

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: Project No. 2021-004689
Oak Tree Permit No. RPPL2021011244
Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2024003297

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

Contact Person and phone number: Marie Pavlovic, Phone: (213) 974-6433, Email: mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov.

Project sponsor's name and address: Sushil Anand, 1354 Michillinda Avenue, Arcadia, CA 91006.

Project location: 849 Madre Street, Pasadena, CA 91107
APN: 5377-019-019 USGS Quad: Mt. Wilson

Gross Acreage: 1.35 Acres

General Plan designation: H-2 Residential which allows density of 0-2 dwelling units per acre (du/ac)

Zoning: R-1-40000 (Single-Family Residence – 40,000 Net Square Feet Minimum Lot Area)

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The Project proposes to remove five oak trees, two heritage oak trees, and three dead trees. The protected zone of 18 oak trees are proposed to be encroached upon as a result of the development of a single-family residence and a lateral limb of Tree #11 is proposed to be cut and removed. The County's Planning and Zoning Code defines the protected zone as "the area within the dripline of an oak tree and extending therefrom to a point at least five feet outside of the dripline, or 15 feet from the trunk of the tree, whichever is greater." The single-family residence would be entitled by a ministerial permit and is not a part of the Project. Therefore, the scope of the environmental review is limited to the removal of two heritage oak trees that are part of a severely degraded oak woodland, 18 oak tree encroachments, and lateral limb removal of Tree #11. The oak woodland is comprised of 36 oak trees, 31 on-site trees (1, 3-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 22, 27, 29-31, 33, 34) and five off-site trees located on the adjacent property to the north. An Oak Tree Report dated June 17, 2024 was prepared by Registered Consulting Arborist Cris Falco and revised on September 27, 2024, which identifies and evaluates each tree and the quality of the oak woodland, provided as Appendix B. A channelized watercourse traverses the westerly portion of the property. The Project Site is vacant. Grading is not proposed in conjunction with the oak tree removals or encroachments.

LOCATION

Regionally, the Project site is located in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, approximately 1.3 miles south of State Route (SR-) 210 Freeway within the East Pasadena - East San Gabriel community, which is an unincorporated community approximately 13.5 miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles. The East

Pasadena - East San Gabriel community is bounded on the north by the City of Pasadena, on the south by the City of Temple City, on the west by the City of San Marino, and on the east by the City of Arcadia.

Locally, the Project site address is 849 Madre Street, situated on the west side of Madre Street.

CONCEPTUAL SITE MAP

The Conceptual Site Plan for the Project below identifies the two heritage oak trees that are proposed to be removed (#7 & 12) depicts the removal of two heritage oak trees and three dead oak trees (#2, 28, 32) and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees by a single-family residence and appurtenant uses and features. The oak tree protected zones are depicted on the Conceptual Site Plan provided in Appendix B.

REQUIRED ENTITLEMENTS

A discretionary Oak Tree Permit (“OTP”) is a required entitlement for the Project pursuant to Chapter 22.174 (Oak Tree Permits) of the Los Angeles County Code. The Project also requires preparation, processing and approval of this environmental compliance document to ensure consistency with CEQA.

Oak Tree Permit No. RPPL2021011244
Environmental Assessment No. 2024003297

According to the County-wide General Plan, the Project site is within H2 Residential land use category that permits a density of 0-2 dwelling units per net acre. To accommodate the development of the proposed single-family residence, the Project is requesting an OTP to facilitate the development.

The current zone for the site is R-1-40,000, which represents Zone Single-Family Residence wherein lots are required to contain a minimum lot area of 40,000 net square feet. A Site Plan Review (“SPR”) Application for the development of a single-family residence has been filed in conjunction with the OTP. The SPR is ministerial in nature and statutorily exempt from CEQA. This zone is intended for the development of low-density residential uses. The Chapman Woods neighborhood is a wooded urban area that is mostly built out. The future single-family residence will be required to comply with the Chapman Woods Community Standards District which imposes architectural requirements on developments.

An OTP is required to protect oak trees which are considered historic, cultural, and ecological resources by requiring two replacement trees for each oak tree that is removed or fails as a result of encroachment as a Project condition of approval. Ten (10) to one (1) mitigation plantings are required for each removal of a heritage oak tree and the Project has been conditioned accordingly.

These entitlements and development of the Project require preparation, processing and approval of this environmental compliance document to ensure consistency with CEQA.

SURROUNDING LAND USES

The Project site is surrounded by single-family residences on wooded properties. A channelized watercourse, that is closed to the public, traverses the westerly portion of the Project site.

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1. The County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning (“LA County Planning”) has a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

LA County Planning lists three tribes requesting notification of proposed developments within the area of the Project site: Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno Tongva, and Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California. On June 24, 2024, letters were sent to representatives of the three tribes inviting formal consultation, in compliance with AB 52.¹ This consultation process and potential Project impacts to Tribal Resources are discussed in Section 18 of this Initial Study.

Additional input regarding archaeological and tribal resources were also requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).

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

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
Department of Public Works	Building Permits

Reviewing Agencies: [See [CEQA Appendix B](#) to help determine which agencies should review your project]

<i>Responsible Agencies</i>	<i>Special Reviewing Agencies</i>	<i>Regional Significance</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
Regional Water Quality Control Board:	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area
<input type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> LAFCO	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Trustee Agencies

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- DPW
- Fire Department
(delete those that don't apply)
 - Forestry, Environmental Division
 - Planning Division
 - Land Development Unit
 - Health Hazmat
- Sanitation District

¹ Tribal consultation notification letters are available at the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning.

- Public Health/Environmental Health Division: Land Use Program (OWTS), Drinking Water Program (Private Wells), Toxics Epidemiology Program (Noise)
- Sheriff Department
- Parks and Recreation
- Subdivision Committee
-

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY

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

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

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Marie Pavlovic

01/30/25

Signature (Prepared by)

Date

Michele R. Bush

01/30/2025

Signature (Approved by)

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with relevant provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the CEQA Guidelines. Section 21063(c) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that the purposes of an Initial Study are to:

1. Provide the Lead Agency (i.e. the County of Los Angeles) with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration;
2. Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the Project to qualify for a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration;
3. Assist the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:
 - Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant;
 - Identifying the effects determined not to be significant;
 - Explaining the reasons why potentially significant effects would not be significant; and
 - Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects;
4. Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;
5. Provide documentation of the factual basis for the findings in a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;
6. Eliminate unnecessary EIRs; and
7. Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The information contained in this document is based, in part, on the following documents that include the Project site or provide information addressing the general project area or use:

- **Los Angeles County General Plan (General Plan).** The General Plan, adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on October 2015, provides the policy framework for how and where the unincorporated County will grow through the year 2035, while recognizing and celebrating the County's wide diversity of cultures, abundant natural resources, and status as an international economic center. Comprising approximately 4,083 square miles, Los Angeles County is home to 9.5 million people. The Los Angeles County General Plan accommodates new housing and jobs within the unincorporated areas in anticipation of population growth in the County and the region.
- **Final Environmental Impact Report Los Angeles County General Plan Update, County of Los Angeles, State Clearinghouse # 2011081042 (General Plan EIR).** The General Plan EIR, adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on March 2015, was prepared in support of the General Plan and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code Section 15000 et seq.).

