainable alternatives. PS 6.3: Promote water conservation, including the use of reclaimed water materials and equipment in future development Green Building Ordinances: In 2008 Los Angeles County Adopted Green Building, Drought-Tolerant Landscaping and Low-Impact Development ordinances that also require energy and water-efficient buildings and landscaping.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Green procurement and alternative fuel vehicle use through municipal mandates and voluntary bid incentives	The community plan is a land use policy document that does not regulate the County's procurement policies. However, the LA County CEO is developing a climate-friendly purchasing program, green contracting, and green fleet program as part of the countywide Climate Change Program.
Alternative fuel facilities and infrastructure through land use designations, zoning, and public-private partnerships	Added C 5.4: Support the installation of alternative fuel and renewable energy facilities, where appropriate.
Renewable energy generation (utility and residential) through feasibility evaluations, land use designations, zoning, permit streamlining, incentives and financing	Added C 5.4: Support the installation of alternative fuel and renewable energy facilities, where appropriate.
Waste diversion, recycling, water efficiency, energy efficiency and energy recovery in cooperation with public services districts and private entities	A 2.3: Provide garbage and recycling receptacles in public places throughout the community. C. 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency through the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, low-impact development and sustainable construction materials. C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home.
Urban and rural forestry through tree planting requirements and programs; preservation of agricultural land and resources that sequester carbon; heat island reduction programs	LU 3.4: Preserve open space for recreation or land preservation. A 1.3: Enhance local walkways with landscaping, pavement treatments, and other beautification measures. A 4.2: Promote the installation of shade trees, non-invasive landscaping or other natural elements, including, but not limited to decorative rock, along public rights-of-way and medians. A 5.4: Require the planting of shade trees or the installation of other natural elements as part of the design of commercial parking lots with over 20 spaces.
Community outreach and education to foster community involvement, input, and support for GHG reduction planning and implementation.	Added Policy C 5.3: Provide information and education to the public about energy conservation and local strategies to address climate change.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Regional cooperation to find cross-regional efficiencies in GHG reduction investments and to plan for regional transit, energy generation, and waste recovery facilities	M-4: Community circulation that supports regional and state transportation goals. M 4.1: Consider contributing to improvements on state highway systems, including SR 60 and its on/off ramps, as well as bus and rail transit facilities, for example, through traffic impact fees. M 4.2: Include vehicle demand reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, park and ride lots, etc. as mitigation alternatives for potentially environmentally significant projects. Land Use Map: SCAG's Compass Blueprint 2% growth strategy was one of the criteria used to develop the proposed land use map, which increases density in the 2% areas (areas with access to transit and existing infrastructure and services).
California Air Pollution Control Officers Association model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans (2009)	
Greenhouse Gas Reduction: Reduce GHG emissions from all activities within the City/County boundaries to support the State's efforts under AB-32 and to mitigate the impact of climate change on the City/County, State, and world. • Emission inventories, climate action plans, Blueprint Planning	C 4.3: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices. Land Use Map: SCAG's Compass Blueprint 2% growth strategy was one of the criteria used to develop the proposed land use map, which increases density in the 2% areas (areas with access to transit and existing infrastructure and services). Added C 5.1: Support the County's efforts to create an adopted Climate Action Plan by 2015 that meets state requirements and includes emission inventories, enforceable reduction measures, regular progress reviews, procedures for reporting on and revising the plan, and provides for resources to implement the plan.
Land Use and Urban Design: Promote land use strategies that decrease reliance on automobile use, increase the use of alternative modes of transportation, maximize efficiency of urban services provision and reduce emissions of GHGs. • Urban growth boundary, density in urban core, infill, mixed-use, land use-transportation linkages, walking, biking, heat island effect.	LU 1.2: Concentrate new higher density residential development along existing commercial corridors, near transit routes and close to other community serving facilities. LU 1.3: Encourage mixed-use in commercial areas. LU 2.1: Allow vertical expansion of commercial and mixed-use development on existing commercial sites. M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. M 1.2:

