

FINDINGS OF FACT and
STATEMENT of OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
regarding GRISWOLD RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

PROJECT NO.: 2020-001385

TENTATIVE MAP NO.: 83183 / RPPL2020004447

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO.: RPPL2021005384

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO.: RPPL202004450

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER: 2022020004

LOS ANGELES COUNTY PLANNING

320 WEST TEMPLE STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
REGARDING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2022020004)

FOR GRISWOLD RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

(COUNTY PROJECT NUMBER 2020-001385)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Regional Planning Commission (“Commission”) of the County of Los Angeles (“County”) hereby certifies the Griswold Residential Project Final Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse Number 2022020004, which consists of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) dated June 8, 2023, Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR dated June 8, 2023, and the Final Environmental Impact Report, including Responses to Comments, dated **August 2023** collectively referred to as the “Final EIR,” and finds that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) (“CEQA”). The Commission further hereby certifies that it has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR; the applications for Tentative Map (“TTM”) TR83183”) 83183 (RPPL2020004447), Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) RPPL2021005384, and Environmental Assessment RPPL2020004450 (collectively, the “Project Approvals”) to permit the subdivision and construction of a 68 unit detached condominium development, together with community amenities and related onsite and offsite infrastructure (“the Project”), as further described below; all hearings and submissions of testimony from officials and departments of the County, MLC Holdings, Inc. (“Applicant”), the public and other municipalities and agencies; and all other pertinent information in the record of proceedings. The Commission further hereby certifies that the final EIR reflects the County’s independent judgment and analysis. Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) attached as Exhibit A to these findings. Initially capitalized terms but not defined in these findings have the meanings set forth in the Final EIR.

II. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS AND BACKGROUND

Project Setting

The Project site is located at 16209 East San Bernardino Road, Covina, CA (APN: 8435-006-900) in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. The Project site is directly north of the intersection of San Bernardino Road and North Woodgrove Avenue. The Project area is surrounded by Covina to the east; Baldwin Park to the west; Irwindale to the north; and West Covina to the south. Regional access is provided by Interstate 10 (I-10) located approximately one mile to the south and State Route 39 (SR-39), approximately one mile to the east. Local access is provided by East San Bernardino Road.

The Project site consists of one 9.61-gross acre (9.53 net acres) parcel. The Project site is the former Griswold School site. Pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. ("State CEQA Guidelines"), specifically, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, the environmental baseline for the Draft EIR was set on February 1, 2022, the date the NOP was published. At that time, the school buildings were vacant but intact. However, after the publication of the NOP for the Draft EIR, the school buildings were damaged in a fire and the school buildings were demolished to eliminate public health and safety hazards related to the unsafe condition of the school buildings. Because the school building were intact as of the date of the NOP publication on February 1, 2022, the Draft EIR environmental baseline condition assumes the site is improved with six permanent structures, as well as associated improvements, such as paved recreational areas, parking lots, and patio areas. The buildings were constructed in 1953 for use as the Griswold School, which operated through 1974. The school was reopened in 1978 for use by Tri-Community Adult Education. The school buildings were vacated and the entire property, with the exception of the parking lot along East San Bernardino Road, is fenced. The site is landscaped and includes grass/turf field areas, as well as shrubs and mature trees. Vehicular access to the site is provided by existing driveways on East San Bernardino Road.

Project Description

The Project site was previously occupied by the Griswold School and Tri-Community Adult Education. The Applicant proposes to develop 68 detached homes, two common open space areas with landscaping totaling 35,780 square feet, stormwater infrastructure, private driveways and fire lanes, and 179 parking spaces. The Project would have a

density of approximately 7.15 dwelling units per acre.

Each detached residence will include front and back lawns and a driveway accessible from the Project's proposed internal, shared private driveways. The Project would also provide two common open space areas with landscaping at the northern and southern portions of the site. In addition, designated areas adjacent to East San Bernardino Road would be developed with an underground biofiltration basin and landscaping.

Architectural Design

The Project would develop 68 two-story detached homes. Each two-story home design would be less than 26 feet in height and would include a attached two-car garage and driveway area. The residences would range in size from approximately 1,677 square feet to 2,300 square feet for the design footprints. The two-story design would consist of three different floor plans: Plan 3222 that consists of a 3-bedroom, 2.5-bathroom floor plan; Plan 3625 that consists of a 5-bedroom, 3-bathroom floor plan; and Plan 3627 that consists of a 5-bedroom, 3-bathroom floor plan.

The Project includes three different elevation styles: Santa Barbara style, Coastal style, and Farmhouse style. The different elevation styles would feature three color schemes, for a total of nine visually unique elevations to be interspersed throughout the community. These elevation styles feature similar architectural elements, such as concrete roof tiles, stucco finishing, shutters, over hangs, and columns.

Access and Circulation

Access to the Project would be provided by a driveway from San Bernardino Road, located at the southwest corner of the Project site. Seven new shared private driveways and fire lanes would be constructed to provide internal circulation. These shared private driveways would feature parallel parking spaces for guests. The Applicant would provide internal walkways and construct a new sidewalk along the East San Bernardino Road frontage. Enhancing the existing crosswalk with in-road warning lights and signage would be conditioned as part of the Project. The Project would also include public transportation access via a bus stop along San Bernardino Road, served by Foothill Transit, which would be relocated from its current location, east of the proposed driveway on East San Bernardino Road.

Parking

The Project would include a total of 179 parking spaces. Each residence would include a two-car garage, and the Project would provide 43 parking spaces within the private driveways, three of which will be accessible (ADA) parking spaces. While not technically identified as parking spots, driveways attached to each -detached residence may also be used for parking.

Recreation and Open Space

The Project includes two common open space areas to be used for passive recreation and landscaping. The 14,821-square foot main common open space would include a community open space area, a playground, a lawn area with bench seating, and a short-term bike rack. The community open space area would include a wood shade area, lighting, community BBQ, table and chair seating, and a fire pit. The playground would be adjacent to the community open space area and include a rubberized surface and play equipment.

A 20,959-square foot secondary open space area would be located along the north end of the property and is designed for passive recreation and landscaping. The secondary open space area would contain a walking path, bench seating, picnic tables, and a community dog run, which would be separated from the Metrolink to the north of the site by a 6-foot-high concrete sound wall. The Project would include a total of approximately 35,780 square feet of programmed amenity area and approximately 62,443 square feet of common open space, including proposed front lawn areas, which would be maintained by the homeowner's association. Additionally, each home would include a private backyard area for a total of approximately 72,719 square feet of private open space within proposed backyards for each unit.

Landscaping

Landscaping proposed as part of the Project would consist of drought-tolerant ornamental trees, shrubbery, and groundcover. The Project would include approximately 231 trees. Turf would be provided in the main common open space lawn area at the southern portion of the property. Landscaping would also be provided to screen above-ground utilities, including transformers.

Walls

The Project would include the removal of the existing chain-link fencing surrounding the eastern and western boundaries of the Project site. The existing 6-foot-high concrete wall

along the northern boundary will be repaired and painted. New concrete sound walls, approximately 6 feet in height, would be constructed along the eastern and western property lines as well as along the yard lines of Units 1 and 34. The concrete walls will reduce noise from the Metrolink to the north and the San Bernardino Road to the south. Additional walls and fencing would be constructed within the Project site.

Lighting

The Project would include lighting throughout the site. Project lighting would include area pole lights and security and decorative lighting in common areas and landscaped areas.

Infrastructure Improvements

The Project would construct onsite infrastructure including new internal private shared driveways, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and storm drain improvements, wet and dry utilities, and related infrastructure improvements.

Drainage

Stormwater runoff in the Project vicinity currently flows from north to south to San Bernardino Road. A series of onsite storm drain facilities with Low Impact Development (LID) and Peak Storm elements are proposed. One infiltration basin is being proposed along the southern property line. Additionally, an onsite drainage swale is being proposed along the eastern property line to convey drainage from adjacent residences to the existing stormwater infrastructure in San Bernardino Road.

Water Infrastructure

The Project would construct private domestic water lines and private fire water lines onsite to connect with existing water mains in San Bernardino Road or the Project might be required to install new 8-inch water lines in East San Bernardino Road that would connect to the existing 8-inch water pipeline in Hartley Avenue. The new onsite water system would be compliant with the California Plumbing Code (Title 24) for efficient use of water.

Wastewater Infrastructure

The proposed development would install new 8-inch private sewer lines onsite that would connect to the existing 8-inch sewer pipeline in San Bernardino Road.

Construction and Phasing

Construction activities would include demolition of the existing structures, rectangular concrete pads, sheds; removal of the existing utility infrastructure; grubbing, grading, excavation, and re-compaction of soils; utility and infrastructure installation; building construction; roadway pavement; and architectural coatings. Grading is expected to result in approximately 98,434 cubic yards of cut (with approximately 8,068 cubic yards of rough grading, approximately 86,434 cubic yards of over-excavation, and approximately 3,932 cubic yards of spoils) and approximately 98,434 cubic yards of fill (with approximately 3,702 cubic yards of rough grading, approximately 86,434 cubic yards of over-excavation, and approximately 8,298 cubic yards of shrinkage). Overall, grading would balance onsite.

Construction activities are anticipated to last 21 to 27 months, with demolition, grading, and infrastructure development lasting nine (9) months and home construction lasting 12 to 18 months. Construction activities would be coordinated with all adjacent property owners for demolition of existing fences and construction of new walls. Project construction would occur within the hours allowed by Los Angeles County Code Title 12, Environmental Protection, Section 12.08.440, which states that construction shall occur only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, with no construction allowed on Sundays and holidays.

General Plan and Zoning

The Project site currently has an existing General Plan land use designation of Public and Semi-Public (P). The intent of the Public and Semi-Public (P) designation is to provide for areas of public and semi-public facilities and community-serving uses, including public buildings and campuses, schools, hospitals, cemeteries, and fairgrounds; airports and other major transportation facilities. As stated in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, "In the event that the public or semi-public use of mapped facilities is terminated, alternative uses that are compatible with the surrounding development, in keeping with community character, are permitted". The surrounding residential uses have existing General Plan land use designations of Residential 9 (H9), which allow up to 9 dwelling units per acre. The Project would feature a density of 7.15 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the surrounding density and is compatible with the surrounding development.

The Project site has a zoning designation of Light Agricultural (A-1-6,000). The minimum lot size of land zoned A-1-6,000 is 6,000 square feet. According to Title 22, Section 22.16.030 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code, single-family residences and crops

are allowable uses for this zone. The 68 detached residences would be single-family in form on a 9.61-acre common lot. As such, the Project would be consistent with the A-1-6,000 zoning designation.

The Project would not require redesignation or a zone change. As a result of Project implementation, all other land use designations and zoning classifications in the Project vicinity would remain the same as under existing conditions.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION BACKGROUND

Initial Study and Determination of Impact Areas to Be Analyzed

Following the Applicant's proposal of the current Project, the County completed an Initial Study for the Project on February 1, 2022 and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include: Transportation. The Draft EIR analyzed both individual component and cumulative effects of the Project together with related projects and based on projections within planning documents on this topic and identified a variety of mitigation measures to mitigate the potential adverse effects of the Project. Related Projects in the vicinity of the Project Site are comprised of those projects that are (1) completed but not fully occupied; (2) currently under construction or beginning construction; (3) proposed with applications on file at the County of Los Angeles, City of Irwindale, City of Covina, and City of West Covina as of the date of issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP); or (4) reasonably foreseeable. These projects (Cumulative Projects) are presented in Table 5-1, Cumulative Projects List, and the locations of the Cumulative Projects are shown in Figure 5-1, Cumulative Projects, in the Draft EIR.

In accordance with CEQA requirements, the Final EIR also analyzed potential alternatives to the Project, including: (1) a No Project/No Build Alternative, (2) a Reduced Project Alternative, and (3) a Buildout of Existing Land use and Zoning Alternative. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed as required by CEQA and each alternative was compared to the Project.

The County determined through the Initial Study that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural/Forest Resources, Air Quality, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, and Wildfire. The Initial Study for the Project identified a variety of mitigation measures to mitigate potential adverse effects of the

Project including impacts related to: biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, tribal cultural resources, and utilities. The Initial Study found that, with incorporation of mitigation, impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, tribal cultural resources, and utilities would be less than significant. Therefore, those issues were not analyzed in the Draft EIR.

EIR Preparation and Public Review Process

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, which requires that a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) be circulated for a 30-day review period, the NOP for the Project was circulated for a 30-day review and comment period, from February 1, 2022 to March 3, 2022, to the State Clearinghouse, various public agencies, and other interested parties. Additionally, a Scoping Meeting was held on February 10, 2022, via Zoom to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR was prepared under the direction and supervision of the Los Angeles County Planning. Los Angeles County Planning also conducted its own independent departmental review and analysis of the Project and the preliminary Draft EIR and circulated copies of the preliminary Draft EIR to all affected County agencies. Interested County agencies conducted an independent review and analysis of the Project and preliminary Draft EIR and provided written comments on the document, where appropriate, and those comments were incorporated into and made part of the Draft EIR.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 21.16.070 of the County Code and the State CEQA Guidelines, Los Angeles County Planning staff provided proper notice to the community by mail, newspaper, and property posting. The Draft EIR was made available for public comment and input for the period set forth by State law. The Draft EIR, Notice of Completion, and Notice of Availability (“NOC-NOA”) were uploaded to the County’s website on June 1, 2023. The public review period commenced on June 8, 2023, when a NOC-NOA was sent to the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse No. 2022020004) and ended on July 24, 2023. On June 8, 2023, the NOC-NOA for the Draft EIR was posted at the Los Angeles County Recorder’s office and was also sent by mail to required agencies including the State Clearinghouse and other interested parties and published on the State Clearinghouse’s website. The NOC-NOA was also posted on the subject parcel. Newspaper notices informing the public regarding the public comment period for the Draft EIR and NOC-NOA were published in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune newspaper on June 8, 2023. On June 8, 2023, this notice was also mailed to property owners and

tenants located within a 900-foot radius of the parcel boundaries and to individuals and organizations known to be interested (“Notice Parties”). Notices were verified to be posted on the subject parcel on June 7, 2023 and were made available on the County’s website on June 1, 2023. Copies of the Draft EIR were also made available at Los Angeles County Planning.