- **Los Angeles County Code (County Code).** Chapter 21 of the County Code establishes procedures for subdividing properties within the County as required by the State of California Subdivision Map Act. Chapter 22 of the County Code the basic zoning regulations under which land is developed and utilized and by which the General Plan is systematically implemented. This includes allowable uses, building setback and height requirements, and other development standards. The basic intent of the Planning and Zoning Code is to promote and protect the public health, safety, convenience, and welfare of present and future citizens of the County.

1. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

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

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

The Los Angeles County’s General Plan defines a scenic vista as a scenic view from a given location, such as a highway, corridors (or routes), hillsides, ridgelines, a park, a hiking trail, river/waterway, or even from a particular neighborhood. The Project is located in an urban area that is flat, away from hillsides. The Eaton Wash is a channelized waterway that is not publicly accessible. The nearest County Trail (Santa Anita Wash Trail) is located approximately 4.5 miles to the east.

Within the County, there are three adopted state scenic highways: Angeles Crest Highway Route-2, from 2.7 miles north of I-210 to the San Bernardino County line; Mulholland Highway (two sections), from SR-1 to Kanan Dume Road, and from west of Cornell Road to east of Las Virgenes Road; and Malibu Canyon–Las Virgenes Highway, from SR-1 to Lost Hills Road. There are also eight highways identified with an “Eligible for State Scenic Highway” designation: SR-1 from the Orange County line to SR-19 (Lakewood Boulevard) in the city of Long Beach; SR-1 from SR-187 (Venice Boulevard) in the city of Los Angeles to the Ventura County line; SR-27 (Topanga Canyon Boulevard) from SR-1 to the city of Los Angeles city limit; SR-67 from the Orange County line to SR-60 in the city of Diamond Bar; SR-118 from the western city of Los Angeles boundary to the Ventura County line; SR-210/I-5 from SR-134 in the city of Pasadena, through the city of Santa Clarita to the Ventura County line; U.S. Route 101 from Topanga Canyon Boulevard to the Ventura County line. The Project site is not located within the vicinity of these designated or eligible scenic highways. Consequently, the removal of two heritage oak trees, limb removal of Tree #11, and 18 oak tree encroachments would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista considering 31 oak trees will remain in place and 20 oak trees are required to be planted on the property as replacement trees. The other three oak trees that will be removed are dead and do not need to be replaced.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail?

The Project is located in an urban area that is flat. The nearest LA County trail (Santa Anita Wash) is located approximately 4.5 miles to the west. The channelized watercourse that traverses the westerly portion of the Project site is closed to the public. At that distance from the Project site in combination with the other 31 oak trees that will remain in place 20 total. Consequently, the Project would not be visible from a regional trail and would not significantly block views of a regional trail.

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

As discussed above, the Project site is not within the vicinity of a designated scenic highway. The Project site contains 31 oak trees on-site, including two heritage oak trees. The Project site is relatively flat and is currently

vacant. The Project site is not listed as a Los Angeles County Landmark or within a designated Historic District, California Point of Historical Interest (SPHI), California Historical Landmark (SHL), and not listed on the California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or the California State Historic Properties Directory (HPD).

The vegetation on the site consists of a severely degraded oak woodland as well as scattered shrubs and trees. The Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance protects oak trees, recognizing oak trees as significant historical, aesthetic, and ecological resources. As such, the Project is conditioned to replace each removal of a heritage oak tree with 10 oak tree plantings.² Consequently, the Project impact on oak trees would be offset by the replacement plantings.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features and/or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point)

There are 31 oak trees on-site and five oak trees on the property to the north that form the sphere of influence and were surveyed for the Oak Tree Report. The Project proposes to remove a total of five oak trees including one heritage oak trees, remove a lateral limb from Tree #11, and encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project is conditioned to plant 10 replacement trees for each heritage oak tree that is removed and 2 replacement trees for each non-heritage oak tree that is removed and already dead. The future single-family residence, which is not a part of this Project, will be required to comply with the Chapman Wood Community Standards District, adopted to prevent the loss of established residential structures and architectural forms that define the CSD and to promote preservation and new construction of development that is compatible with the existing residential scales and architectural styles. The Project will retain 31 oak trees, coupled with the replacement plantings will ensure the Project will protect against the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

Single-family residences are built on all adjacent properties. The Project would be consistent with surrounding properties. The County's Oak Tree Ordinance allows oak tree encroachments and removals as long as mitigation trees are planted and the encroachments do not result in the loss of an oak tree. Consequently, the Project would have a less than significant impact on the visual character of the site or its surroundings.

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

The Project consists of the removal of two heritage oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees and does not require the installation or usage of lighting. Consequently, Project impacts relative to a new source of substantial shadow, light or glare would be less than significant.

² County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Revised Oak Tree Permit Number RPPL2021011244 re: 849 Madre St., Pasadena dated October 22, 2024.

References:

- Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, Figure 9.7, Scenic Highways Map, Figure 9.9, Historic Resource Sites Policy Map, and Figure 10.1, Regional Trail System,
https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/9.1_Chapter9_Figures.pdf
https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/10.8_Chapter10_Figures.pdf,
accessed November 22, 2023.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

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

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

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

According to the State of California Important Farmland Map 2018, the Project site and its surrounding areas are not designated as farmlands.³ The General Plan Figure 9.5 identifies potential agricultural resources within the County as occurring from the Angeles National Forest north. The Project site is south of the Angeles National Forest and not within any mapping of agricultural resources. Consequently, the Project would not convert Farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

The current zoning for the site is R-1-40,000 (Single-Family Residence). According to Section 22.18.020 of the County Zoning Code, the R-1 zone is intended for the development of single-family residences. The proposed primary use, the development of a single-family residence on the subject vacant lot is consistent with the purpose of the zone. The removal of two heritage oak trees, in addition to three dead oak trees, and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees to facilitate the development of a single-family residence, after securing an OTP that would require replacement plantings, is consistent with the County's Planning and Zoning Code.

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

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

The Project site is within an urbanized area. The General Plan identifies the Los Padres National Forest, Angeles National Forest and Santa Monica Mountains as natural forest areas within the County. Of these areas, the Angeles National Forest is the closest to the Project site at a distance of approximately 13 miles. There are no lands zoned for timberland production within the County. Consequently, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land.