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Transportation: Reduce GHG emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled and by increasing or encouraging the use of alternative fuels and transportation technologies. • Public transit, system interconnectivity, transit infrastructure, fees, traffic management, trip reduction, shuttles, bicycles, parking, low- and zero-emission vehicles.	M-1: A variety of options for mobility into and out of the community. M 1.1: Promote "complete streets" that safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. M 1.2: Promote the integration of multi-use regional trails, walkways, bicycle paths, transit stops, parks and local destinations. M 1.4: Create a community shuttle service and designate shuttle routes to link residential neighborhoods to commercial areas and community facilities. M 1.5: Promote Dial-a-Ride or other senior paratransit service. M-2: Safe and well-maintained bike routes and facilities. M 2.1: Upgrade existing Class III bike lane designations to Class II and make all new bike lanes Class II or better, where infrastructure permits. M 2.3: Add and maintain new bike racks and lockers at major bus stops in commercial areas, and at all community facilities. M-3: Safe and well-maintained pedestrian pathways.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Energy Efficiency: Reduce emissions from the generation of electricity by reducing electricity use through increased efficiency. • Green building ordinances, energy efficiency policies, outdoor lighting, affordable efficient housing, restrict residential wood burning, heat island, community energy program.	C-4: A community that conserves its natural resources. C 4.1: Encourage energy efficiency through the use of alternative energy sources, drought-tolerant landscaping, low-impact development and sustainable construction materials. C 4.2: Encourage sustainable, environmentally-friendly construction and business operating practices. C 4.3: Encourage community members to reduce waste and conserve energy and water at home. C 4.4: Encourage efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote air resource management best practices. C 4.5: Require the use of sustainable, environmentally-friendly paving materials on new exercise walking paths. PS 6.3: Ensure adequate energy from both traditional and alternative sources whenever available while promoting more sustainable alternatives. A 4.2: Promote the installation of shade trees, non-invasive landscaping or other natural elements, including, but not limited to decorative rock, along public rights-of-way and medians. A 5.4: Require the planting of shade trees or the installation of other natural elements as part of the design of commercial parking lots with over 20 spaces. Green Building Ordinances: In 2008 Los Angeles County Adopted Green Building, Drought-Tolerant Landscaping and Low-Impact Development ordinances that also require energy and water-efficient buildings and landscaping.
Alternative Energy: The City/County will seek to reduce emissions associated with electrical generation by promoting and supporting the generation and use of alternative energy. • facilitate citing, promote and require renewable energy, support and require solar energy, economic incentives for renewable energy, support purchase of alternative energy.	PS 6.3: Ensure adequate energy from both traditional and alternative sources whenever available while promoting more sustainable alternatives.

Model Policies	Hacienda Heights Community Plan Update Consistency
Municipal Operations: Reduce GHG emissions from municipal facilities and operations, and by purchasing goods and services that embody or create fewer GHG emissions. • Energy efficiency of facilities, efficiency requirements for new facilities, efficient vehicles, reduce employee trips, enhanced renewable energy generation, manage vegetation to reduce GHG, promote reduction in GHG emissions by suppliers of goods and services.	The community plan is a land use policy document that does not regulate the County's municipal operations. However, LA County is developing an energy/water efficiency and conservation program for internal operations as part of the countywide Climate Change Program. The County's Capital Projects program also requires all new County facilities to meet LEED Silver requirements and other sustainable design policies for new construction. Best practices are being developed for existing County facilities.

As shown above, the Plan contains numerous goals and policies that support more efficient future development that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In cases where the Plan could have been stronger, goals, policies, and mitigation measures were revised or added to ensure the Plan's consistency with applicable regional and state plans and policies that seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Based on the above analyses, the Plan has less than significant impacts on greenhouse gas emissions with project mitigation.

Air Quality Impacts

Air quality impacts are associated with short and long term impacts. Short term impacts are generally the result of construction or grading related operations while long term impacts are a result of ongoing conditions and operations. As discussed above, short-term construction related air quality impacts are not quantified at this time and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for future projects that are subject to CEQA review.

Long-term air quality impacts were calculated using the URBEMIS 2007 program (version 9.2.4). Impacts are calculated for carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulate matter smaller than 10 and smaller than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM10 and PM2.5), and sulfur oxides (SOx). The program was set to calculate emissions for the Community Plan area using default values, except for habitat preservation areas as explained above. Air Quality significance thresholds are based on the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) *Air Quality Handbook* (1993).

As with greenhouse gas emissions, three scenarios were evaluated: existing conditions (represents the baseline), maximum build-out of adopted Community Plan, and maximum build-out of proposed Community Plan. Although the maximum build-out is unlikely based on historic growth trends, it is used in the analysis to determine a "worst case scenario" in regards to air quality impacts. The majority of emissions generated will be from vehicles, followed by hearth emissions from wood burning stoves and fireplaces. Other emissions will be generated from the combustion of natural gas associated with water and space heating, landscaping activities, and architectural coatings. The results of the URBEMIS model are depicted in the following table. The complete input data used, including number of units, square feet of development, and acres of specific land use types as well as the complete URBEMIS outputs is attached.