Following the close of public comment period on the Draft EIR on July 24, 2023, detailed responses to all agency and public comments received regarding the Project and the analyses of the Draft EIR were prepared by LA County Planning staff with assistance from a private consultant, and reviewed and revised as necessary by County Planning and other County staff to reflect the County’s independent judgment on issues raised. These Responses to Comments are included in the Final EIR.

A public hearing on the Project and the Final EIR was held before the Commission on September 27, 2023, at which the Commission reviewed each of the alternatives presented by the Final EIR and recommended approval of the Project. At the conclusion of that hearing, the Commission made the following environmental findings and granted the Project Approvals.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e) on which the Commission’s CEQA findings are based are located at Los Angeles County Planning. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2).

IV. FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY LEAD AGENCY UNDER CEQA

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more of three possible findings for each of the significant impacts. Having received, reviewed, and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all other information in the record, the Commission, acting as the lead agency under CEQA with respect to the Project, hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21081 as follows:

- (a) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (b) Those changes or alterations that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of

another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency,

- (c) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the final environmental impact report.

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the Draft EIR, Final EIR, technical studies, and other CEQA related materials, staff reports, information provided by the Applicant, and the administrative record as a whole. Moreover, the County finds that where more than one reason exists for any finding, each reason independently supports such finding, and that any reason in support of a given finding individually constitutes a sufficient basis for that finding.

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impact that is found to be significant in the Final EIR for the Project as fully set forth therein. Although Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings nevertheless fully account for all such potentially significant effects identified in the Final EIR in order to provide a better understanding the full environmental scope of the Project. The following information is provided for each potentially significant impact and the significant impact identified in the Final EIR:

- a) Potential Effects – A specific description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR for each identified impact area, including a judgment regarding the significance of the impact.
- b) Plans, Programs, or Policies – Where applicable, identified existing regulation that would be applicable to the Project.
- c) Project Design Features – Where applicable, identified project design features or actions that are included as part of the Project.
- d) Mitigation Measures – Where applicable, identified mitigation measures or actions that are required as part of the Project.
- e) Findings – One or more of three specific findings in direct response to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 as discussed in the previous paragraph.
- f) Rationale for Finding – A rationale for the specific findings summarizing the reasons for the findings for each impact area.

These findings are based on the most current information available. Accordingly, to the extent there are any apparent conflicts or inconsistencies between the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, on the one hand, and these findings, on the other, these findings shall control and the Draft EIR and Final EIR or both, as the case may be, are hereby amended as set forth in these findings. Each of the Plans, Programs, or Policies, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures referenced in these findings shall be conditions of project approval to be monitored and enforced by the County pursuant to the building permit process and the MMRP. To the extent feasible, each of the other findings and conditions of approval made by or adopted by the County in connection with the Project are also incorporated herein by this reference.

The Final EIR has been prepared by the County in accordance with CEQA, as amended, and State and County Guidelines for implementation of CEQA. More specifically, the County has relied on Section 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which allows acceptance of drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. Los Angeles County Planning, acting for the County, has reviewed, considered, revised, and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

Within this Article IV, Section 1 of these findings discusses environmental effects found not to be significant in the Initial Study and Final EIR. Section 2 of these findings discusses the potential environmental effects of the Project which have been mitigated to a less than significant level. Section 3 of these findings discusses the significant environmental effects of the Project which cannot be feasibly mitigated to a level of insignificance. Section 4 discusses the growth-inducing impacts of the Project. Section 5 discusses Other Environmental Considerations, including the significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the Project should it be implemented and the secondary effects of implementation of mitigation measures imposed by the Project. Section 6 discusses the evaluation of Alternatives to the Project. Section 7 discusses the Project's MMRP. Section 8 contains the Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b). Section 9 contains the findings pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15092 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Section 10 contains the findings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3). Section 11 contains a finding that no recirculation is required. Section 12 identifies the custodian of the record upon which these findings are based. The findings set forth in each section are supported by substantial evidence in the

administrative record of the Project.

SECTION 1

EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The County prepared an Initial Study for the Project, which is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impacts by topic and the reasons that each topical area is or is not analyzed further in the Draft EIR. As further described in the Initial Study, the County determined that the Project would not result in significant impacts related to Aesthetics, Agricultural/Forest Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources (Sensitive Natural Communities, Wetlands, Oak Woodlands, Local Policies and Ordinances, Habitat Conservation Plan), Cultural Resources (Historical Resources), Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Government Code § 65962.5 sites, Airports, Emergency Plans, Fires), Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise (Airport Noise), Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation (Hazards in Road Design, Inadequate Emergency Access), Utilities (Water Supply, Wastewater Capacity, Solid Waste), and Wildfire.

After analysis in the Draft EIR Section 5.1, impacts in the following areas were determined to be less than significant: Transportation (Conflict with Policies Addressing the Circulation System). Based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the Commission finds that the foregoing environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed. The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact will occur in each of these issue areas is summarized below (and set forth in the Draft EIR in Section 5.1), and based on that rationale, and other evidence in the administrative record, the Commission finds that the preceding environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed.

The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact will occur in each of these issue areas is summarized below (and set forth in Draft EIR Section 6.0 and in the Initial Study (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), and based on that rationale, and other evidence in the administrative record as a whole, the Commission finds that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed. These topics were not, therefore, addressed in detail in the Final EIR.

1. Aesthetics

The Project site is within an urbanized area of unincorporated Los Angeles County, surrounded by residential developments. Given the distance of the Project site to any scenic features, impacts from development of the Project site with single-family residences to scenic vistas would be less than significant [Impact AES-1]. Similarly, the Project is not located in the vicinity of a County regional riding or hiking trail and thus would not result in impacts related to regional riding or hiking trails and scenic views. [Impact AES-2]. The Project is not located within view of a state scenic highway, as there are no designated scenic highways within the vicinity. The nearest state-designated scenic highway is California State Route 2, approximately 11 miles from the Project. The nearest eligible scenic highway is Highway 39, approximately 3.5 miles from the Project site. The Project would not result in impacts to trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact AES-3] (Initial Study, p. 10, Draft EIR, p. 6-5).

The Project site is designated as P (Public and Semi-Public) within the General Plan. The surrounding areas are designated as Residential 9 (H9), which allows for single-family residences at a density of up to nine dwelling units per net acre. The Project would have a density of approximately 7.15 du/acre, which is consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential densities. Thus, the Project would not conflict with applicable General Plan buildout densities that govern scenic quality. In addition, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan Conservation and Natural Resource Element goals and policies related to scenic quality. The Project site is currently zoned A-1-6,000 (Light Agriculture with 6,000 sq. ft. lot minimum). The Project would be consistent with the 6,000 sq. ft. lot minimums as the Project would consist of one common lot encompassing the entire 9.61-acre parcel. As shown in the Project plans incorporated herein, the Project would be consistent with the setbacks, maximum height requirements, and all additional development standards outlined in Section 22.140.580 of the Los Angeles County Code. Thus, the Project would not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact AES-4] (Initial Study, p. 10, Draft EIR, p. 6-5).

At the time the NOP was issued, the Project site was developed with six permanent buildings. The Project would introduce additional sources of light from new building security lighting, streetlights, interior lights shining through building windows, and headlights from nighttime vehicular trips generated from the Project. However, the Project would only slightly increase lighting and glare compared to the existing condition and new landscaping would be provided throughout the Project site that would limit impacts from new sources of light and glare. Landscaping, including trees, would limit spill of light to

adjacent properties. Also, as a standard condition of Project approval, the Project would be required to comply with lighting standards detailed in the County's Code, which requires construction-related and operation-related Project lighting to be shielded, diffused or indirect to avoid glare to both on and offsite residents, pedestrians, and motorists (Draft EIR pp. 6-6 to 6-7). Compliance with the County Code would be implemented through the construction permitting and plan check process. Therefore, impacts associated with new lighting would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact AES-5] (Initial Study, p. 10-14, Draft EIR, p. 6-6).

Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts

Potential Effect

Various development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the Project Site. These Cumulative Projects, in conjunction with the Project, may potentially result in cumulative impacts pertaining to aesthetics, views, light, or glare.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative aesthetic impacts due to the projects' locations and distances from each other, as well as the projects' compliance with adopted plans, regulations, and guidelines and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Rationale for Finding

Of future development in the surrounding area, only those projects sufficiently close to influence the visual character of the Project vicinity or affect the same off-site sensitive uses could pose cumulative effects in conjunction with the Project. None of the Cumulative Projects are located near enough to the Project Site to be within the same viewshed. Further, all Cumulative Projects would be expected to comply with adopted plans, regulations, and guidelines regarding the protection of scenic views. As such, cumulative impacts relative to views would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-7).

Development of the Project in combination with Cumulative Projects would introduce new sources of artificial light and thus could contribute to increased nighttime light levels as experienced by off-site sensitive uses. Cumulative projects would be expected to implement similar measures as the Project and comply with regulatory requirements to reduce light trespass. Therefore, cumulative impacts relative to light would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-7).

With regard to glare, only related development immediately adjacent to Project structures would have the potential to create glare that could collectively pose impacts affecting a given off-site use, property, or activity. None of the Cumulative Projects are close enough to the Project to cumulatively increase glare in the Project vicinity. In addition, it is anticipated that all future development projects would be required to implement applicable measures to ensure that significant sources of glare are not introduced. As such, cumulative glare impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-7).

Therefore, cumulative impacts related to views, light, and glare would be less than significant.

2. Agricultural and Forest Resources

The Project site is developed for urban uses and located in an area that is completely developed for urban uses. The Project site is zoned as Light Agriculture (A-1-6,000), is not burdened with Williamson Act contract, and the Project vicinity is void of agricultural uses. The Project development is an allowed use within the A-1-6,000 zoning designation, which allows for single-family residential development, outdoor recreational uses, and public and institutional facilities [Impact AG-2]. The California Department of Conservation Important Farmland mapping identifies the Project site as Urban and Built-Up land, and the site has not been used for agricultural uses since construction of the Griswold School. No areas of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the Project or converted to a non-agricultural use [Impact AG-1]. In addition, the Project site and vicinity is void of forest land or timberland. As the Project site and vicinity do not include these resources, no other changes to the existing environment would occur from implementation of the Project that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or forest/timberland land to non-forest or non-timberland use [Impact AG-3 through AG-5]. Thus, significant impacts related to agriculture and forestry resources would not occur, and no mitigation measures would be required (Initial Study, p. 15-16, Draft EIR, p. 6-8).

Cumulative Agricultural and Forestry Impacts

Potential Effect

Various development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the Project Site. These Cumulative Projects, in conjunction with the Project, may potentially result in cumulative impacts pertaining to agricultural and forestry resources.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative agricultural or forestry impacts due to the projects' locations and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Rationale for Finding

The Project site is developed for urban uses and located in an area that is completely developed for urban uses. Cumulative Projects are also located in an urbanized area of Los Angeles County and would not replace any agricultural or forestry resources. Due to the urbanized setting of the Project and Cumulative Projects, cumulative agricultural and forestry impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-8).

3. Air Quality

The Project would support SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) objectives to promote infill/redevelopment and balance jobs and housing for Los Angeles County and would not conflict with implementation of the AQMP. As a result, the Project would comply with Consistency Criterion No. 1 and would not result in growth that is substantially greater than what was anticipated [Impact AQ-1]. Furthermore, as substantiated by the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Energy Analysis prepared for the Project (included as Appendix B to the Draft EIR), the emissions resulting from construction and operation of the Project would be less than the SCAQMD's prescribed regional and localized significance thresholds [Impact AQ-2 through AQ-3]. Furthermore, construction of the single-family residents would not result in odors that affect a substantial amount of people [Impact AQ-4]. As such, impacts to air quality would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required (Initial Study, p. 17-21, Draft EIR, p. 6-8 to 6-10).

Plans, Programs, or Policies:

PPP AQ-1: SCAQMD Rule 403. The following measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403:

- All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.
- The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.
- The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.

PPP AQ-2: SCAQMD Rule 1113. The following measure shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 1113. The Project shall only use “Low-Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)” paints (no more than 50 gram/liter of VOC) consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1113.

PPP AQ-3: SCAQMD Rule 445. The following measure shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 445. Wood burning stoves and fireplaces shall not be included or used in the new development.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Potential Effect

Various development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the Project Site. These Cumulative Projects, in conjunction with the Project, may potentially result in cumulative impacts pertaining to air quality.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative air quality impacts due to the projects’ locations and distances from each other, as well as the projects’ compliance with adopted plans, regulations, and guidelines.

Rationale for Finding

Per SCAQMD’s methodology, if an individual project would result in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceeds the SCAQMD’s thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants.

As discussed in the Initial Study, the Project meets both the first and second criteria for determining consistency with the 2016 SCAQMD AQMP. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the 2016 AQMP and would also not result in a cumulatively considerable impact. Also, construction and operational activities related to buildout of the Project would not exceed any of the applicable SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, emissions would be less-than-cumulatively considerable (Initial Study, p. 18–19, Draft EIR, p. 6-9 to 6-10).

4. Biological Resources

The Project site does not contain any sensitive natural communities and the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur to sensitive natural communities, and no mitigation measures are required [Impact BIO-2] (Initial Study p. 22-23, Draft EIR, p. 6-10).

The Project site does not contain any state or federally protected wetlands and the Project would not 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. Therefore, redevelopment of the Project site would not result in impacts to wetlands, and no mitigation measures are required [Impact BIO-3] (Initial Study, p. 23, Draft EIR, p. 6-10).

The Project site does not contain any oak woodlands or other unique native woodlands and the Project would not 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 other unique native woodlands (juniper, Joshua, southern California black walnut, etc.). As a result, impacts to oak woodlands or unique native trees would not occur with implementation of the Project, and no mitigation is required [Impact BIO-5] (Initial Study, p. 24, Draft EIR, p. 6-11).

The Project site is developed and in an urbanized area, and the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas, the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance, the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), Specific Plans, Community Standards Districts, and/or Coastal Resource Areas. Overall, the Project would include the removal of ornamental trees and shrubs within the Project site. However, none of the existing trees and shrubs on site have been determined to be significant biological resources in the biological survey conducted on February 20, 2020. Furthermore, the Project site is not located in a Wildflower Reserve Area, Significant Ecological Area, Specific Plan, Community Standards District, or Coastal Resource Area. Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (e.g., a tree preservation policy or ordinance). Therefore, no impacts would occur with implementation of the Project, and no mitigation is required [Impact BIO-6] (Initial Study, p. 24, Draft EIR, p. 6-11).