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

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

³ [DLRP Important Farmland Finder \(ca.gov\)](https://dlrp.ca.gov/); accessed June 22, 2024.

As discussed in above, no forest lands occur in the vicinity of the Project site. Consequently, the Project would not result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land.

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

No Farmland or forest land occurs in the vicinity of the Project site. Consequently, the Project would not result in the conversion from Farmland to a non-agricultural use or from forest to a non-forest use.

References:

- Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, Figure 9.7, Scenic Highways Map, Figure 9.9, Historic Resource Sites Policy Map, and Figure 10.1, Regional Trail System, https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/9.1_Chapter9_Figures.pdf https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/10.8_Chapter10_Figures.pdf, accessed November 22, 2023.

3. AIR QUALITY

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

Would the project:

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

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

Applicable Air Quality Policies: The Project area is within Los Angeles County which is part of the the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the south and west and mountains to the north and east. Air quality in the South Coast Air Basin is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are the agencies responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. Every three (3) years the SCAQMD prepares a new AQMP, updating the previous plan and having a 20-year horizon. The latest version is the 2019 AQMP. The 2016 AQMP is a regional blueprint for achieving the federal air quality standards and healthful air. While air quality has dramatically improved over the years, the SCAB still exceeds federal public health standards for both ozone and particulate matter (PM) and experiences some of the worst air pollution in the nation.

Project Compliance with Air Quality Plan: CEQA requires that projects be consistent with the AQMP. A consistency determination plays an essential role in local agency project review by linking local planning and unique individual projects to the AQMP in the following ways: (1) it fulfills the CEQA goal of fully informing local agency decision-makers of the environmental costs of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are fully addressed, and (2) it provides the local agency with ongoing information assuring local decision-makers that they are making real contributions to clean air goals contained in the AQMP.

Only new or amended General Plan elements, specific plans, and regionally significant projects need to undergo a consistency review. This is because the AQMP strategy is based on projections from local General Plans. Projects that are consistent with the local General Plan are, therefore, considered consistent with the air quality management plan. The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees in accordance with the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance. The Project’s condition of approvals requires 10 oak tree plantings for each heritage oak tree that is removed, as well as two plantings for each tree (or 10:1 for heritage trees) that dies as a result of encroachment, consistent with the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

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

A violation of an air quality standard is not expected to occur during the removal of the two heritage oak trees and/or encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees for the development of a single-family residence. The single-family residential land use is not a part of the Project. The flat Project site is vacant and no grading or demolition is proposed as part of the Project.

Air quality impacts may occur during site preparation and the removal of two oak trees. Exhaust emissions and fugitive dust generated as a result of soil and material disturbance during site preparation may be sources of emission during the short-term activity. SCAQMD’s Rule 403 governs fugitive dust emissions from construction projects. This rule sets forth a list of control measures that must be undertaken for all construction projects to ensure that no dust emissions from the Project are visible beyond the property boundaries. These measures include: (1) soil stabilizers shall be applied to unpaved roads; (2) ground cover shall be quickly applied in all disturbed areas; and (3) the active construction site shall be watered twice daily. Adherence to Rule 403 is mandatory. Consistent with SCAQMD established methodologies, this rule is a requirement and not a mitigation of the Project. With required adherence to SCAQMD’s Rule 403, fugitive dust emission controls of any mobile equipment used to carry out the Project would have a less than significant impact on air quality.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The Project’s short-term activity is not expected to raise localized ambient pollutant concentrations or impact nearby sensitive receptors or uses. Nearby sensitive receptors include adjacent and nearby residential uses, and a private school (Pasadena Art School). The Project does not have any long-term effects on pollutant concentrations.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment for the removal of two heritage oak trees from the site. With regards to nuisance odors, any air quality impacts would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment itself and would be temporary in nature. By the time such emissions reach neighboring residential properties, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Any exposure of common construction odors to the general public would be of short duration and not significant. Consequently, potential impacts associated with objectionable odors would not be significant.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?**

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

Chapter 9, Conservation and Natural Resources Element of the General Plan identifies the biological resources and important habitat areas in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The Element identifies Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) within the County, a designation is given to land that contains the most sensitive biological resources and established local policies to protect sensitive habitats. The nearest SEAs are located in the Angeles National Forest, north of Interstate 210. The Project is located approximately 1.5 miles south of Interstate 210.

A revised Oak Tree Report dated September 27, 2024 was prepared for the Project site by Registered Consulting Arborist, Cris Falco (Appendix B). According to the Oak Tree Report, the Project site contains a severely degraded oak woodland. The vacant site is surrounded by single-family residences with oak trees on the properties. No sensitive species as identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) are found on the Project site or surrounding properties. However, the existing vegetation including the oak woodland could provide nesting habitat for birds or roosting habitat for bats, some of which may be sensitive. The Project site does is vacant and does not contain any structures. Migratory birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and under Section 3513 et. seq. of the CDFW Code. Bats are considered non-game mammals and are afforded protection by state law from take and/or harassment, (Fish and Game Code Section 4150, California Code of Regulations, Section 251.1). Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA).

Project conditions will inform the subdivider of state and federal requirements concerning pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures for roosting bats and nesting birds will reduce potential impacts to these resources to a less than significant level

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

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

As discussed above, the Project site is urbanized and surrounded by urban land uses. The oak woodland on the Project site is severely degrading. Consequently, the proposed oak tree removals and encroachments would not cause a substantial adverse effect on a County, USFWS or CDFW designated natural community.

Further, Project conditions required replacement plantings at a ratio of 10:1 for each heritage oak tree that is removed for a total of 20 replacement plantings and 2:1 replacement plantings for each tree that fails as a result of encroachment. The Conditions of Approval reduces the impact to the oak woodland to a less than significant level.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Wetlands are defined under the federal Clean Water Act as land that is flooded or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that normally does support, a prevalence of vegetation adapted to life in saturated soils. Wetlands include areas such as swamps, marshes, streams, lakes, and bogs. A channelized watercourse traverses the westerly portion of the Project Site, with an easement to the Los Angeles Flood Control District, and is closed off to the public. According to the USFWS National Wetlands Mapper,⁴ the channelized watercourse is classified as a wetland. The channelized watercourse is fenced off and there is no direct access from the Project site. Consequently, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

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

As discussed in Section 4.a, above, the vacant Project site contains 31 oak trees and 5 off-site oak trees on the northerly adjacent property form the sphere of influence and comprise an oak woodland. These trees and other shrubs on the Project site provide suitable roosting and nesting habitat for bat and bird species. Bats are considered non-game mammals and are afforded protection by state law from take and/or harassment, (Fish and Game Code Section 4150, California Code of Regulations, Section 251.1). Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA).

Project conditions will inform the subdivider of state and federal requirements concerning pre-construction surveys and avoidance measures for roosting bats and nesting birds which would ensure the impact to these animals would be less than significant.