Total Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)						
Source	**CO**	**VOC**	**NOx**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**	**SOx**
Existing Conditions						
Vehicular Emissions	22,359.51	2,321.61	3,075.03	3,685.17	719.11	18.85
Natural Gas Combustion	147.12	23.16	302.55	0.57	0.57	-
Hearth	7,424.48	2,676.82	235.91	1,151.45	1,108.49	
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	876.10	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings		134.75				
Total Emissions	**29,931.11**	**6,032.44**	**3,613.49**	**4,837.19**	**1,828.17**	**18.85**
Adopted Community Plan						
Vehicular Emissions	7,583.44	884.28	850.40	3,887.21	753.93	19.78
Natural Gas Combustion	153.17	25.36	330.19	0.63	0.62	-
Hearth	8,512.75	3,069.07	271.77	1,320.24	1,270.99	23.94
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	1,004.45	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	-	85.04	-	-	-	-
Total Emissions	**16,249.36**	**5,068.20**	**1,452.36**	**5,208.08**	**2,025.54**	**43.72**
Proposed Community Plan Update						
Vehicular Emissions	7,895.40	924.87	885.92	4,048.25	785.14	20.60
Natural Gas Combustion	163.46	26.50	345.47	0.66	0.65	-
Hearth	8,974.21	3,235.78	282.87	1,391.76	1,339.83	25.22
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	1,059.09	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	-	142.41	-	-	-	-
Total Emissions	17,033.07	5,388.65	1,514.26	5,440.67	2,125.62	45.82
Significance Threshold	*550.00*	*55.00*	*55.00*	*150.00*	*55.00*	*150.00*
Net Change in Emissions over Adopted Plan						
	783.71	320.45	61.90	232.59	100.08	2.10
Net Change in Emissions over Existing Conditions						
	(12,898.04)	(643.79)	(2,099.23)	603.48	297.45	26.97

Total Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)						
Source	**CO**	**VOC**	**NOx**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**	**SOx**
Existing Conditions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicular Emissions	22,359.51	2,321.61	3,075.03	3,685.17	719.11	18.85
Natural Gas Combustion	147.12	23.16	302.55	0.57	0.57	-
Hearth	7,424.48	2,676.82	235.91	1,151.45	1,108.49	
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	876.10	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	-	134.75	-	-	-	-

Total Emissions	**29,931.11**	**6,032.44**	**3,613.49**	**4,837.19**	**1,828.17**	**18.85**
Adopted Community Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vehicular Emissions	7,583.44	884.28	850.40	3,887.21	753.93	19.78
Natural Gas Combustion	153.17	25.36	330.19	0.63	0.62	-
Hearth	8,512.75	3,069.07	271.77	1,320.24	1,270.99	23.94
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	1,004.45	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	-	85.04	-	-	-	-
Total Emissions	**16,249.36**	**5,068.20**	**1,452.36**	**5,208.08**	**2,025.54**	**43.72**
Proposed Community Plan Update						
Vehicular Emissions	8,241.96	958.68	923.99	4,228.88	820.18	21.52
Natural Gas Combustion	166.88	27.75	361.20	0.69	0.68	-
Hearth	9,604.85	3,463.10	303.51	1,489.57	1,434.00	26.99
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-
Consumer Products	-	1,133.47	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	-	142.87	-	-	-	-
Total Emissions	18,013.69	5,725.87	1,588.70	5,719.14	2,254.86	48.51
Significance Threshold	*550.00*	*55.00*	*55.00*	*150.00*	*55.00*	*150.00*
Net Change in Emissions over Adopted Plan						
	1,764.33	657.67	136.34	511.06	229.32	4.79
Net Change in Emissions over Existing Conditions						
-	(11,917.42)	(306.57)	(2,024.79)	881.95	426.69	29.66

As shown above, the maximum build-out of the proposed Plan will increase emissions relative to the adopted Plan, but will significantly decrease emissions of CO, VOC, and NOx relative to existing conditions. This is due to the anticipated decrease in the future emission rates for vehicles as projected by the EMFAC2007 program. However, the net increases for PM10 and PM2.5for the proposed Plan as compared to existing conditions are above the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore the project may result in significant air quality impacts if maximum build-out is achieved. Although this is unlikely based on historical trends, mitigation measures are required to bring potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Attachments

A. URBEMIS inputs
B. URBEMIS output