The Project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan, and the Project would not conflict with the provisions of such a plan. As such, implementation of the Project would have no potential to conflict with a conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with

any conservation plan, no impact would occur [Impact BIO-7] (Initial Study, p. 24-25; Draft EIR, p. 6-10 to 6-11).

Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other Cumulative Projects, may potentially increase the potential impacts to biological resources, resulting in potentially significant cumulative impacts to such resources.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities, protected wetlands, oak woodlands due to lack of such environments. In addition, no cumulative impacts related to conflicts with local policies or approve state, regional, or local habitat plans would occur with compliance to Los Angeles County requirements.

Rationale for Finding

The proposed Project would not have significant impacts related to jurisdictional waters, wildlife movement, local ordinances or regulations protecting biological resources, habitat conservation plans, plant communities, and habitat fragmentation. The cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable survey requirements pursuant to Los Angeles County requirements and mitigation for biological resources. Since all projects would be required to implement their respective mitigation measures, their contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. There are no projects that would, in combination with the Project, produce a significant impact to biological resources (Draft EIR, p. 6-12)

5. Cultural Resources

There are no historic resources located on the Project site and the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5.

The Project site is currently developed with the vacant Griswold Elementary School. The

Project site was used as an elementary school between 1953 and 1974. It was later used as an adult school between 1978 and 2017. The Historical Resource Evaluation Report conducted for the Project describes that the school was one of 25 original schools designed by architect Henry L. Gogerty for the Covina-Valley Unified School District. The Griswold School is an example of a Mid-Century Modern school building. It was not the first of its kind and does not appear to have been instrumental in inciting or pioneering the Mid-Century Modern movement within the County of Los Angeles or the Covina-Valley Unified School District. As such, the Griswold School has not been found eligible under NRHP Criterion A or CRHR Criterion 1 as the property has not been associated with significant events or patterns of events in national, state, regional, or local history.

The Griswold School was named after May Evangeline Griswold (Dec. 28, 1875-Dec. 1967). Griswold's family were pioneers of the area and she was a long-time schoolteacher. May Evangeline Griswold's potential importance is not directly associated with the Griswold School. It has not been found individually eligible under NRHP Criterion B or CRHR Criterion 2 as it has not been identified as having an association with an important person.

The Griswold School campus possesses characteristics of the Mid-Century Modern style, but it is a typical example of postwar school construction conducted on a large scale using similar stylistic features and materials throughout the region. The commonly seen combination of design details and materials of this campus does not exemplify the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, because it is not an example of building practices from a particular time in history. Schools of similar design and form are extant throughout Southern California and research did not reveal any reason to suggest that this campus had an impact on this type of construction, nor does it represent an evolution or transition. The architect Henry L. Gogerty designed the school campus and the individual buildings. Gogerty was hired by the school district to design a number of campuses after World War II. Gogerty designed approximately 25 projects for the Covina-Valley Unified School District, as well as many others including approximately 20 projects for the Compton Unified School District. While Gogerty is undoubtedly considered a master architect, the Griswold School campus is not considered an important representation of his extensive portfolio of work. Within the Covina-Valley Union School District alone, it is one of many similar campus designs Gogerty completed. For these reasons, the Griswold School does not appear to be individually eligible under NRHP Criterion C or CRHR Criterion 3.

The Griswold School was constructed in 1953 on previously undeveloped agricultural land. Without evidence to indicate otherwise, the school has not been found eligible under NRHP Criterion D or CRHR Criterion 4 as further study of the property would not appear to yield information which would be considered important in local, regional, state, or national history. Therefore, the existing school facility does not meet any of the historic resource criteria and does not meet the definition of an historical resource pursuant to CEQA. Thus, impacts related to historic resources would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact CUL-1] (Initial Study, p. 27-28, Draft EIR, p. 6-14).

Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in context with past projects in Los Angeles County, may potentially increase the potential impacts to historical resources, resulting in potentially significant cumulative impacts to such resources within the vicinity of the Project Site.

Finding

The Project would not cause any cumulative impacts to historical resources due to the absence of historical resources onsite and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Rationale for Finding

The existing Griswold School facility does not meet any historic resource criteria; therefore, no mitigation measures are required and the Project would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts to historical resources. With compliance with County regulation and project-specific mitigation for cumulative projects, cumulative impacts would be less than significant, and the Project would make no contribution. (Initial Study, p. 91, Draft EIR, p. 6-15).

6. Energy

As demonstrated by the Air Quality, GHG, and Energy Analysis included as Appendix B to the Draft EIR, construction activities related to the Project would not result in demand for fuel greater on a per-unit-of-development basis than other development projects in southern California. Demolition of the existing buildings and infrastructure that exist onsite would need to be undertaken; however, because much of the demolition materials can be recycled, the demolition needed to implement the Project is not considered to be

wasteful. Construction would occur in three phases over a 21 to 27-month period and the demand for construction-related electricity and fuels would be limited to that time frame. The Project site is within an area where existing infrastructure would provide for efficient delivery of electricity and natural gas to the Project and the Project would not inhibit the development of other alternative energy sources. Furthermore, other existing and future regulations are likely to result in more efficient use of all types of energy, and reduction in reliance on non-renewable sources of energy. These include the federal Energy Independence and Security Act, the state Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, SB 350, and AB 1007, which are designed to reduce reliance on non-renewable energy resources and reduce demand by providing federal tax credits for purchasing fuel-efficient items and improving the renewable fuel, appliance, and lighting standards. Thus, operation of the Project would not use large amounts of energy or fuel in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner, and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact E-1] (Initial Study, p. 35, Draft EIR, p. 6-17).

The Project would be required to meet the Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect during permitting of the Project. The Project is subject to and shall be in compliance with the Los Angeles County Green Building Standards Code. The Green Building Standards Code requirements which must be complied with include Green Building, Low-Impact Development, and Drought Tolerant Landscaping. The Green Building Standards Code, Title 31, states that the purpose of the County's Green Building Standards Code, which was adopted in 2010, is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the use of building concepts having a reduced negative impact, or positive environmental impact, and encouraging sustainable construction practices. As such, the Project would be designed to meet all applicable State building energy efficiency standards as well as to meet the County's energy efficiency standards. Redevelopment of the site would not result in obstruction of opportunities for use of renewable energy due to the addition of PV panels on each home. Thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would not occur, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact E-2] (Initial Study, p. 32-36, Draft EIR, p. 6-17 to 6-18).

Cumulative Energy Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative energy resource impacts.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative energy resource impacts through compliance with current codes and other applicable laws and regulations.

Rationale for Finding

The Project's energy use would not be considered to be substantial when compared to statewide energy use. The County and state have mandated goals and objectives to maximize energy efficiency (e.g., the County's Green Building Standards Code and the 2019 CALGreen Code), which contain requirements for construction site selection, storm water control during construction, construction solid waste reduction, indoor water use reduction, material selection, natural resource conservation, site irrigation conservation and more. The Project would fully comply with these requirements.

Given the Project's consistency with state and County energy reduction goals and objectives, the contribution to a cumulative inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary use of energy resources would be less than significant and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing energy use. Similarly, the Cumulative Projects would also be anticipated to incorporate energy conservation features and comply with these same energy reduction goals and objectives as required by the various local governing codes and regulations (e.g., the 2019 CALGreen Code, Title 24 and the County's Green Building Standards Code). Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with energy consumption and regulatory compliance would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-18).

7. Geology and Soils

As further described in the Geotechnical & Infiltration Evaluation, included as Appendix G to the Draft EIR, there are no known active or potentially active faults within the Project site or within the immediate area. The nearest fault line is the Sierra Madre Fault located approximately three (3) miles to the north of the Project site (CGS 2020). Since no known faults exist within a mile of the Project site, and since the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, impacts related to rupture would be less than significant [Impact GEO-1i]. Furthermore, while development of the Project could subject people and structures to hazards from ground shaking, the Project would be required to adhere to the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC), included as PPP GEO-1, which would reduce impacts related to ground shaking to a less than significant level, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact GEO-1ii] (Initial Study, p. 37, Draft EIR, p. 6-19).

The depth of groundwater on the Project site is anticipated to be at a depth of 150 feet or greater, therefore, the potential for liquefaction to occur is low (Geotek 2020). Compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, would require specific engineering design recommendations be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of construction permit approval to ensure that Project structures would withstand the effects of seismic ground movement, including liquefaction and settlement. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC and County Code for structural safety (included as PPP GEO-1) would reduce hazards from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and settlement to a less than significant level, and no mitigation measures would be required. [Impact GEO-1iii] (Initial Study, p. 37, Draft EIR, p. 6-19).

The Project site is relatively flat and does not contain any hills or steep slopes, nor is surrounded by any hills or steep slopes. The nearest landslide zone is approximately 0.48-mile (2,537 feet) from the Project site. Due to the lack of onsite and offsite hills and slopes, the Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Impacts related to landslides would be less than significant with implementation of the Project [Impact GEO-1iv] (Initial Study, p. 38, Draft EIR, p. 6-19).

Based on the relatively flat topography of the site, lack of exposed rock surfaces nearby and lack of a liquefaction hazard area, the Geotechnical Report determined that there is no potential for lateral spreading on the site and it is not considered to be a hazard (Geotek 2020). Thus, impacts related to lateral spreading would be less than significant (Initial Study, p. 39, Draft EIR, p. 6-20).

The Geotechnical Report identified that seismic induced settlement onsite could be about 1-inch; and differential seismic settlement is estimated as less than ½-inch over a 40-foot span (Geotek 2020). However, these estimated magnitudes of settlement do not warrant any mitigation or special foundation design (Geotek 2020). In addition, the Project includes excavation and re-compaction of soils, and development of foundation systems in compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, which would require proper construction of building foundations to reduce impacts related to settlement and subsidence would not occur onsite, and no mitigation measures would be required.

During construction activities, soil would be exposed and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. Additionally, during a storm event, soil erosion could occur at an accelerated rate. The increased erosion potential could result in short-term water quality impacts. The Project would increase the impervious surface area on the Project site compared to existing conditions. This would change the volume of stormwater runoff generated from the Project site. However, since the Project site is relatively flat, soil erosion would be controlled via implementation of

standard erosion control practices required by a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction (included as PPP WQ-1). Once developed, the Project's implementation would not increase the volume of runoff from the Project site because the Project would include landscaped pervious surfaces intended to capture stormwater runoff, as well as new drainage infrastructure designed to accommodate the increase in stormwater runoff. In addition, implementation of the Project requires County approval of a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which would ensure that the County Code, RWQCB requirements, and appropriate operational best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur. As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact GEO-2] (Initial Study, p. 38, Draft EIR, p. 6-19).

As described by the Geotechnical Report, onsite alluvium varied from a poorly graded sand, silty sand to a sandy silt. The sandy soils were noted to range from loose to very dense and the silt soils possessed a medium stiff to hard consistency. However, the soils onsite would be excavated to a minimum of six (6) feet below existing or finished grade for at least seven (7) feet beyond the building perimeters, reconditioned, and recompacted as engineered fill to support the proposed building structures. As part of reconditioning the compacted engineered fill, the soils would be moisture conditioned, as required by the CBC for expansive soils. Furthermore, prior to approval of construction, an engineering level design geotechnical report is required to be prepared and submitted to the County that details the Project designs that have been included to address potential geotechnical and soil conditions pursuant to the CBC requirements, that are included in the County Code Chapter in Title 26 and implemented by PPP GEO-1. Compliance with the CBC, through design level geotechnical specifications that would be reviewed and approved by the County Engineer, per PPP GEO-1 would ensure that potential impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact GEO-4] (Initial Study, p. 39, Draft EIR, p. 6-20).

Additionally, the Project would connect into existing sewer infrastructure and would not use septic tanks or alternative methods for disposal of wastewater. Therefore, no impacts would occur related to alternative wastewater disposal methods, and no mitigation measures would be required [Impact GEO-5] (Initial Study, p. 37-40, Draft EIR, p. 6-18 to 6-20).

Regarding the Hillside Management Area Ordinance, the Project site is relatively flat with a gentle slope to the southwest and the surrounding area is also relatively flat. The site is also not located within a Hillside Management Area as such, the Project would not conflict with the ordinance and no impacts would occur [Impact GEO-6] (Initial Study, p. 40, Draft EIR, p. 6-21).

Cumulative Geology Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative geotechnical and soil resource impacts.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative geotechnical and soils resource impacts through compliance with current building and seismic safety codes and other applicable laws and regulations.

Rationale for Finding

Due to the site-specific nature of geological conditions, geotechnical impacts are typically assessed on a project-by-project basis. Cumulative projects would be subject to varying risks associated with geotechnical hazards. The Cumulative Projects are all located in Southern California, a seismically active region, and would therefore be subject to hazards during seismic events, including ground shaking, rupture, liquefaction, and subsidence. However, as with the Project, Cumulative Projects in the area would be subject to regulations pertaining to geology and soils, including California Building Code and Los Angeles County Building Code requirements, that would require structures of all Cumulative Projects be constructed to meet minimum seismic safety standards. In addition, Cumulative Project impacts would be addressed through imposition of recommendations specific to each project. Therefore, with regulatory compliance, cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-21).

Plans, Programs, or Policies:

PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance. The Project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code (CBC) as included in the County Code as Title 26, to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. As part of CBC compliance, CBC related and geologist and/or civil engineer specifications for the Project shall be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The County of Los Angeles does not provide any quantitative GHG emissions thresholds for new development projects nor does it provide any direction on how to analyze new development projects within the County. As such, a quantitative analysis was conducted

by the Air Quality, GHG, and Energy Analysis which concluded that the Project would result in 898.44 MTCO₂e per year (Appendix B to the Draft EIR) [Impact GHG-1]. The Project would be consistent with the County's Draft 2045 Climate Action Plan (CAP), the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan, and the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS [Impact GHG-2]. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a), the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions. (Draft EIR, p. 6-21 to 6-34).

Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative greenhouse gas emission impacts.