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

⁴ <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.HTML>; accessed June 22, 2024.

other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

The Project consists of 36 oak trees, 31 on-site as well as 4 off-site, that form an oak woodland. According to the Oak Tree Report dated September 27, 2024, the Project’s impact to the oak woodland would be significant due to loss of oak woodland acreage, vertical and horizontal structural complexity, loss of nesting and denning with the removal of old oaks within the cavities of the oak trees proposed to be removed, and loss of individual heritage trees. However, the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance requires two replacement oak trees to be planted for each tree that is removed. The County Forester is also requiring 10 replacement trees to be planted for each living heritage tree that will be removed. Therefore, the Project will be conditioned to plant 20 replacement trees, as well as additional trees if any of the plantings fail. All replacement plantings will be monitored for a period of seven years. Consequently, with the proposed conditions, the Project would have a less than significant impact on oak woodlands.

Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.174), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 102), Specific Plans (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.46), Community Standards Districts (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.300 et seq.), and/or Coastal Resource Areas (L.A. County General Plan, Figure 9.3)?

The Project site is not within a designated Significant Ecological Area. The site is urbanized and surrounded by urban land uses. The Project’s conditions of approval require the planting of 10 oak trees for each heritage oak tree and two oak trees for each non-heritage oak tree that is removed from the Project site⁵. Additionally, the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance requires two trees to be planted for each oak tree that dies as a result of encroachment into its protected zone. Consequently, the Project would be consistent with the Oak Tree Ordinance, which is designed to protect biological resources.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

References:

- Oak Tree Report for 849 Madre St. prepared Arborist Cris Falco dated September 27, 2024.
- County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Revised Oak Tree Permit Number RPPL2021011244 re: 849 Madre St., Pasadena dated October 22, 2024.

⁵ County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Revised Oak Tree Permit Number RPPL2021011244 re: 849 Madre St., Pasadena dated October 22, 2024.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5, define “historic resources” as resources listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, or determined to be eligible by the California Historical Resources Commission for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.⁶ The criteria for eligibility are generally set by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which established the National Register which recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a district, site, building, structure, or object must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association relative to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture.⁷ According to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning’s Geographic Information Systems Interactive Map, the property is not located within a designated historical district, but the Chapman Woods CSD is a potential district if more than 50% of the owners in the potential district consent to the designation. The Project site is vacant and does not contain any built resources. It does contain an oak woodland consisting of 36 oak trees that form the sphere of influence, including three heritage oak trees. The Project is conditioned to plant replacement trees for each tree that is removed and not already dead (10:1 for heritage trees and 2:1 for non-heritage trees)⁸. Since the oak trees that comprise the woodland are not the oldest in the County and replacement trees will be planted, the impact to the potential historic district is less than significant.

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

“Unique archaeological resources” are defined by §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- (1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- (2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

⁶ California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), Section 5024.1(g).

⁷ Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms, National Register Bulletin 16, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, September 30, 1986 (“National Register Bulletin 16”).

⁸ County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Revised Oak Tree Permit Number RPPL2021011244 re: 849 Madre St., Pasadena dated October 22, 2024.

- (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

To identify potential archaeological resources on the Project site and its vicinity, a records search by the SCCIC was conducted. (Reference Appendix D.) The records search results, dated August 27, 2024, indicate the archaeological sensitivity of the property is unknown and that while there are currently no recorded archaeological sites within the project area, surface or subsurface resources could be encountered while carrying out Project activities. The SCCIC records search reports cultural resources were recorded nearby the Project area (an 1870s fire hearth features and refuse from a residence constructed in 1908 confirming historic accounts of a Rancheria and cultural resources though to be associated with the late Prehistoric tribal village) and seeps, springs, and marshy areas nearby were created by the Raymond Fault which dammed the flow of groundwater. Therefore, SCCIC recommends a qualified archaeological consultant be retained to survey the property for cultural resources prior to the approval of Project plans and for a Sacred Land Search of the property to be conducted.

A Sacred Land Search for the Mount Wilson USGS Quadrangle was conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). LA County Planning received correspondence dated August 7, 2025 indicating a positive result, meaning sacred Native American cultural resources were found within the boundaries of the quadrangle. Therefore, the following Project conditions will be applied to the Project to incorporate SCCIC's recommendation will ensure any potential impact to archaeological resources is less than significant. Cost of these measures shall be the responsibility of the Applicant, and the Department of Regional Planning shall be responsible for their enforcement.

- 1) If an archaeological resource is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50 feet of the find must halt, a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology must be contracted immediately to evaluate the find, and the Department of Regional Planning shall be notified of the discovery. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted. The on-site monitoring shall end when the Project site excavation cut activities are completed, or sooner if the archaeologist indicates that the site has a low potential for archeological resources.**
- 2) The qualified archaeological monitor shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted by the Permittee to the Los Angeles County Planning, the South Central Coastal Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historical Resources.**

c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Chapter 9: Conservation and Natural Resources Element of the General Plan states that over 1,000 fossil localities have been recorded and in excess of a million specimens have been collected in Los Angeles County. According to the EIR for the General Plan Update, significant fossils were found in the Palos Verdes Peninsula, Mint Canyon, Santa Monica Mountains, Puente Hills, and the LA Brea Tar Pits. The Project is not located near any of these locations and does not include grading. Consequently, the potential Project impacts regarding paleontological resources would be less than significant.

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

According to SCCIC records, cultural resources have been recorded near the Project area as described above. A Sacred Land Records Search was also performed by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Correspondence from NAHC, dated August 7, 2024, returned a positive result for the Mount Wilson USGS Quadrangle Map which covers approximately 59 square miles (attached in Appendix A).

Pursuant to State of California Health and Safety Code provisions (notably § 7050.5-7055), should any human remains be uncovered, all construction activities must cease and the Los Angeles County Coroner, County Department of Regional Planning and Sheriff Department be immediately contacted. With this legal requirement in place and given the fact that the Mt. Wilson United States Geological Survey Quadrangle map covers approximately 59 square miles and the Project does not grading. Therefore, the Project's potential to encounter or disturb any human remains would be less than significant.

References:

- Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, Figure 9.9, Historic Resource Sites Policy Map, https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/9.1_Chapter9_Figures.pdf, accessed November 22, 2023.
- South Central Coast Information Center (SCCIC). August 27, 2024. Records Search Results for 849 Madre Street.
- Sacred Land Record Search Re: PRJ2021-004689 Project, Los Angeles County. Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). August 7, 2024.

6. ENERGY

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

Would the project:

a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary**

consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Removal of two heritage oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during construction of the single-family residence, which would be permitted by a ministerial permit. The single-family residence will be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Green Building Code. The proposed Project will incorporate energy efficient measures such as the following:

- Drip irrigation
- Low flow plumbing fixtures
- Energy efficient appliances and light fixtures
- Net Zero 2020 (enhanced Title 24 standards)
- Solar.