Rationale for Finding

GHG emissions impacts are assessed in a cumulative context, since no single project can cause a discernible change to climate. Climate change impacts are the result of incremental contributions from natural processes, and past and present human-related activities. Therefore, the area in which a proposed project in combination with other past, present, or future projects, could contribute to a significant cumulative climate change impact would not be defined by a geographical boundary such as a project site or combination of sites, city or air basin. GHG emissions have high atmospheric lifetimes and can travel across the globe over a period of 50 to 100 years or more. Even though the emissions of GHGs cannot be defined by a geographic boundary and are effectively part of the global issue of climate change, CEQA places a boundary for the analysis of impacts at the state's borders. Thus, the geographic area for analysis of cumulative GHG emissions impacts is the State of California.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Nunez), recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions. The statute begins with several legislative findings and declarations of intent, including the following:

Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the

state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems” (California Health and Safety Code, Section 38501(a)).

Thus, AB 32 recognizes the significance of the statewide cumulative impact of GHG emissions from sources throughout the state and sets a performance standard for mitigation of that cumulative impact.

The analysis of GHG emission impacts under CEQA effectively constitutes an analysis of a project’s contribution to the significant cumulative impact of GHG emissions. The SCAQMD developed a tiered approach to determine if a project would result in less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions, contained in the SCAQMD Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas Significance Threshold. A screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO_{2e}, applicable for all land use types, was used for a conservative analysis as compared to the 3,500 MTCO_{2e} residential-specific threshold. As described previously, the estimated GHG emissions from construction and operation of the Project would be lower than the threshold of 3,000 MTCO_{2e}. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to GHG emissions, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-21 to 6-34).

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

According to the California DTSC EnviroStor database, the Project site is not located on a federal Superfund site, State response site, voluntary cleanup site, school cleanup site, corrective action site, or tiered permit site. Therefore, the Project would not result in an impact related to a known hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment [Impact HAZ-4] (Initial Study, p. 48, Draft EIR, p. 6-39).

The Project is not within an airport land use plan and is located approximately 5.5 miles to the east of the San Gabriel Airport, which is the closest airport and is open for public use. Additionally, the residential development would not be of a sufficient height to require modifications to the existing air traffic patterns at the airport and, therefore, would not affect aviation traffic levels or otherwise result in substantial aviation-related safety risks. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts to an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area [Impact HAZ-5] (Initial Study, p. 48, Draft EIR, p. 6-39).

Construction

The County's General Plan Safety Element outlines goals and policies aimed at reducing the potential risk of death, injuries, and economic damage resulting from natural and man-made hazards. Additionally, the County's General Plan Safety Element works in conjunction with the Operational Area Response Plan, which is prepared by the County's Chief Executive Office – Office of Emergency Management. The Operational Area Emergency Response Plan strengthens short and long-term emergency and recovery capability and identifies emergency procedures, as well as emergency routes in Los Angeles County.

The Office of Emergency Management prepares the All-Hazard Mitigation Plan, which provides policy guidance for minimizing threats from natural and man-made hazards in Los Angeles County. The Project does not include any characteristics (e.g., permanent road closures or long-term blocking of road access) that would physically impair or otherwise conflict with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. During short-term construction activities, the Project is not anticipated to result in any substantial traffic queuing on nearby streets, and all construction equipment would be staged within the Project site. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans associated with construction of the Project would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-6] (Initial Study, p. 49, Draft EIR, p. 6-39).

Operation

The Project does not include any changes to public or private roadways that would physically impair or otherwise conflict with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Further, the Project would not obstruct or alter any transportation routes that could be used as evacuation routes during emergency events. During the operational phase of the Project, onsite access would be required to comply with standards established by the County. The size and location of fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants) and fire access routes would be required to conform to County's fire standards. The Project would provide adequate emergency access to the site via private shared driveways from San Bernardino Road. Further, access to and from the Project site for emergency vehicles would be reviewed and approved by the County as part of the approval process to ensure the Project is compliant with all applicable codes and ordinances for emergency vehicle access. Therefore, impacts related to interference with an emergency response plan are considered less than significant [Impact HAZ-6] (Initial Study, p. 48-49, Draft EIR, p. 6-39).

The Project site is not within an area identified as a Fire Hazard Area that may contain substantial fire risk or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to CalFire. Furthermore, the Project site would include adequate access. Therefore, impacts related to wildland fire would not occur [Impact HAZ-7i].

The Project site is located within an urban developed area and is not located within an identified wildland fire hazard area and is not an area where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The Project would include onsite water pipes that connect to the existing water line in San Bernardino Road. Furthermore, the Project is required to comply with Los Angeles County Code Sections 20.16.040 and 20.16.060, which set water flow requirements for residential developments, onsite water lines, and fire hydrants. The Fire Hydrant Flow Report prepared for the Project site that was conducted by Azusa Light & Water found that the existing hydrant has a flow of 4,290 gpm at 20 psi, which meets the required flow standard of 1,250 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving fires because the Project is located within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards, and impacts would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-7ii].

The Project site is not within proximity to land uses that have the potential for a dangerous fire hazard. The area surrounding the Project site is developed with single-family residences and is not in an area with excessive amounts of dry brush that pose significant fire risks. The train tracks adjacent to the Project are maintained and properly cleared of dry brush by Metrolink contractors and the train tracks do not pose a significant hazard. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving fires because the Project is within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazards, and impacts would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-7iii] (Initial Study, p. 50, Draft EIR, p. 6-39 to 6-40).

The Project would develop residential land uses. None of the uses related to the Project would constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard and impacts would not occur. With adherence to existing regulatory requirements, the Project would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. [Impact HAZ-8] (Initial Study, p. 50, Draft EIR, p. 6-40).

Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Finding

The Project and the Cumulative Projects would not cause any cumulative hazards impacts related to the impairment of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan nor impacts related to exposure to fire hazard, through compliance with current building and fire safety codes and other applicable laws and regulations.

Rationale for Finding

Since impacts related to impairment of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan nor impacts related to exposure to fire hazard are largely site-specific, this evaluation would occur on a case-by-case basis, in conjunction with development proposals on these properties. Cumulative Projects would be required to implement similar measures to those proposed for the Project. Therefore, with compliance of all applicable local, state, and federal rules and regulations, cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-40).

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Demolition of existing structures, grading, stockpiling of materials, excavation and the import/export of soil and building materials, construction of new structures, and landscaping activities would expose and loosen sediment and building materials, which have the potential to mix with stormwater and urban runoff and degrade surface and receiving water quality. Pollutants of concern during construction activities generally include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. Each of these pollutants on its own or in combination with other pollutants can have a detrimental effect on water quality. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (such as paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked during construction, which would have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into nearby receiving waters and eventually may affect surface or groundwater quality. During construction activities, excavated soil would be exposed, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to occur compared to existing conditions. In addition, during construction, vehicles and equipment are prone to tracking soil and/or spoil from work areas to paved roadways, which is another form of erosion that could affect water quality. However, the use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the NPDES General Construction Permit and included as PPP WQ-1 would serve to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant. Furthermore, an Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan prepared by a qualified SWPPP developer (QSD) is required to be included in the SWPPP

for the Project. Therefore, compliance with the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit requirements, included as PPP WQ-1, which would be verified during the County's construction permitting process, would ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact WQ-1] (Draft EIR, p. 6-41 to 6-42).

The Project would result in operation of residential uses on the site that could generate pollutants such as suspended solids, nutrients, bacteria/viruses/pathogens, pesticides, oil and grease, trash and debris. These pollutants could potentially discharge into surface waters and result in degradation of water quality. However, the Project would be required to comply with the NPDES permit requirements, which are included in the Los Angeles County Code Chapter 12.80, that would limit the potential for pollutants to discharge from the site. Pursuant to the existing requirements, construction includes installation of drainage infrastructure that would convey runoff to the south to a basin for infiltration and treatment. After treatment through the infiltration basin, flows that have not infiltrated into site soils would be conveyed to the existing stormwater culvert in E. San Bernardino Road. In compliance with the NPDES Permit and Los Angeles County Code, development projects are required to prepare a Low-Impact Development (LID) report, included as PPP WQ-2. The LID report identifies non-structural, structural, and source control and treatment control BMPs to protect surface water quality. The LID report is required to be approved prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit (Appendix K to the Draft EIR). In addition, the County's permitting process would ensure that all BMPs in the LID report would be implemented during construction and operation. Overall, implementation of the LID report pursuant to the existing regulations (included as PPP WQ-2) would ensure that implementation of the Project would not violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise degrade water quality; and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact WQ-1] (Draft EIR, p. 6-41 to 6-42).

Water to the Project site would be provided by Azusa Light and Water (ALW). The Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin provides approximately 66.2 percent of ALW's water supply. The remaining supply comes from the San Gabriel River (33.8%). Watermaster provides management of groundwater supplies within the Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basin through their yearly Operating Safe Yield. The supply of water from ALW would be sufficient during both normal years and multiple dry year conditions to meet all the service area's estimated needs, including the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in changes to the projected groundwater pumping that would decrease groundwater supplies. Furthermore, as discussed previously, the Project would include an infiltration basin and would comply with required LID standards, which would ensure the Project would not significantly decrease groundwater infiltration onsite. Thus, impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact

WQ-2] (Draft EIR, p. 6-42).

The Project site does not include, and is not adjacent to, a stream or river, or within a floodplain. Implementation of the Project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Overall, with implementation of the existing regulations and provision of BMPs that would be verified by the County during the permitting approval process, impacts related to alteration of an existing drainage pattern during construction and operation that could result in substantial erosion, siltation, and increases in stormwater or polluted runoff would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact WQ-3i through 3iii] (Draft EIR, p. 6-43).

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Map 06037C1700F), the Project site is located in Zone X, which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year floodplains. Therefore, development of the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and no impacts would occur [Impact WQ-3iv and WQ-4] (Initial Study, p. 52-59, Draft EIR, p. 6-43).

Pursuant to Chapter 12.84 of the County's Code (LID Standards), construction, and operation BMPs would be implemented as a standard condition of the Project, which would reduce impacts to water quality during construction and operation, including those impacts associated with soil erosion and siltation. The LID Standards require that new development (1) mimics undeveloped stormwater runoff rates and volumes in any storm event up to and including the Capital Flood; (2) prevents pollutants of concern from leaving the development site in stormwater as the result of storms, up to and including a Water Quality Design Storm Event; and (3) minimizes hydromodification impacts to natural drainage systems. Compliance with the LID Standards of the County's Code would be implemented through the development permitting and plan check process. As described previously, with implementation of the Project, the implementation of BMPs would result in a 25-year storm flow of 17.61 cubic feet per second (cfs), which is a 0.44 cfs decrease in runoff on the site. Therefore, stormwater runoff from the site would decrease compared to existing runoff flow. Development of the Project would comply with the County's LID Standards and would incorporate BMPs that are consistent with the County's LID program. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with the County's LID program, a water quality control plan, or sustainable groundwater management plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required [Impact WQ-5 and WQ-8] (Draft EIR, p. 6-43 to 6-44).

Wastewater from the Project site is conveyed via County sewer infrastructure to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant which is designed for a capacity of 100 million gallons of wastewater per day. No wastewater treatment systems, onsite or offsite, are proposed as part of the Project and therefore, no impacts would occur [Impact WQ-6]

(Initial Study, p. 58, Draft EIR, p. 6-44).

Plans, Programs, or Policies:

PPP WQ-1: NPDES/SWPPP. Prior to issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the Applicant shall provide the County Department of Public Works evidence of compliance with the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or larger. The Applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

PPP WQ-2: LID. Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits, a LID Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Department of Public Works. The LID Plan shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development Project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.

Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative hydrology and drainage impacts.

Finding

The Project and Cumulative Projects would meet all local County and State hydrology and water quality requirements. The cumulative impacts of the Project and Cumulative Projects with respect to hydrology and water quality are not significant.

Rationale for Finding

Pursuant to Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) requirements, all future drainage facilities in the County must be designed for either the capital storm or the 25-year urban design storm (storm drains under major and secondary highways, open channels, debris carrying systems, and sumps must be designed for the capital storm). LACDPW also prohibits increases in off-site post-development storm flows and increases in storm flow velocities. As a result of compliance with LACDPW requirements, overall storm runoff discharge quantities from the Project site under post-development runoff

conditions would be less than or equal to existing conditions.

Project design would be in compliance with all applicable site design requirements to ensure that the Project conditions will cause no incremental contribution to the cumulative impact of watershed-wide development. Because the cumulative project drainage improvements in Los Angeles County would be required to conform to the requirements of LACDPW in order to accommodate the capital flood from the affected watershed, no potentially significant cumulative project flooding impacts are expected to occur. The development criteria imposed on each project by LACDPW would ensure no potentially significant cumulative impacts.

Other projects within the County would not only be subject to the same general requirements as the Project, but to other requirements that LACDPW Water Resources Division may specifically identify for such projects based on their unique topographic and geologic characteristics. All development within unincorporated Los Angeles County is required to comply with the LACDPW Water Resources Division requirements, which are designed to ensure that upstream or downstream flooding does not occur, and to ensure that downstream erosion and sedimentation do not occur.

As with the Project, any future urban development occurring in the San Gabriel River watershed must also comply with adopted regulatory requirements that are designed by the Los Angeles RWQCB to assure that regional development does not adversely affect water quality, including Los Angeles County MS4 Permit requirements; General Permit and General Dewatering Permit requirements; and benchmark Basin Plan water quality objectives, California Toxic Rules criteria, and TMDLs. All development in unincorporated areas of the County would be required to adhere to the requirements of the Los Angeles County LID Ordinance. Further, the City of Covina has adopted its own low-impact development standards regarding water use and quality which projects within the City's boundaries would be required to implement. Therefore, no significant unavoidable cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would occur (Draft EIR, p. 6-44 to 6-45).

11. Land Use and Planning

The Project site is bounded by a railway easement to the north, San Bernardino Road to the south, and single-family residential developments to the east and west. The Project would replace the existing school buildings with single-family residential uses and would not physically divide an established community. The land uses proposed for the site are consistent with the land uses designated by County's General Plan, as well as consistent with residential land uses in the immediate Project vicinity. In addition, Project

implementation would not disturb or alter access to any existing adjacent uses. Therefore, the Project would not result in the physical division of any established community, and no impacts would occur [Impact LU-1] (Draft EIR, p. 6-45).

The Project site currently has a General Plan land use designation of Public and Semi-Public (P). The P designation allows residential land uses because the area surrounding the Project site is similar to and compatible with the proposed single-family residences. The existing surrounding residential uses are designated as Residential 9 (H9), which allows for single-family residential uses at densities of up to 9 dwelling units per net acre. Therefore, the Project's density of approximately 7.15 du/acre would be consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential densities. Therefore, the Project is consistent and compatible with the General Plan. Title 22 describes and elaborates on permitted land uses and contains more specific information related to allowable building intensities and development standards. The Project site has a zoning designation of A-1-6,000, which requires a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. According to Title 22, Section 22.16.030 of the Los Angeles County Code, single-family residences are allowable uses in this zone. The Project would develop 68 single-family residences within the 9.61-acre Project site. The Project would include one residential lot of 9.61 acres. The Project would comply with the minimum required lot area requirement set forth in Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code, and the Project would not conflict with the land use plan, policies, or regulations [Impact LU-2] (Initial Study, p. 60-61, Draft EIR, p. 6-45 to 6-46).

The Project is within an urbanized residential area of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed Project is not located within any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and is not located in a Hillside Management Area or Significant Ecological Area; thus, no conflicts would occur with related General Plan goals and policies [Impact LU-3] (Initial Study, p. 60, Draft EIR, p. 6-46)

Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative land use and planning impacts.

Finding

The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, when considered together with Cumulative Projects, with respect to compliance with planning and land use plans and regulatory provisions.

Rationale for Finding

Future growth in the Project vicinity through 2023 (i.e., the Project buildout year) associated with identified Related Projects in the area and general ambient growth would have the potential to alter the existing land use environment due to infill development at increased densities and/or conversion of existing land uses (e.g., commercial to residential). However, future development projects would be subject to existing zoning and land use designations as well as environmental review by the appropriate jurisdiction. Further, the Cumulative Projects are typical of the area including residential, industrial, and commercial development. Like the Project, development of the Cumulative Projects is expected to occur in accordance with adopted plans and regulations. Therefore, such future projects are not expected to fundamentally alter the existing land use relationships in the community. If plan amendments or zone changes are needed to accommodate particular projects, they would be carried out in accordance with established local procedures, including CEQA review and an evaluation of consistency with policies/regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating a physical impact on the environment.

All new projects would be required to be consistent with adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations, would be subject to appropriate permit approval processes and would incorporate mitigation measures necessary to reduce potential land use impacts. Furthermore, as the Project would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, the Project would not incrementally contribute to significant cumulative land use inconsistencies. Therefore, no significant cumulative land use impacts are anticipated (Draft EIR, p. 6-46).

12. Mineral Resources

No active mining operations exist within the Project site. While the mapping by the California Geological Survey shows that the Project site is partially in mineral resource zones MRZ-2 and MRZ-3, which indicates the potential for mineral deposits within the site, the Project area is fully developed with urban uses and has no history of mining. Implementation of the Project would not cause the loss of availability of mineral resources valuable to the region or state, and impacts would be less than significant [Impacts MIN-1 and MIN-2] (Initial Study, p. 62, Draft EIR, p. 6-46).

Cumulative Mineral Resource Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending projects

within the vicinity of the Project Site, could increase the potential impacts to mineral resources resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact in the Project area.

Finding

Due to the developed nature of the Project vicinity and Cumulative Project area, the Project and Cumulative Projects would not result in significant cumulative impacts to mineral resources.

Rationale for Finding

The Project site and area surrounding the Project, including the Cumulative Project area has not historically been used for mineral resource extraction. Additionally, potential impacts related to mineral resources would vary on a site-by-site basis. As the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, the Project would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts to mineral resources (Draft EIR, p. 6-40 to 6-41).

13. Noise

The Project is not within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Project site is located approximately 5.5 miles to the east of the San Gabriel Airport, which is the closest public airport. Due to the distance from the San Gabriel Airport, the Project would not expose people residing in the Project area to excessive noise levels from aircraft. Therefore, no impacts would occur [Impact NOI-3] (Initial Study, p. 69, Draft EIR, p. 6-49 to 6-50).

14. Population and Housing

Based on a SCAG population density factor of 3.85 persons per household for the community of unincorporated Covina, the Project would result in a net increase of approximately 262 new residents. Overall, the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy's (2020-2045 RTP/SCS) population and household growth forecast from 2016 through 2045 for the County's unincorporated area envisions 213,500 additional persons, yielding an approximately 20.4% growth rate. The unincorporated areas of Los Angeles are projected to have a population of 1,258,000 persons and 419,300 housing units by 2045. The Project would generate approximately 262 persons, which represents approximately 0.0002 percent of the forecasted population in 2045 and approximately 0.001 percent of the forecasted growth between 2016 and 2045 for the County's unincorporated area. Thus, the proposed increase in housing units and

population as a result of the Project is within SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast. (Draft EIR, p. 6-51).

Furthermore, the Project is located in an urbanized residential area of unincorporated Los Angeles County and is surrounded by residential uses. The Project would be served by new onsite sewer main lines that would be maintained by the Los Angeles County Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District, and each residence would be served by a separate house lateral, which would be maintained by the property owner. In addition, vehicular access would be provided by new private shared driveways from San Bernardino Road. Because the Project proposes development in an already built-out neighborhood, it would not indirectly induce population growth through the extension of roads or other infrastructure. In addition, the Project would not create employment opportunities that could induce population growth. Therefore, potential impacts related to inducement of unplanned population growth, either directly or indirectly, would be less than significant [Impact POP-1] (Draft EIR, pp. 6-51).

The existing Project site does not provide any residential uses. Therefore, the Project would not displace a substantial number of existing people and would also provide 68 new residential units on the Project site. With construction of the additional housing units, replacement housing would not need to be constructed elsewhere. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing [Impact POP-2] (Initial Study, p. 71-72, Draft EIR, p. 6-51).

Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the Project Site, would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and result in significant impacts related to population and housing.

Finding

The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, when considered together with Cumulative Projects, with respect to population and housing impacts.

Rationale for Finding

Impacts from cumulative population growth are considered in the context of their consistency with local and regional planning efforts. As discussed, SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS serves as a long-range vision plan for development in the counties of San Bernardino, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and Ventura. The Project would

not exceed the SCAG population, housing, and employment growth projections for the unincorporated County. Based on the growth projections analyzed in SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, full buildout of the Project, including buildout of up to 68 single-family residences would represent approximately 0.001 percent of projected housing growth in the unincorporated County through 2045. Thus, impacts related to cumulative growth would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable (Draft EIR, p. 6-52).

15. Public Services

Fire protection and emergency medical services in the County of Los Angeles are provided by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) from 175 fire stations. There are currently five (5) county operated fire stations located within 3.5 miles of the Project site. Station 48, which is located 1.3 miles from the Project site, is the first responding station to the property. LACoFD's average response time for on-scene services is approximately five (5) minutes and their standard is to arrive on scene within 30 minutes. Station 48 would have an on-scene response time of approximately four (4) to five (5) minutes to the Project site. Because the Project site is within 3.5 miles of five (5) existing fire stations and the Project site is within a developed area that is currently served by these stations, the Project would not result in the requirement to construct a new fire station. In addition, the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Fire Prevention Fees require a developer impact fee be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit, which provides funding for the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of fire station facilities. Additionally, the Project would remove the existing school, which was constructed pursuant to fire code standards of 1953 and develop new building structures pursuant to the most recent California building and fire codes, which would improve the structural fire safety over the existing buildings. California's building/fire codes are published in their entirety every three years and were most recently updated in 2019. As for all projects within the County, the Project would be required per County permitting to comply with existing regulations within the Los Angeles County Fire Code. The Project would require the installation of various fire protection systems, including sprinkler systems. Therefore, with implementation of the California building and fire codes, and payment of developer fees, impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant [Impact PS-1, Fire] (Initial Study, p. 73-74, Draft EIR, p. 6-52).

The Los Angeles County Sheriff Department (LASD) provides law enforcement and protection services in unincorporated Los Angeles County, including the Project area. The Project site would be served by the San Dimas Sheriff's Station, which is located approximately 8.1 roadway miles from the Project site. In 2020, the San Dimas Sheriff's Station had 137 personnel which includes sworn and non-sworn positions. Based on the LASD's 2019 Synopsis, the total population of the area served by the San Dimas Sheriff's

Station was 84,240 people. The San Dimas Station's officer to population ratio is approximately 1.63 officers per 1,000 population. The residential population of the Project site would be approximately 262 residents and based on the Sheriff's Department's 2019 staffing of 1.63 officers per thousand population, the Project would not require any additional officers. Furthermore, the Project site is part of an existing patrol area covered by LASD. Therefore, with existing personnel at the San Dimas Sheriff's Station, law enforcement personnel are anticipated to be able to respond in a timely manner, and within set standard response times, to emergency calls in the Project area. Therefore, the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered LASD service facilities. Thus, substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or expanded facilities would not occur [Impact PS-1, Sheriff] (Initial Study, p. 74-75, Draft EIR, p. 6-53).

The Project site is located within the Covina Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) boundary. The Project site is within the school boundaries of Manzanita Elementary School, Las Palmas Middle School, and Northview High School. The Covina Valley Unified School District uses the State's Student Yield Factor for Unified School Districts, which is 0.7 student per dwelling unit (Office of Public School Construction 2009). Using this factor, the proposed 68 residences could result in approximately 48 new students that would range in age from elementary through high school. While development of the new residential units would increase the number of students, this increase would be accommodated by the existing schools. The enrollment for the schools serving the Project site ranged by 183 students in the elementary school, 121 students in the middle school, and 141 students in the high school between the 2019-2020 and the 2013-2014 school years (California Department of Education 2020). Furthermore, none of the schools serving the Project site are near their capacity limits according to the CVUSD. Thus, the 48 new students generated from the Project would be accommodated by existing school facilities. Additionally, the need for additional school facilities is addressed through compliance with school impact fee assessment. SB 50 (Chapter 407 of Statutes of 1998) sets forth a state school facilities construction program that includes restrictions on a local jurisdiction's ability to condition a project on mitigation of a project's impacts on school facilities in excess of fees set forth in the Government Code. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be less than significant [Impact PS-1, School] (Initial Study, p. 75-76, Draft EIR, p. 6-53).

The proposed open space and recreation area on the Project site and the facilities provided by the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation would provide park services to the Project. According to the 2016 Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment (the most recent park needs assessment), there are 3.3 acres of local and regional recreation park per 1,000 residents, which is less than the 4.0 acres per 1,000 goal included in the Los Angeles County General Plan. For regional

open space and natural areas, there are 86.2 acres per 1,000 people countywide. Based on the Project's generation of 262 new residents, the Project would result in a demand for 0.84 acre of local parkland and 1.3 acres of regional parkland. A large portion of the Project's park demand would be met onsite with the Project's provision of 0.82 acre (35,780 square feet) of recreational amenities including walkways, gathering spaces, barbeques, and a playground for use by residents within the complex. In addition, the Project would be required to pay parkland fees in compliance with County Code Section 21.28.140. These fees would be used for the maintenance of existing parkland and provision of future parkland within the County. The County currently has over 69,595 acres of parkland, with approximately 998 acres within 1.5 miles of the Project site. As such, with provision of onsite recreational amenities and payment of park fees, the Project would not result in significant environmental impacts related to parks [Impact PS-1, Parks] (Initial Study, p. 76, Draft EIR, p. 6-53 to 6-54).

The Project is not expected to result in significant demand for other public facilities or services, including libraries. The Project is not likely to create capacity or service level problems or result in substantial adverse physical impacts for any other public facility. As such, the Project would not significantly adversely affect other public facilities or services, and therefore would not require the construction of new or modified public facilities. Less than significant impacts would occur to other public facilities [Impact PS-1, Libraries and Other Facilities] (Initial Study, p. 76, Draft EIR, p. 6-64).

Cumulative Public Services Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the Project Site, could increase the potential impacts to public services, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact in the Project area.

Finding

As with the Project, each Cumulative Project is required to ensure that adequate public services can serve that project, and to comply with all required regulations. As such, cumulative impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Rationale for Finding

As with the Project, each Cumulative Project would be developed in an urbanized area with adequate public services provided by various departments. Each project would be required to comply with existing regulations such as the California Fire Code, school impact fees, and development impact fees, which would ensure that each project would

not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to any public services (Draft EIR, p. 6-55).

16. Recreation

According to the 2016 Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment, there are 3.3 acres of local and regional recreation park per 1,000 residents, which is less than the 4.0 acres per 1,000 goal included in the Los Angeles County General Plan. For regional open space and natural areas, there are 86.2 acres per 1,000 people countywide. The Project-related increase in population could incrementally increase the use of existing parks within unincorporated areas of the County. The Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140 requires the developer of a residential subdivision to mitigate recreational impacts by dedicating park space, paying an in-lieu fee, or doing a combination of the two. The Project would include approximately 35,780 square feet of onsite recreational amenities. Residents are anticipated to utilize the onsite open space to a greater degree than offsite facilities due to convenience and proximity. In this way, the Project's provision of onsite open space would reduce the use of area parks by Project residents. Nevertheless, some Project residents would still be expected to utilize other public recreational facilities. As a result, the Project would create a limited incremental increase in the use of area parks. The Project would be subject to the County's Code to provide local park space or pay a fee in lieu of the provision of park space, which would be used for the purpose of acquiring, developing, improving and expanding open space and park lands. Therefore, due to the limited increase in residents near existing park and recreational facilities, and compliance with Section 21.24.350 of the County's Code, the Project's contribution to deterioration of parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant [Impact REC-1] (Initial Study, p. 77, Draft EIR, p. 6-54 to 6-55).

The Project would include 35,780 square feet of recreational amenities, 62,443 square feet of designated common open space, and 72,719 square feet of private open space within the Project site. The potential adverse effects associated with implementation of the Project, including development of the proposed recreational areas, have been considered throughout the analysis for the Project. Development of the open space area would not have any potentially significant impacts outside of those analyzed for the whole of the Project. The Applicant will be required to pay parkland fees in compliance with County Code Section 21.28.140 to satisfy park obligation. Therefore, the Project does not include recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment [Impact REC-2] (Initial Study, p. 77-78, Draft EIR, p. 6-55).