Consequently, the Project would not result in the potentially significant wasteful consumption of energy resources.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The Project itself would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency as construction and operation of the new single-family residence would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Green Building Code. The ministerial single-family land use would connect to utilities and as required by the 2022 Building Code, the Project buildings would be equipped with solar.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

Would the project:

a) **Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures used for human occupancy.⁹ The main purpose of the Act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on top of the traces of active faults. General Plan Figure 12.1, Seismic and Geotechnical Hazard Zones Policy Map, identifies Alquist-Priolo zones and active seismic faults within Los Angeles County. The closest mapped recently active fault is the Mount Wilson Fault located approximately 250 feet to the north of the Project site. It is an identified Alquist-Priolo (AP) Earthquake Fault.

The Project site is located in the generally flat central portion of the community. Although the Project site is located relatively close to the fault trace, the removal of two heritage oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees is expected to have a less than significant impact related to rupture of a known earthquake fault.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

As discussed above, the Project site is approximately 250 feet south of Mount Wilson Fault. All of Los Angeles County could be affected by seismic hazards including ground shaking. During the life of the proposed Project residential, the site could experience ground shaking from a seismic event. Design and construction in accordance with the current CBC requirements is anticipated to address the issues related to potential ground shaking at the site. Consequently, Project impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

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

Liquefaction occurs during moderate to great earthquakes, when ground shaking causes water-saturated soils to become fluid and loose strength, much like quicksand. If the liquefied layer is in the subsurface, the material

⁹ Originally titled the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act until renamed in 1993, Public Resources Code Division 2, Chapter 7.5, Section 2621.

above it may slide laterally depending on the confinement of the unstable mass. According to County GIS mapping, the Project site is in a liquefaction zone. However, the Project does not include development. Consequently, Project impacts related to liquefaction would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

According to General Plan Figure 12.1, Seismic and Geotechnical Hazard Zones Policy Map, areas of landslides occur generally within the hills and mountainous areas of the County. The area surrounding the Project site is relatively flat and the site is not identified as being within a potential landslide area. Consequently, Project there would be no impacts related to landslides.

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

The vacant Project site is relatively flat and is located within an oak woodland. During Project construction when soils are exposed, temporary soil erosion may occur, which could be exacerbated by rainfall. Grading is not associated with the Project. Any grading associated with construction of the proposed single-family residence would be managed through the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by State Water Resources Control Board. In addition, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) requires that all post development stormwater runoff shall not exceed the pre-development peak flow. Consequently, by controlling off-site run-off, substantial soil erosion and potential loss of topsoil would be reduced to less than significant levels.

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

As discussed above, the site is within a potential liquefaction which could cause lateral spread. Project construction must comply with the requirements of the approved geotechnical report and CBC. Although there is low probability for unstable soils on the site, compliance with these measures would further reduce potential adverse impacts from geologic hazards. Consequently, Project impacts related to unstable soils, including liquefaction or collapse liquefaction would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

The Project is located in a liquefaction area. Prior to development, the Project would be required to provide a geotechnical study for review and approval by the County, and to comply with the requirements of the approved geotechnical report. Consequently, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

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

The vacant Project site is located in an urbanized area. The future single-family residence will have connection to the public sewer system and not make use of an onsite wastewater treatment system.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.104)?

As discussed in Section 1.a, the Project site is not within a designated Hillside Management Area or hillside area protected by the General Plan Conservation and Natural Resources Element.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Would the project:

a) **Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

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

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) comprise less than 0.1 percent of the total atmospheric composition, yet they play an essential role in influencing climate. Greenhouse gases include naturally occurring compounds such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), water vapor (H₂O), and nitrous oxide (N₂O), while others are synthetic. Man-made GHGs include the chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and Perfluorocarbons (PFCs), as well as sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Different GHGs have different effects on the Earth's warming. GHGs differ from each other in their ability to absorb energy (their "radiative efficiency") and how long they stay in the atmosphere, also known as the "lifetime".

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved the 2045 CAP on June 25, 2024. The 2045 CAP replaces the 2020 CCAP. The 2045 CAP is LA County's path toward meeting the goals of AB 1279 and achieving carbon neutrality for unincorporated areas of the County. The 2045 CAP is not a regulatory document. Rather, the 2045 CAP provides a policy framework to guide future County actions, so that the County can reach its emissions reduction targets. The County recognizes that its GHG reduction goals cannot be achieved by individual projects alone, but instead requires a comprehensive Countywide approach that would include the enactment of future plans, changes to existing ordinances, and an integrated and sustainable approach. The goals in the 2045 CAP are Countywide, not requirements or mandates for individual, private development projects, unless and until they are implemented through appropriate legal processes.

The 2045 CAP is designed to be consistent with the GHG reduction measures and recommendations contained in CARB's 2022 Scoping Plan. The Pavley Program, RPS, LCFS, SB 375 land use and transportation strategies, energy efficiency measures, solar PV measures, vehicle and fuel efficiency measures, landfill methane capture, and urban forestry practices are all measures in the 2022 Scoping Plan that are also included in the 2045 CAP emission forecasts or as CAP measures. Consistent with AB 1279, the 2045 CAP sets a GHG emissions target for 2030 equal to 40 percent below 2015 levels, for 2035 equal to 50 percent below 2015 levels, and for 2045 equal to 83 percent below 2015 levels and sets a long-term aspirational goal for carbon neutrality by 2045.

GHG emissions associated with the construction of projects, including demolition and decommissioning activities, are generally orders of magnitude lower than operational GHG emissions. This is primarily because construction emissions are typically short in duration compared to the project's overall lifetime. Typically, construction GHG emissions are amortized over 30 years and added to a project's 30-year lifetime emissions total; after this amortization, construction GHG emissions usually represent a small fraction of a project's total annual emissions. It is generally difficult to enforce low-emission construction equipment because of the limited availability of zero-emission and near-zero-emission construction equipment, along with contracting requirements. In addition, the 2045 CAP quantifies GHG emissions from off-road construction activity at the unincorporated Los Angeles County level; these emissions are accounted for in the 2045 CAP's ability to achieve the 2030, 2035, and 2045 targets.

The Project which would encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees and remove two heritage oak trees, each with a large cavity in its base. Oak tree removals and encroachments only involve construction impacts which have been accounted for by the 2045 CAP, as explained above. Therefore, the Project would a less than significant impact with regard to GHG emissions.

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

The 2045 CAP is designed to be consistent with the GHG reduction measures and recommendations contained in CARB’s 2022 Scoping Plan. Consequently, the Project would not conflict with any policies or regulations intended to reduce GHG.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

Would the project:

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

The Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project is not associated with the transport or use of hazardous materials. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

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

As discussed above, the proposed residential Project is not associated with the transport or use of hazardous materials. The Project consists of the removal of two heritage oak trees and includes encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Therefore, impacts relative to transport or use of hazardous materials are not expected.