There are no regional trails within the Project vicinity. The recreational areas provided by the Project would not interfere with any regional open space connectivity. Therefore,

Project impacts related to open space connectivity would not occur [Impact REC-3] (Initial Study, p. 78, Draft EIR, p. 6-55).

Cumulative Recreation Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the Project Site, could increase the potential impacts to park and recreation facilities, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact in the Project area.

Finding

As with the Project, each Cumulative Project is required to pay fees towards or dedicate parkland for public use. As such, cumulative impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Rationale for Finding

The Project and Cumulative Projects would be subject to the Quimby Act and County or City requirements, which would reduce the demand associated with each project through dedication of parkland or payment of fees. As a result, no significant cumulative impacts on County parks and recreation facilities would occur with implementation of the Project (Draft EIR, p. 6-55).

17. Transportation

The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Roadway Facilities

Pursuant to the County of Los Angeles *Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines*, the Opening Year (2023) traffic volumes were developed by applying a growth rate of 1.21 percent per year to the existing (2020) traffic volumes and adding traffic generated by cumulative projects, which include approved and pending development projects on file at the City of Covina, the City of West Covina, City of Irwindale, and the County of Los Angeles. As demonstrated by the Traffic Impact Analysis, included as Appendix M to the EIR, all intersections would continue to operate at satisfactory LOS. Thus, impacts in the Opening Year (2023) Plus Project condition would not result in an intersection deficiency pursuant to Los Angeles County General Plan Policy M4.7 (Draft EIR, p. 5.1-13).

Transit Facilities

The Metrolink San Bernardino Line operates directly north of the Project site. Based on the proposed site plan, Project construction and operation would not result in any interruptions to Metrolink services along the San Bernardino Line or impacts to the rail tracks within the right-of-way. The proposed buildings would be set back by approximately 98 feet from the northern property line. As such, significant excavation for footings of proposed buildings would not take place in close proximity to the existing rail tracks and construction would not result in a physical impact to tracks. Furthermore, the Project would utilize the existing block wall and would not result in any construction directly adjacent to the train tracks. Overall, the Project would not alter or conflict with existing Metrolink operations, and impacts to the railway would be less than significant.

As described previously, the Project site is currently served by Foothill Transit, which serves 22 different cities via 39 existing bus lines between Downtown Los Angeles and southwest San Bernardino County. The existing Foothill Transit Line 190 would likely serve the Project as it runs along San Bernardino Road with an existing bus stop in front of the Project. The transit frequency at these stops is approximately every 20 minutes. Line 190 serves El Monte, Baldwin Park, Covina, and Pomona. The Metrolink also runs just north of the site (San Bernardino Line) and has stops in Baldwin Park and Covina approximately 1.8 and 2.4 miles from the Project site, respectively. The Project would include relocation of the Foothill Transit line bus stop in front of the Project. The Project would not alter or conflict with existing bus stops and schedules, and impacts related to transit services would not occur (Draft EIR, p. 5.1-14).

Bicycle Facilities

There are several roadways in the Project vicinity that currently have bicycle lanes, which include: Badillo Street, along with portions of Vincent Avenue and San Bernardino Road east of Vincent Avenue. Additionally, sidewalks currently exist adjacent to the site along San Bernardino Road.

The Project would not involve any off-site improvements that would remove the existing bicycle lanes or result in any identified impacts to bicycle routes. The existing bicycle routes would provide bicycle transportation opportunities for residents of the Project site.

The Project would not conflict with any bicycle facilities (Draft EIR, p. 5.1-14).

Pedestrian Facilities

Similarly, the Project site is bound by sidewalks along San Bernardino Road. The Project would replace the existing sidewalks and add a crosswalk across San Bernardino Road, which would facilitate pedestrian use and walking to nearby locations. Therefore, the Project would also not conflict with pedestrian facilities. Overall, Project impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant. [Impact TRAN-1] (Draft EIR p. 5.1-14).

Project implementation would not add incompatible uses to area roadways. The Project would be subject to the requirements and design standards of the County Department of Public Works. The Project would not create a roadway hazard and impacts would be less than significant [Impact TRAN-3] (Initial Study, p. 79, Draft EIR, p. 6-55).

Project development would not result in inadequate emergency access. Direct access to the Project site would be provided by a new private roadway intersecting with San Bernardino Road. The Project would also be required to construct internal access and provide fire suppression facilities, including three fire hydrants, in conformance with the County Code Title 32, Fire Code. The Project would be subject to all requirements of the Fire Department and shall comply with the provisions set forth pursuant to the requirements Uniform Code and Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9). As such, Project implementation would not result in inadequate emergency access and no impacts would occur [Impact TRAN-4] (Initial Study, p. 80, Draft EIR, p. 6-56).

Cumulative Transportation Impacts

Potential Effect

Construction and operation of the Project, in conjunction with the construction and operation of other approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the Project Site, could potentially lead to interferences with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system, increases in VMT, additional traffic conflicts, and interference with emergency access, resulting in potentially significant cumulative traffic impacts.

Finding

The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, when considered together with Cumulative Projects, with respect to transportation impacts related to conflicts with transportation plans, increased VMT, increased hazards or incompatible uses or interference with emergency access.

Rationale for Finding

The Project would not result in significant impacts related to conflict with a program, plan, or policy and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts stemming from conflicts with a program, plan, or policy addressing the circulation system would not occur (Draft EIR, p. 5-12).

The County Transportation Guidelines provide that land use projects should consider both short- and long-term project effects on VMT. Short-term effects are to be evaluated in a detailed project-level VMT analysis. Long-term, or cumulative effects, in contrast, are determined through consistency with the SCAG RTP/SCS. The County Transportation Guidelines state that projects that are consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS would have a less than significant cumulative impact on VMT. This is because the RTP/SCS is a regional plan that demonstrates compliance with air quality conformity requirements and GHG reduction targets. The Project is surrounded by single-family residences or areas planned for urban development. The Project site is zoned as Light Agricultural (A-1-6,000), which under Title 22 allows for low density residential development. In addition, based on SCAG model data, with an estimate of 3.85 persons per household within the community of unincorporated Covina, the proposed Project would result in a net increase of approximately 262 new residents. Overall, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS population and household growth forecast from 2016 through 2045 for the County's unincorporated area envisions 213,500 additional persons, yielding an approximately 20.4% growth rate. The unincorporated areas of Los Angeles are projected to have a population of 1,258,000 persons and 419,300 housing units by 2045. The Project would generate approximately 262 residents, which represents approximately 0.0002 percent of the forecasted population in 2045 and approximately 0.001 percent of the forecasted growth between 2016 and 2045 for the County's unincorporated area. Thus, as the Project is consistent with the Los Angeles County General Plan and zoning designations for the site, which SCAG relies on to determine projections, the Project is within SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast. As such, the Project's cumulative VMT impact would be presumed to be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 5.1-12).

Additionally, the evaluation of Impacts TR-3 (increases in traffic hazards) and TR-4 (in

adequate emergency access) in the Draft EIR concluded that the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to incompatible uses, hazards due to roadway design, or emergency access. The proposed circulation layout would be required to be installed in conformance with County design standards to ensure that no potentially hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access would be introduced by the Project that could combine with potential hazards from other projects. In addition, cumulative development in the County and surrounding jurisdictions would be subject to site-specific reviews, including reviews by police and fire protection authorities that would not allow potential cumulatively considerable design hazards. Therefore, potential impacts related to circulation design features and emergency access would not occur from the Project and would not combine with hazards from other projects. Thus, cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-54).

18. Utilities

The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Azusa Light and Water is responsible for supplying potable water to the Project site and its region. Azusa Light and Water's water supplies consist of local groundwater, local surface water, and imported water. Azusa Light and Water's service area includes the City of Azusa and portions of Covina, Glendora, Irwindale, West Covina, and portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The 2015 Azusa Light and Water's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) details that Azusa Light and Water has adequate supplies to serve its customers during normal, dry year, and multiple dry year demand through 2040 with projected population increases and accompanying increases in water demand.

Furthermore, Azusa Light and Water forecasts for water demand are based on population projections of SCAG, which rely on adopted land use designations contained within the general plans that cover the geographic area. Implementation of the Project would not change the land use designation or zoning of the Project site. The UWMP assumes a 2020 water demand of 168 gallons per capita per day. The Project would result in approximately 262 new residents. Thus, the Project would generate a demand of approximately 34,272 gallons of water per day or 38.4 acre-feet per year, which is within the anticipated increased demand and supply for water. Additionally, this is a conservative estimate because Azusa Light and Water's actual water use during FY 2014-15 was 142 gallons per capita per day. Redevelopment of the Project site would also be required to be compliant with CalGreen/Title 24 requirements for low flow plumbing fixtures and

irrigation, which would provide for efficient water use.

Furthermore, the UWMP states that due to Azusa Light and Water's diverse water supply portfolio, water supplies may be re-apportioned during multiple dry years to meet Azusa Light and Water's water demands, and that a single dry year or a multiple dry year period will not compromise Azusa Light and Water's ability to provide a reliable supply of water to its customers. Additionally, per the will serve letter dated March 18, 2020, Azusa Light and Water's has capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, Azusa Light and Water has sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project during normal, dry and multiple dry years, and impacts would be less than significant [Impact UT-2] (Initial Study pp. 85-86, Draft EIR, p. 6-60).

Based on the Los Angeles County Sanitation sewage flow generation rate of 260 gallons per day of wastewater per single-family residence, the Project would result in generation of 17,680 gallons per day of wastewater. Wastewater generated from the Project site would be treated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD), which convey wastewater from the Project site to the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant. The San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for a design capacity of 100 million gallons of wastewater per day (mgd) (LACSD). Per the sewer will serve letter for the Project, dated August 14, 2020, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts has capacity to serve the Project. The San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant currently processes an average flow of 58.5 mgd of wastewater, resulting in a remaining capacity of approximately 41.5 mgd of wastewater. This remaining capacity is adequate to serve the Project and the Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Thus, impacts would be less than significant [Impact UT-3] (Initial Study p. 86, Draft EIR, p. 6-61).

A majority of the solid waste from the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, where the Project site is located, that was disposed of in landfills went to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. The Sunshine Canyon Landfill is permitted to accept 12,100 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through October 2037. In December 2021, the facility received an average of 7,380 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,270 tons per day.

Project construction would generate solid waste for landfill disposal in the form of demolition debris from the existing buildings and infrastructure that would be removed

from the site. Construction waste in the form of packaging and discarded materials would also be generated by the Project. Demolition would result in 3,715 tons of debris. However, Section 5.408.1 of the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste. Thus, the demolition and construction solid waste that would be disposed of at the landfill would be 1,300 tons of debris. As the Sunshine Canyon Landfill had additional capacity of 4,270 tons per day, the facility would be able to accommodate the addition of solid waste during construction of the Project.

Project includes development of 68 residential units, which is anticipated to result in approximately 262 residents, as described previously in the population and housing discussion. Based on the default CalEEMod solid waste generation rate of 0.41 ton per year per resident, the 262 residents are estimated to generate 107.42 tons of solid waste per year (or 2.07 tons per week). Overall, operation of the Project is anticipated to generate 2.07 tons (4,140 pounds) of solid waste per week. As the Sunshine Canyon Landfill had additional capacity of 4,270 tons per day, the facility would be able to accommodate the addition of 4,140 pounds of solid waste per week from operation of the Project. Thus, impacts related to solid waste generation and landfill capacity would be less than significant [Impact UT-4] (Initial Study p. 86-87, Final EIR, Chapter 3, p. 3-2).

Implementation of the Project would result in new development that would generate an increased amount of solid waste. All solid waste-generating activities within the County are subject to the requirements set forth in Section 5.408.1 of the California Green Building Standards Code that requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste, and AB 341 that requires diversion of a minimum of 75 percent of operational solid waste. Development of the Project would be consistent with all state and County regulations, and impacts would not occur [Impact UT-5] (Initial Study, p. 87).

Cumulative Utilities and Service System Impacts

Potential Effect

Construction and operation of the Project, in conjunction with the Cumulative Projects, could increase the demand on existing service systems, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impacts.

Finding

The Project would not result in unplanned or substantial demand on water, sewer, and solid waste service systems. In addition, with adherence to state and local regulations and guidelines, and implementation of Project-specific mitigation, the Project would not result in cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems.

Rationale for Finding

Cumulative water supply impacts are considered on a water purveyor basis and are associated with the capacity of the infrastructure system and the adequacy of the water purveyor's infrastructure and primary sources of water that include groundwater, surface water, purchased or imported water, and recycled water (Draft EIR, p. 6-62).

With adherence to existing regulations, the Project and Cumulative Projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to the construction of new infrastructure from increased demand for water, generation of wastewater and stormwater, and generation of solid waste. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-62).

19. Wildfire

The Project site is located within an urban developed area and is not located within or near an identified wildland fire hazard area and is not in an area where residences or other structures are intermixed with wildlands. In addition, implementation of the Project would be required to adhere to the Los Angeles County Code to reduce potential fire hazards. Additionally, the Project would be in compliance with any further guidelines from the Los Angeles County Fire department related to fire prevention and is subject to approval by the County's Building and Safety Division. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts related to wildfires [Impacts WF-1 through WF-5] (Initial Study, p. 88-89, Draft EIR, p. 6-63 to 6-64).

Cumulative Wildfire Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending projects within the vicinity of the Project Site, could potentially result in cumulative impacts to wildfire.

Finding

With compliance with existing requirements and regulations, the Project and Cumulative Project would not result in impacts related to wildfire.

Rationale for Finding

The Project and Cumulative Projects are located within an urbanized area of Los Angeles County and are not located in high fire hazard areas. As such, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to wildfires (Draft EIR, p. 6-64).

SECTION 2

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The remaining aspects of the impact categories analyzed in the Initial Study and Draft EIR that were found to have potentially significant impacts that can be reduced to a less than significant level through imposition of Project Design Features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval are discussed below. Vehicle miles traveled from the Project will generate significant and unavoidable impacts and is therefore described below in Section 3.

All Final EIR mitigation measures (as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the Project's conditions of approval. In addition, the other required conditions of the Project Approvals further lessen the potential effects of the Project.

The Commission hereby finds, based on the Final EIR, that the Project Design Features and the Project's mitigation measures and conditions of approval will reduce Project-specific impacts concerning Biological Resources (Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species; Wildlife Nursery Sites); Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources, Human Remains, Paleontological Resources); Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Transport/Disposal of Hazardous Materials, Accident Conditions, Hazards to Schools); Noise (Construction Noise, Construction Vibration); Tribal Cultural Resources; Utilities (Expanded Facilities) to a less than significant level.

The Commission finds, based on the Final EIR, that there are no significant cumulative impacts, or that the Project Design Features and the Project's mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce the Project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable levels, concerning Biological Resources (Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species; Wildlife Nursery Sites); Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources, Human Remains, Paleontological Resources); Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Transport/Disposal of Hazardous Materials, Accident Conditions, Hazards to Schools); Noise (Construction Noise, Construction Vibration); Utilities (Expanded Facilities).

Project Impacts

1. Biological Resources

Potential Effect

The Project could 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).

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate the Project's potential significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species to a less than significant level during construction and operation of the Project.

Rationale for Finding

Biological resources are addressed in Section 4 of the Initial Study, included as Appendix A to the Draft EIR, and in Appendix C (Biological Constraints Analysis), and Appendix N (pre-Construction Biological Surveys) of the Draft EIR. A literature review and field survey were conducted on the Project site and surrounding area. The literature review and field survey found that no native vegetation exists on the Project site, and no candidate, sensitive, or special status wildlife species have the potential to occur onsite. According to the literature review, a total of 20 sensitive wildlife species and 11 sensitive plant species have the potential to occur, or have historically occurred, in the Project vicinity. These include species listed or candidates for listing by USFWS and/or CDFW or designated as rare by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). All habitats with the potential to be used by sensitive species were evaluated during the field survey for their presence or potential presence.

At the time the NOP was issued, the Project site was fully developed. As described by the Biological Constraints Analysis prepared for the Project, and included in Appendix C of the Draft EIR, there are no suitable conditions or habitats for any protected plant or wildlife species that have historically occurred within the Project vicinity. Therefore, no protected plant or wildlife species have the potential to occur onsite.

The existing trees on the site have the potential to provide habitat for nesting migratory

birds. Many of these trees would be removed during construction. Therefore, the Project has the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation and trees are removed during the nesting season. Nesting birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (United States Code Title 33, Section 703 et seq.; see also Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Any activities that occur during the nesting/breeding season of birds protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code, could result in a potentially significant impact if requirements of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code are not followed. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 are required and would ensure compliance with federal and State regulations and would require a roosting bat and nesting bird survey to be conducted prior to the commencement of construction during roosting and nesting season, which would reduce potential impacts related to nesting avian species and native wildlife nursery sites to a less than significant level [Impact BIO-1] (Initial Study, p. 22).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Special-Status Roosting Bats. To avoid the direct loss of bats that could result from disturbance to trees or structures that may provide maternity roost habitat (e.g., in tree cavities or under loose bark) or structures that contain a hibernating bat colony, the following steps shall be taken:

- a) To the extent feasible, demolition or disturbance to suitable bat roosting habitat shall be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season.
- b) If trees must be encroached during the maternity season (March 1 to September 30), or structures must be removed at any time of the year, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify those trees or structures proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat for bats.
- c) Each tree or structure identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost and each structure potentially supporting a hibernating colony shall be closely inspected by the qualified bat specialist no greater than seven (7) days prior to tree disturbance or structure removal to more precisely determine the presence or absence of roosting bats.
- d) If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year, it is preferable to bring down trees or structures in

a controlled manner using heavy machinery. In order to ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, the trees or structures shall be nudged lightly two to three times, with a pause of approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. Trees or structures may then be pushed to the ground slowly under the supervision of a bat specialist. Felled trees shall remain in place until they are inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts shall not be immediately disposed. A period of at least 48 hours shall elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape. Bats shall be allowed to escape prior to demolition of buildings. This may be accomplished by placing one way exclusionary devices into areas where bats may exit but not enter the building.

- e) Maternity season lasts from March 1 to September 30. Trees or structures determined to be maternity roosts shall be left in place until the end of the maternity season. A structure containing a hibernating colony shall be left in place until a qualified biologist determines that the bats are no longer hibernating.
- f) The bat specialist shall document all demolition monitoring activities and prepare a summary report to the County upon completion of tree disturbance or building demolition activities. If Townsend's big-eared bat is detected during pre-construction surveys, all construction-related activity shall be halted immediately and CDFW shall be notified. Work may only resume subsequent to CDFW approval.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Bat Relocation. If confirmed occupied or formerly occupied bat roosting habitat is destroyed, artificial bat roosts of comparable size and quality shall be constructed and maintained at a suitable undisturbed area. The design and location of the artificial bat roosts shall be determined by the bat specialist in consultation with CDFW.

- a) In exceptional circumstances, such as when roosts cannot be avoided and bats cannot be evicted by non-invasive means, it may be necessary to capture and transfer the bats to appropriate natural or artificial bat roosting habitat in the surrounding area. Bats raising young or hibernating shall not be captured and relocated. Capture and relocation shall be performed by the bat specialist in coordination with CDFW, and shall be subject to approval by Los Angeles County Planning and CDFW.
- b) A monitoring plan shall be prepared for the replacement roosts, which shall include performance standards for the use of the replacement roosts by the displaced

species, as well as provisions to prevent harassment, predation, and disease of relocated bats.

- c) Annual reports detailing the success of roost replacement and bat relocation shall be prepared and submitted to Los Angeles County Planning and CDFW for five (5) years following relocation or until performance standards are met, whichever period is longer.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Nesting Birds. Construction activities (including, but not limited to, staging and disturbances to native and nonnative vegetation, structures, and substrates) shall occur outside of the avian breeding season, which generally runs from February 1 – August 31 (as early as January 1 for some raptors), to avoid take of birds or their eggs. Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (Fish and Game Code Section 86), and includes take of eggs or young resulting from disturbances which cause abandonment of active nests. Depending on the avian species present, a qualified biologist may determine that a change in the breeding season dates is warranted.

If avoidance of the avian breeding season is not feasible, a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys shall conduct weekly bird surveys beginning thirty days prior to the initiation of Project activities, to detect protected native birds occurring in suitable nesting habitat that is to be disturbed and (as access to adjacent areas allows) any other such habitat within 500 feet of the disturbance area. The surveys should continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the initiation of Project activities. If a protected native bird is found, the Project proponent should delay all Project activities within 300 feet of on- and off-site suitable nesting habitat (within 500 feet for suitable raptor nesting habitat) until August 31. Alternatively, the qualified biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, Project activities within 300 feet of the nest (within 500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biological monitor, must be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Flagging, stakes, or construction fencing should be used to demarcate the inside boundary of the buffer of 300 feet (or 500 feet) between the Project activities and the nest. Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. The Project proponent should provide Los Angeles County Planning the results of the recommended protective measures described above to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

If the biological monitor determines that a narrower buffer between the Project activities and observed active nests is warranted, he/she should submit a written explanation as to why (e.g., species-specific information; ambient conditions and birds' habituation to them; and the terrain, vegetation, and birds' lines of sight between the Project activities and the nest and foraging areas) to Los Angeles County Planning and, upon request, the CDFW. Based on the submitted information, Los Angeles County Planning (and the CDFW, if the CDFW requests) will determine whether to allow a narrower buffer. The biological monitor shall be present on site during all grubbing and clearing of vegetation to ensure that these activities remain within the Project footprint (i.e., outside the demarcated buffer) and that the flagging/stakes/fencing is being maintained, and to minimize the likelihood that active nests are abandoned or fail due to Project activities. The biological monitor shall send weekly monitoring reports to Los Angeles County Planning during the grubbing and clearing of vegetation, and shall notify County Planning immediately if Project activities damage active avian nests.

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with candidate, sensitive, or special-status species to less than significant levels.

Potential Effect

The Project could 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.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate the Project's potentially significant impacts to migratory fish or wildlife species or native wildlife nursery sites to a less-than-significant level during construction and operation of the Project.

Rationale for Finding

Biological resources are addressed in Section 4 of the Initial Study, included as Appendix A to the Draft EIR, in Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR, and as well as in Appendix C (Biological Constraints Analysis), and Appendix N (pre-Construction Biological Surveys) of the Draft EIR. As discussed with respect to Impact BIO-4 in Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR, the Project site does not contain, or is not adjacent to, any wildlife corridors. The Project site has previously been developed and is surrounded by roadways and developed areas. Areas

of residential, commercial, and additional roadways are located beyond the roadways adjacent to the site. Development of the site would not result in impacts related to established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor.

However, the existing trees on the site have the potential to provide habitat for nesting migratory birds and roosting bats. Many of these trees would be removed during construction. Therefore, the proposed Project has the potential to impact active bird nests or bat roosts if vegetation and trees are removed during the nesting season. Nesting birds are protected under the MBTA and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Any activities that occur during the nesting/breeding season of birds protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code, could result in a potentially significant impact if requirements of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code are not followed. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 (Special-Status Roosting Bats), BIO-2 (Bat Relocation), and BIO-3 (Nesting Birds) would ensure compliance with federal and State regulations and would require a roosting bat and nesting bird survey to be conducted prior to the commencement of construction during roosting and nesting season, which would reduce potential impacts related to nesting avian species and native wildlife nursery sites to a less than significant level [Impact BIO-4] (Initial Study, p. 23, Draft EIR, pp. 6-10 to 6-11).

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 through **MM BIO-3**, as listed above.

Cumulative Biological Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with the other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may result in a potentially significant cumulative impact to biological resources within the vicinity of the Project site.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the Project's incremental contribution to cumulatively significant environmental impacts regarding biological resources to less-than-cumulatively-considerable levels.

Rationale for Finding

Cumulative biological impacts tend to center around connectivity of habitat and migration routes and continuing loss of natural habitats. The Project and Cumulative Projects are located in an urbanized area that is developed with commercial and residential uses. Therefore, neither local nor regional wildlife movement patterns are expected to be substantially disrupted by Project or Cumulative Project implementation. Further, there would be no substantial loss of any sensitive habitat types.

The Project site has been previously developed and does not contain any native vegetation. However, the Project contains potential habitat for nesting birds and roosting bats. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, impacts related to nesting birds and roosting bats would be less than significant. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation, the Project would not cumulatively combine with other cumulative projects to become significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-12).

2. Cultural Resources

Potential Effect

The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required or incorporated into the Project which mitigate the potentially significant archaeological resource impacts from the Project to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding

Potential archaeological impacts are assessed in Section 5 of the Initial Study and Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR, and additional information regarding potential archaeological resources is provided in Appendix D, Cultural Resources Assessment, of the Draft EIR. The ground surface within the Project site has long been used for urban development. The Project site was used for a citrus grove until the early-1950s when school buildings were developed on the site. Thus, the site has been previously disturbed from both agricultural uses and development, including ground disturbance to depths for installation of the existing utility infrastructure that serves the site. A records search for the Project site was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) that included California

Points of Historical Interest (PHI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), the CRHR, the NRHP, the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), and historic topographic maps.

The records search conducted for the Project site identified that two archaeological resources (P-19-187085 and P-19-187977) are located within one-half mile of the Project site. The closest resource (P-19-187065) to the Project is located approximately 0.4 mile southwest of the site. This resource is the potential location or vicinity of the Mojave Road, which according to historical documentation, existed in between Fort Drum in Wilmington, California, and Fort Mojave, Arizona. In addition, the Cultural Resources Survey determined that due to the absence of any previously recorded archaeological resources with physical remains within one-half mile of the Project site, the area has a moderate to low level of sensitivity for archaeological resources.

Construction activities within the Project site would include removal of the existing buildings, infrastructure and landscaping; grading and excavation; and installation of the new drainage and utility infrastructure. The grading and excavation process would remove and recompact the loose alluvium that currently underlies the upper three (3) feet of soil. As the Project site has a low to moderate level of sensitivity for archaeological resources and the site has been previously disturbed, the Cultural Resources Assessment conducted for the Project determined that Mitigation Measure CUL-1 should be included to require retention of an archaeologist for monitoring during initial grubbing and scraping and provide spot check throughout Project ground disturbing activities. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts would be less than significant [Impact CUL-2] (Initial Study, p. 28-29, Draft EIR, p. 6-14 to 6-15).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Archaeological Monitoring. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the owner/Applicant shall provide written evidence to the Director of Regional Planning, or designee that a qualified archaeologist has been retained, from a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology as defined at 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A stating that the archeologists have been retained and will be present at pre-grade meetings and for all initial ground disturbing activities. The archaeologist shall provide spot check monitoring as determined necessary by the retained archaeologist.

In the event that field personnel encounter buried cultural materials, work in the immediate vicinity of the find should cease and a qualified archaeologist should be retained to assess the significance of the find. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop or divert construction excavation as necessary. If the qualified archaeologist finds that any cultural resources present meet eligibility requirements for listing on the California Register or the National Register, plans for the treatment, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to the find would need to occur.

In the event a previously unrecorded archaeological deposit is encountered during construction, all activity within 50 feet of the area of discovery shall cease and the County shall be immediately notified. The qualified archeologist shall be contacted to flag the area in the field and shall determine if the archaeological deposits meet the CEQA definition of historical (State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a)) and/or unique archaeological resource (Public Resources Code 21083.2(g)).

If the find is considered a “resource,” the qualified archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage, and treatment of the deposits. Recovery, salvage, and treatment protocols shall be developed in accordance with applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4 in consultation with the County. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the developer/Applicant’s expense.