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

Residential uses and a private school are located in the vicinity of the Project site and are considered sensitive land uses. Residential uses are adjacent to the Project site on its north, east, and west sides. The Pasadena Art School is located at the corner of Huntington Drive and Rosemead Boulevard approximately 0.5 miles to the east. The proposed residential Project is not associated with the transport or use of hazardous materials. Therefore, potential impacts relative to hazardous emissions or materials within one-quarter mile of a sensitive land use would be less than significant.

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

Section 65962.5 requires that State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) compile and update as appropriate a list of all hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code (HSC). The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites maintained by DTSC, nor any other identified lists of hazardous materials sites including those maintained by the LARWQCB. Consequently, the Project is not included on a hazardous materials sites list and therefore would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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

The closest airport to the Project site is the San Gabriel Valley Airport, located approximately 6 miles to the southeast. There is no airport in or within two miles of the East Pasadena - East San Gabriel. Consequently, the Project would not result in an airport related safety hazard for future Project residents.

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

The emergency response plan for the unincorporated areas of the County is the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP), which is prepared by the County Office of Emergency Management (OEM). The OAERP strengthens short and long-term emergency response and recovery capability, and identifies emergency procedures and emergency management routes in Los Angeles County. Vehicle access to the Project site is via Madre Street. Consequently, the Project would not impair or physically interfere with the County OAERP or other adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

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

i) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

Los Angeles County faces major wildland fire threats due to its hilly terrain, dry weather conditions, and the nature of its plant coverage. The at-risk areas are designated as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) and are classified as Very High, High, and Moderate in State Responsibility Areas and Very High in Local and Federal Responsibility Areas. Areas in the Very High FHSZ areas are generally located in the mountainous and hilly areas of the County, including the Santa Monica Mountains, Angeles National Forest and Puente Hills. The Project site is located in a flat and urbanized area of the County. According to the County Fire Zone Map, the Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ.¹⁰

Vehicle access to the Project site is via Madre Street. Regional access is available on surrounding arterials and freeways, including the nearby I-210 freeway north of the Project site. The Project site is not within a high fire hazard area and would provide adequate access.

ii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

The vacant Project site is located within a fully urbanized area of the County. Consequently, the Project is located in an area with adequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards and in compliance with County Fire requirements.

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

As discussed above, the Project site is located in a flat and urbanized area of the County. According to the County Fire Zone Map, the Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ. The Project site is not proximate to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard.

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

As discussed above, the Project site is an infill property located in a flat and urbanized area of the County. According to the County Fire Zone Map, the Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ. The Project would remove two heritage oak trees, remove a lateral limb from Tree #11, and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

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

According to Section 7.1 of the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development (LID) Standards (February 2014), “Stormwater quality control measures are required to augment site design principles and source control measures to reduce the volume of stormwater runoff and potential pollution loads in stormwater runoff to the maximum extent practicable.”¹¹

The Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project impacts relative to violation of water quality and waste discharge standards would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

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

The Project would remove two heritage oak trees, remove a lateral limb from Tree #11, and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. No local groundwater would be drawn to supply water to the Project. Consequently, the Project's impact on groundwater supplies or recharge would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain; the alteration of the course of a stream or river; or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

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

As depicted in Figure 12.2, Flood Hazard Policy Map, of the General Plan, the Project site is not located within a 500-year or 100-year flood plain. The vacant site is relatively flat. The Project does not include grading and is not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

(ii) Substantially increase the rate, amount or depth of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

As discussed above, the Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite, and this impact is less than significant.

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

As discussed above, the Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed existing or planned drainage systems, and this impact is less than significant.

(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows which would expose existing housing or other insurable structures in a Federal 100-year flood hazard area or County Capital Flood floodplain to a significant risk of loss or damage involving flooding?

Figure 12.2, Flood Hazard Policy Map, of the General Plan illustrates locations of flood hazard areas and shows the area surrounding the Project site as outside of any 100-year or 500-year flood hazard. Further, as discussed above, the Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

d) Otherwise place structures in Federal 100-year flood hazard or County Capital Flood floodplain areas which would require additional flood proofing and flood insurance requirements?

As discussed above, the Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not conflict with the County’s LID Ordinance.

e) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84)?

As discussed above, the Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The future single-family residence would be required to comply with the County’s Low Impact Development Ordinance, which would ensure that County water quality and waste discharge standards are met. Consequently, the Project would not conflict with the County’s LID Ordinance.

f) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high

groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

The Project is located within a fully urbanized area and would not make use of an onsite wastewater treatment system.

g) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

As discussed above, the Project site is outside of any 100-year or 500-year flood hazard. A seiche is a surface wave created when an inland body of water is shaken. A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The Project site is located inland approximately 29 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Consequently, the Project would not place development in areas of flooding, tsunamis or seiches.

h) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

As discussed above, the Project LID identifies a series of drainage and water quality improvements required to comply with the County LID requirements. The Project would remove two heritage oak trees and authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, Project impacts relative to degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Would the project:

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and includes encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consistent with the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance, the Project would plant replacement oak trees. The Project would not divide an established community.

b) **Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any County land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

The Project site has a current General Plan Land Use Map designation of H2 Residential which permits a density of 0-2 du/ac. The current zoning for the Project site is R-1-40,000, which allows single-family residences and oak tree removals and encroachments to facilitate permitted uses as long as replacement trees are planted, consistent with the County’s Oak Tree Ordinance. Replacement plantings will also be required for each oak tree that fails as a result of an encroachment.

Consequently, the Project would not conflict with County land use plans and policies.

c) **Conflict with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to Hillside Management Areas or Significant Ecological Areas?**

As discussed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the Project site is not within a County designated Hillside Management Area or Significant Ecological Area (SEA). Consequently, the Project would not conflict with these plans.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

a) **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?**

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

The General Plan Chapter 9: Conservation and Natural Resources Element identifies mineral resources in the County. Regionally-significant mineral resources in the County are designated as Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ-2s). Four major MRZ-2s are identified in, or partially within the unincorporated areas: Little Rock Creek Fan, Soledad Production Area, Sun Valley Production Area, and Irwindale Production Area. The Project site and surrounding areas are not within the designated MRZ-2 zones. Consequently, the Project would not impact a known mineral resource.

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

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

As noted above, there are no identified mineral resources on the Project site or in the vicinity. Consequently, the Project would not result in a loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource.

References:

- Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, Figure 9.6, Mineral Resource Areas: https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/9.1_Chapter9_Figures.pdf, accessed on November 6, 2023.

13. NOISE

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

Would the project result in:

a) **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?**

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

Noise Measurements: Since the human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire auditory spectrum, human response is factored into sound descriptions by weighting sounds within the range of maximum human sensitivity more heavily in a process called “A-weighting,” written as dB(A). Any further reference in this discussion to decibels written as "dB" should be understood to be A-weighted. Time variations in noise exposure are typically expressed in terms of a steady-state energy level equal to the energy content of the time varying period (called LEQ), or alternately, as a statistical description of the sound pressure level that is exceeded over some fraction of a given observation period.

Typical human hearing can detect changes in sound levels of approximately 3 dBA under normal conditions. Changes of 1 to 3 dBA are detectable under quiet, controlled conditions, and changes of less than 1 dBA are usually indiscernible. A change of 5 dBA is discernable to most people in an exterior environment while a change of 10 dBA is perceived as a doubling (or halving) of the noise. Because people are generally more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, state law requires that, for planning purposes, an artificial dB increment be added to quiet time noise levels in a 24-hour noise descriptor called the Ldn (day-night) or the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). The CNEL metric has gradually replaced the Ldn factor, but the two descriptors are essentially identical.

Noise Standards: Noise is defined as unwanted sound, and is known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise, the federal government, the State of California, and many local governments have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent disruption of certain human activities.

The State of California has established guidelines for acceptable community noise levels that are based upon the CNEL rating scale to ensure noise exposure is considered in any development. For exterior noise levels at sensitive land uses, the State guidelines set 50-65 dB CNEL as normally acceptable, and 60-70 dB CNEL as conditionally acceptable.¹² Sensitive land uses include residences, hospitals, schools and lodging. An interior CNEL of 45 dBA for sensitive land uses is mandated in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations for sensitive uses, including all habitable rooms in a residential.

¹² State Guidelines provide the following definitions:

- **Normally Acceptable:** Specified land use is satisfactory based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

For stationary noise sources located proximate to sensitive land uses, Los Angeles County has adopted a detailed Noise Ordinance that establishes the maximum allowable noise exposure. In areas of sensitive land uses, daytime noise exposure is not to exceed 70 dB for any period of time, and nighttime noise exposure is not to exceed 65 dB for any period of time. Section 12.08.440 of the County Code regulates construction noise, prohibiting construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of any day, any time on Sundays, and legal holidays. Required compliance with these time restrictions would limit construction noise to times when people are generally less sensitive to noise and reduce construction equipment noise.

Project Area Noise: Major noise sources in the vicinity of the Project site are from vehicles on adjacent streets, primarily from Madre Street. The Project would not have any long-term noise impacts.

Project Construction Noise: Noise levels associated with construction activities would be higher than the ambient noise levels in the Project area today, but would subside once construction of the project is completed. Two types of noise impacts could occur during the construction phase. First, the transport of workers and equipment to the construction site would incrementally increase noise levels along site access roadways. Even though there could be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential with passing trucks (a maximum noise level of 86 dBA at 50 feet), the increase in noise would be less than 1 dBA when averaged over a 24-hour period, and would therefore have a less than significant impact on noise receptors along the truck routes. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the County Code regulations that prohibit construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of any day, any time on Sundays, and legal holidays. Consequently, both Project operational and construction noise are expected to comply with County noise regulations and Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Vibration is a trembling, quivering, or oscillating motion of the earth. Unlike noise, vibration is typically of a frequency that is felt rather than heard. The equipment used to remove the trees (crane, stump grinder, wood chipper, heavy duty trucks) may generate short term ground vibration. However, the duration of equipment used to remove the trees would be limited to the days and times established by County ordinance. Consequently, potential impacts from exposure to vibration from the Project would be less than significant.

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

As discussed in Section 9.e., above, the closest airport to the Project site is the San Gabriel Valley Airport, located approximately 6 miles to the southeast. There is no airport in or within two miles of the Project site. Consequently, the Project would not expose future residents to excessive airport noise.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the proposed single-family residence and appurtenant uses to encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would be developed consistent with the General Plan and zoning. The Project does not add new roads or infrastructure, and consequently, the Project would not induce unplanned growth.

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

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

The Project site is vacant. Consequently, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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:

Fire protection?

According to the General Plan EIR, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) serves the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County as well as 59 cities. In addition to fire suppression, the LACoFD also provides fire prevention services, emergency medical services (EMS), hazardous materials services, and urban search and rescue (USAR) services. The closest fire station is Fire Station 47 located at 5946 Kaufman Avenue in Temple City.

The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the proposed single-family residence and appurtenant uses to encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on fire protection facilities.

Sheriff protection?

The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the proposed single-family residence and appurtenant uses to encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on Sheriff facilities.

Schools?

The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the proposed single-family residence and appurtenant uses to encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on school facilities.

Parks?

The Project would not result in a population increase and the development itself is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on park facilities.

Libraries?

The County Library System has 20 libraries throughout the County with the closest to the Project site located at 5939 Golden West Avenue in Temple City, about 3 miles east. The Project consists of removing two heritage oak trees and authorizing the proposed single-family residence and appurtenant uses to encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on library facilities.

Other public facilities?

The Project would generate revenue for the County in the form of property tax, sales tax and user fees. These fees are available to the County to support general public services. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on other public facilities.

16. RECREATION

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

As discussed above, the Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and includes encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The proposed residential does not include any neighborhood or regional park or recreational facilities. Consequently, the Project would have no impact on regional parks or other recreational facilities.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Would the project interfere with regional trail connectivity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As discussed in Section 1.b, above, the Project would not interfere with regional trail connectivity. There are no trails within the vicinity of the Project site. Consequently, the development of the proposed residential on the Project would not interfere with regional open space connectivity.

17. TRANSPORTATION

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

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Effective July 1, 2020, the longstanding metric of roadway level of service (LOS), which is typically measured in terms of auto delay or volume-to-capacity, will no longer be considered a significant impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to the 2020 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.3, “Generally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel.”

For land use projects, the CEQA guidelines provides the following criteria for analyzing Transportation Impacts and VMT:

- Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact.
- Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.
- Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

In July 2020, Los Angeles County adopted Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (TIA Guidelines). Projects are exempt from a trip generation study and VMT analysis for the following conditions:

- (1) Non-retail projects that generate less than 110 daily vehicle trips.
- (2) Retail projects that are less than 50,000 square feet of gross floor area.
- (3) Residential land uses that set aside 100 percent of the units for low-income households.
- (4) Projects that are located within a one-half mile radius of a major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor but do not meet the following criteria:
 - Have a Floor Area Ratio of less than 0.75.
 - Provides more parking than required by the County Code.
 - Inconsistent with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).
 - Replaces residential units set aside for low-income households with a smaller number of market-rate residential units.

The Project site is vacant. The Project would generate few landscape worker trips in connection with the removal of two heritage oak trees. Consistent with the list of exemptions discussed above, Section 3.1.2.1.

of the TIA Guidelines, non-retail projects that generate less than 110 ADT a day are exempt from further VMT analysis. The Project meets this exemption. Consequently, the Project would support the state mandate to reduce VMT, and would not conflict with plans that support non-motorized systems of transportation.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

As discussed above, the Project is a non-retail project that would generate less than 110 ADT. Consequently, the Project would be consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, supporting the state mandate to reduce VMT.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a road design feature (e.g., sharp curves) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and includes encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project site fronts Madre Street, a 60-foot-wide public local street. The 1.35-acre Project site is vacant and deep enough at approximately 480 feet in length to accommodate work trucks on-site. Consequently, the Project would not substantially increase hazards related to traffic or incompatible land uses such as farm equipment.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

As discussed in Section 9.f, above, the emergency response plan for the unincorporated areas of the County is the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (OAERP), which is prepared by the County Office of Emergency Management (OEM). The OAERP strengthens short and long-term emergency response and recovery capability, and identifies emergency procedures and emergency management routes in Los Angeles County. Vehicle and emergency access to/from the Project site is via Madre Street. Consequently, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code § 5020.1(k), or</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

As discussed in Section 5 of this document, the Project site does not contain historical resources. Consequently, the Project would not have impacts relative to the County, State, or National Register of Historical Resources.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Significant archaeological resources found in the County include those associated with Native American cultures. AB52 which became effective July 1, 2015, requires public agencies to respond to Native American tribal representative requests by providing formal notification of proposed projects within the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe.

In compliance with AB 52, a Project notification letter was issued to three tribes that are culturally affiliated with the Project site and who are included on LA County Planning’s Tribal and Cultural Resources Notification List: Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno Tongva, and Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California. On June 24, 2024, letters were sent to representatives of the three tribes inviting both to request formal consultation through AB 52. Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation was the only tribe to responded to the invitation, but later determined that consultation was not necessary. The tribe did recommend preservation of the oak trees. Correspondence concluded on August 15, 2024. All of the tribal consultation notification letters are attached to this Initial Study.

As discussed in Section 5.b, above, surveys prepared by the NAHC and SCCIC found no previously identified archaeological resources on or in the vicinity of the Project site. However, both the NAHC and SCCIC

conclude that there is the potential for the discovery of resources within the site boundaries, including archaeological finds of Native American origin. Although grading is not proposed, the Project includes the removal of five oak trees. To ensure the protection of any potential tribal cultural resources, the following mitigation measure is provided:

MM-TCR-1: If a tribal cultural resource is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50 feet of the find must halt, a qualified tribal monitor from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation shall be contracted immediately to evaluate the find, and LA County Planning shall be notified of the discovery. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted. The on-site monitoring shall end when the Project site excavation cut activities are completed, or sooner if the tribal monitor or archaeologist indicates the site has low potential for encountering archaeological resources.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Would the project:

a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not create wastewater system capacity problems, or necessitate construction or relocation of storm water drainage and telecommunication facilities.

b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not create problems with water supplies.

c) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not create wastewater system capacity problems.

d) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not create solid waste or local infrastructure problems.

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

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

The Project consists of two heritage oak tree removals and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project would not create compliance issues related to solid waste.

20. WILDFIRE

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

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan?

As discussed in Section 9.g, above, Los Angeles County faces major wildland fire threats due to its hilly terrain, dry weather conditions, and the nature of its plant coverage. The at-risk areas are designated as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) and are classified as Very High, High, and Moderate in State Responsibility Areas and Very High in Local and Federal Responsibility Areas. Areas in the Very High FHSZ areas are generally located in the mountainous and hilly areas of the County, including the Santa Monica Mountains, Angeles National Forest and Puente Hills. The vacant Project site is located in a flat and urbanized area of the County. According to the County Fire Zone Map, the Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ. ¹³ The Project would not expose people or structures to significant loss involving wildland fires.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

The Project will remove two heritage oak trees and include encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project site is flat and not within a Very High FHSZ. The Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose residential occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

The Project site is located in a flat and urbanized area of the County. According to the County Fire Zone Map, the Project site is not within a Very High FHSZ. The Project would not require installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Figure 5.9-3 of the General Plan EIR illustrates locations of flood hazard areas and shows the area surrounding the Project site as outside of any 100-year or 500-year flood hazard. Figure 5.6-2, Map of Seismic Hazards Los Angeles County shows the Project site is within a Seismic Hazard area. The Project site is flat and does not contain slopes, and the Project does not propose drainage changes. The Project consists of the removal of two heritage oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. Consequently, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from flooding, landslides, slope instability or drainage changes.

e) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Figure 5.9-3 of the General Plan EIR illustrates locations of flood hazard areas and shows the area surrounding the Project site as outside of any 100-year or 500-year flood hazard. The Project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Project site is flat and does not contain slopes, and the Project does not propose drainage changes. Consequently, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from flooding, landslides, slope instability or drainage changes.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

a) Does the project have the potential to 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

The Project is an infill development replacing religious facility and preschool buildings constructed about 57 years ago with a new residential project constructed to current codes. It would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce species or eliminate important examples of history or pre-history. However, certain site-specific impacts could occur during Project development. These potential impacts include disturbance of biological resources and potential archaeological resources. Mitigation Measures 5.1, 5.2 and 18.1 have been added to the Project to mitigate potential impacts to biological and Native American resources to less than significant levels.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

The vacant Project site contains 31 oak trees. The 31 on-site oak trees together with five oak trees located on the northerly adjacent property form the sphere of influence. According to the Oak Tree Report prepared for the Project, the canopies of the 36 oak trees cover the majority of the Project site and are a part of a severely degraded oak woodland. A proposed single-family residence will necessitate the removal of two heritage oak trees and encroach into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The future single-family residence will be constructed in accordance with current codes. Pursuant to Green Building Code contemporary requirements, the Project would include energy efficient heating and air conditioning and lighting, and water conserving plumbing and irrigation fixtures. Project improvements are expected to result in improved energy efficiency and reduced site stormwater runoff. The Project is consistent with General Plan goals and policies, as well as land use and density. Consequently, the Project would not achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals as the Project will be required to plant 20 mitigation trees.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects,

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

the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

The Project consists of the removal of two heritage oak trees and includes encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. The Project will be required to plant 20 mitigation trees. The requested oak tree permit would also authorize encroachment into the protected zone of 18 oak trees. If construction of the proposed single-family residence causes any of the 18 oak trees to fail, the applicant is conditioned to plant two oak trees for each failed oak tree, or ten oak trees if a heritage oak tree fails. With these conditions in place in conjunction with the aforementioned mitigation measures, the Project would have a less than significant effect on potential cumulatively considerable adverse impacts.

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

The Project would not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse environmental effects on human beings would be less than significant.