Through incorporation of the above Mitigation Measure, potential impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Potential Effect

While no paleontological resources have been identified on the Project site, there remains the possibility of encountering buried resources during excavations. Thus, the Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate potential significant archeological resource impacts from the Project to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding

The Project site is mapped as being underlain by surficial sediments of alluvial gravel, sand, and silt (Qa). A records search conducted with the University of California Museum of Paleontology identified that the closest previously discovered fossil locality is 2.5 miles away from the Project site within the Miocene Puente Formation, and that the area has a low level of sensitivity for paleontological resources. Additionally, previous onsite ground disturbances have further reduced the potential of the site to contain paleontological resources. Construction of the Project includes excavation of approximately three (3) feet of loose alluvium that would be replaced as compacted fill. The Paleontological Resource Survey determined that shallow excavation (≤ 15 feet) in the Project site is unlikely to impact paleontological resources. However, in the event paleontological resources are incidentally discovered during the construction process, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is included to require retention of a paleontological resource specialist to evaluate the incidental discovery. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant [Impact CUL-3] (Initial Study, p. 29, Draft EIR, p. 6-16).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Paleontological Incidental Discoveries. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the owner/Applicant shall provide written evidence to the Director of Regional Planning, or her/his designee, that a qualified paleontologist has been retained and either the paleontologist, or a qualified representative, shall be onsite if excavations penetrate the bedrock formations.

In the event paleontological resources are encountered, ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area of the discovery shall cease. The Project Applicant shall then inform the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum of the find and retain a qualified paleontologist. The qualified paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered.

Criteria for discard of specific fossil specimens will be made explicit by the qualified

paleontologist. If the qualified paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by Project planning, then recovery may be applied. Actions may include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction, monitoring work and halting construction if an important fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging specimens for curation and research purposes. Recovery, salvage and treatment shall be done at the Applicant's expense. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the qualified paleontologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The qualified paleontologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource.

Through incorporation of the above Mitigation Measure, potential impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Potential Effect

While no human remains have been identified on the Project site, there remains the possibility of encountering previously unknown burials during excavations. Thus, the Project could disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate potential impacts from the Project to human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding

The Project site does not contain a cemetery, and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Nevertheless, should human remains be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with Project development, the construction contractor would be required by California law to comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. According to Section 7050.5(b) and (c), if human remains are discovered, the County Coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner is required to contact the Native American Heritage

Commission (NAHC) by telephone within 24 hours. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, whenever the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner, the NAHC is required to immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. According to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(k), the NAHC is authorized to mediate disputes arising between landowners and known descendants relating to the treatment and disposition of Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials. Through mandatory compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, included as Mitigation Measure CUL-3, any potential impacts to disturbing human remains, including remains of Native American ancestry, would be less than significant [Impact CUL-4] (Initial Study, p. 29-30, Draft EIR, p. 6-16).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Human Remains. If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be notified (California Public Resources Code §5097.98). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner, with the aid of the County-approved Archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, s/he will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed if feasible and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials (California Health and Safety Code §7050.5). If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further subsurface disturbance (California Public Resources Code §5097.98).

Through incorporation of the above Mitigation Measure, potential impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

Cumulative Cultural Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially increase the potential impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources, resulting in potentially significant cumulative impacts to such resources within the vicinity of the Project Site.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the Project's potential incremental contribution to cumulatively significant environmental impacts regarding archaeological and paleontological resources to less-than-cumulatively-considerable levels.

Rationale for Finding

The Project Site and surrounding area may contain actual or potential archaeological or paleontological resources, although the likelihood is low. Where these resources may exist, implementation of the Project would represent an incremental adverse cumulative impact to archaeological or paleontological resources. However, the Project's potential impact to archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. In addition, Cumulative Projects would also be required to implement appropriate mitigation measures, as necessary. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts, and cumulative impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant (Initial Study, p. 91, Draft EIR, p. 6-15).

3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential Effect

The Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the Project's significant hazard impact to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Rationale for Finding

Construction

The proposed construction activities would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, oils, grease, and caulking during construction activities. In addition, hazardous materials would routinely be needed for fueling and servicing construction equipment on the site. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are subject to federal, state, and County regulation. As a result, hazardous material impacts related to construction materials would be less than significant.

Asbestos-Containing Materials. The use of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead paint was common in building construction prior to 1978. Based on the age of the onsite school buildings, it is possible that ACM is present in the existing structures on the Project site. As a result, asbestos surveys and abatement would be required prior to demolition of the existing buildings pursuant to SCAQMD, Cal/OSHA, and Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requirements. SCAQMD Rule 1403 requires notification of the SCAQMD prior to commencing any demolition or renovation activities that involve ACM. Rule 1403 also sets forth specific procedures for the removal of asbestos and requires that an onsite representative trained in the requirements of Rule 1403 be present during the stripping, removing, handling, or disturbing of ACM. Mandatory compliance with the provisions of Rule 1403, which would be outlined in the Project's conditions of approval, as included as PPP HAZ-1, would ensure that construction related activities do not expose construction workers or nearby sensitive receptors to significant health risks associated with ACM, and impacts would be less than significant.

Lead Based Paint. Based on the age of the existing school buildings, it is also possible that lead-based paint (LBP) may be present. Pursuant to existing regulations, a LBP survey shall be completed prior to any activities with the potential to disturb suspected LBP. The regulations specify actions to manage and control exposure to LBP (per the Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1926.62 and California Code of

Regulations Title 8 Section 1532.1) that cover the demolition, removal, cleanup, transportation, and disposal of lead-containing material. In addition, Cal/OSHA's Lead in Construction Standard requires that the Project develop and implement a lead compliance plan when lead-based paint would be disturbed during construction. Cal/OSHA requires 24-hour notification if more than 100 square feet of LBP would be disturbed. With compliance to Cal/OSHA requirements, included in the Project's conditions of approval and below as PPP HAZ-2, impacts related to the disposal of LBP would be less than significant.

Undocumented Hazardous Materials. Historically, the property and surrounding properties were occupied by orchard land from at least 1928 until at least 1952. A wide variety of pesticides may have been used during this period, including those containing persistent compounds such as arsenic and lead. Therefore, the Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the Project site conducted soils testing and compared the laboratory test results to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CAL-EPA/ Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) residual screening levels. The Phase II ESA found that no organochlorine pesticides were detected in the soil samples. As such, the onsite soils are not contaminated with organochlorine pesticides. The Phase II ESA also found that concentrations of lead ranged from 6.13 to 66 ppm and are lower than the Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) established by the EPA for this metal. Therefore, the onsite soils are not contaminated with lead. However, the Phase II ESA testing identified arsenic in soil samples at concentrations higher than the residential RSLs established by the EPA. The Phase II ESA describes that excavated soils may be used for backfill and grading; and although grading is anticipated to balance onsite, any soil that is disposed of offsite would require testing for appropriate disposal. Thus, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is included to require testing of any export soils and appropriate landfill disposal. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires the preparation and implementation of a Health and Safety Plan to notify workers involved in Project excavation and soil handling of the presence of arsenic onsite. Additionally, standard dust reduction measures (pursuant to AQMD Rule 403) would be implemented during all soil handling activities. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, impacts related to contaminants in soils would be less than significant (Initial Study, p. 44–45, Draft EIR, p. 6-34 to 6-36).

Operation

Operation of the Project includes activities related to single-family residential

development, which generally includes the use of common hazardous materials such as solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, batteries, and aerosol cans. Although the Project's residents would utilize common types of hazardous materials, normal routine use of these products pursuant to existing regulations would not result in a significant hazard to the environment, residents, or workers in the vicinity of the Project. Operation of the Project may generate household hazardous wastes. As such, Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 has been included to require provision of educational materials on proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste to homeowners. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-3, operational impacts related to transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during operation of the Project would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-1] (Initial Study pp. 44-45, Draft EIR, p. 6-36).

Plans, Programs, or Policies

PPP HAZ-1: SCAQMD Rule 1403. Pursuant to existing regulations, prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Applicant shall submit verification to the County Building and Safety Division that an asbestos survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If asbestos is found, the Applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403. Prior to issuance of demolition permits the Applicant shall provide verification that the following SCAQMD Rule 1403 regulations have been taken: notification of SCAQMD prior to construction activity, asbestos removal in accordance with prescribed procedures, placement of collected asbestos in leak-tight containers or wrapping, and proper disposal.

PPP HAZ-2: Lead. Pursuant to existing regulations, prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Applicant shall submit verification to the County Building and Safety Division that a lead-based paint survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If lead-based paint is found, County demolition permits shall ensure that all procedural requirements and regulations are followed for proper removal and disposal of the lead-based paint. Cal-OSHA has established limits of exposure to lead contained in dusts and fumes. Specifically, CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1 provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, and respiratory protection, and mandates good working practices by workers exposed to lead.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a soils testing plan for

arsenic shall be prepared by a qualified hazardous materials consultant and shall detail procedures and protocols for testing any soils that require offsite disposal. Based on testing results soils shall be transported and disposed of per California Hazardous Waste Regulations to an appropriately permitted landfill. Any soil contaminated with concentrations of arsenic exceeding 12 ppm shall be removed and transported to an appropriately permitted disposal facility prior to site grading and development activities. Should the volume of arsenic impacted soil exceed 50 cubic yards, a SCAQMD Rule 1466 permit would be required and shall be implemented during soil excavation and removal activities. Soils testing and disposal requirements shall be included within all grading permits and specifications.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Due to the potential for onsite soils to contain elevated levels of arsenic, a Health and Safety Plan shall be prepared in compliance with OSHA Safety and Health Standards (29 Code of Federal Regulations 1910.120) and Cal/OSHA requirements (CCR Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders and California Labor Code, Division 5, Part 1, Sections 6300-6719). The Health and Safety Plan shall address, as appropriate, safety requirements that would serve to avoid significant impacts or risks to workers or the public in the event that elevated levels of arsenic are encountered during grading and excavation and shall include any applicable recommendations contained in all Phase I and Phase II ESAs. The Health and Safety Plan shall have emergency contact numbers, maps to the nearest hospital, allowable worker exposure times, and mandatory personal protective equipment requirements. The Health and Safety Plan shall be signed by all workers involved in the removal of the contaminated soils to demonstrate their understanding of the risks of excavation.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: As part of the Home Buyer's package, the Applicant/Owner shall provide new homeowners education materials on the proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste. The educational materials shall provide new homeowners with links to the County Department of Public Works' website regarding the Los Angeles County Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program and provide the addresses of permanent household hazardous waste collection centers.

Potential Effect

The Project could 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.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the Project's significant hazard impact to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment.

Rationale for Finding

Construction

While the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable regulations during demolition, excavation, grading, and construction activities would not pose health risks or result in significant impacts, the improper use, storage, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes could result in accidental spills or releases, posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. The use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit, included as PPP WQ-1, would minimize potential adverse effects to workers, the public, and the environment. Construction contract specifications would include strict onsite handling rules and BMPs (Initial Study, p. 46, Draft EIR, p. 6-36).

Asbestos Containing Materials. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in the California Code of Regulations Sections 1529 and 341.6 through 341.14 as implemented by SCAQMD Rule 1403 to ensure that asbestos removed during demolition and redevelopment of the existing buildings is transported and disposed of at an appropriate facility. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a Hazardous Waste Manifest which details the hauling of the material from the site and the disposal of it. Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requires that local agencies not issue a demolition permit until an Applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. These requirements are included as PPP HAZ-1 to ensure that the Applicant submits verification to the County that the appropriate activities related to compliance with existing asbestos regulations have occurred, which

would reduce the potential of impacts related to asbestos to a less than significant level (Initial Study, p. 46, Draft EIR, p. 6-37).

Lead Based Materials. The lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provide regulations related to the handling and disposal of lead-based products. Federal regulations to manage and control exposure to LBP are described in Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1926.62, and state regulations related to lead are provided in the California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 1532.1, as implemented by Cal/OSHA. Cal/OSHA's Lead in Construction Standard requires applicants to develop and implement a lead compliance plan when LBP would be disturbed during construction or demolition activities. These requirements are included as PPP HAZ-2 to ensure that the Applicant submits verification to the County that the appropriate activities related to existing lead regulations have occurred, which would reduce the potential of impacts related to lead-based materials to a less than significant level (Initial Study, p. 46–47, Draft EIR, p. 6-37).

Contaminated Soils/Undocumented Hazardous Materials. Due to the existence of contaminated soils and excavation activities that would occur during Project construction, implementation of the Project has the potential to result in upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation of PPP AQ-1, which requires compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 for fugitive dust control, would ensure that exposed soils that potentially contain arsenic or other hazardous materials would not result in fugitive dust. Excavated soil containing hazardous substances and hazardous building materials would be classified as a hazardous waste if they exhibit the characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3). State and federal laws require detailed planning to ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled, used, stored, and disposed of, and in the event that such materials are accidentally released, to prevent or to mitigate injury to health or the environment. These regulations are detailed previously and include, but are not limited to, the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act that is implemented by OSHA, and the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act. Additionally, the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the RWQCB specifically address management of hazardous materials and waste handling in their adopted regulations (CCR, Title 14 and CCR, Title 27). Moreover, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is included to require preparation of a soils testing plan and to outline disposal requirements. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires the preparation and implementation of a Health and Safety Plan to notify workers involved in

Project excavation and soil handling of the presence of arsenic onsite. With implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, impacts related to hazards from contaminated soils would be less than significant (Initial Study, p. 47, Draft EIR, p. 6-37 to 6-38).

Operation

The risks related to upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be adequately addressed through compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations such as County Code Chapter 12.80 and Chapter 12.52. Project development would involve single-family residential uses that would use and store common hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, and cleaning products. Also, building mechanical systems and ground and landscape maintenance could also use a variety of products formulated with hazardous materials, including fuels, cleaners, lubricants, adhesives, sealers, and pesticides/herbicides. Normal routine use of these products pursuant to existing regulations would not result in a significant hazard to the environment, residents, or workers in the vicinity of the Project. In addition, a WQMP is required to be implemented for the Project (included as PPP WQ-2). The BMPs that would be implemented as part of the WQMP would protect human health and the environment should any accidental spills or releases of hazardous materials occur during operation of the Project. As a result, operation of the Project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and impacts would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-2] (Initial Study pp. 45-47, Draft EIR, p. 6-38).

Plans, Programs, or Policies

PPP HAZ-1 and **HAZ-2**, as listed above.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through **HAZ-3**, as listed above.

Potential Effect

The Project could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the Project, which will mitigate, to less than significant, the Project's impact related to the emission of hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses.

Rationale for Finding

The Project site is located 0.27-mile from the closest school, which is Merwin Elementary School, located at 16125 Cypress Street, Covina, CA 91722, and 0.3-mile from Manzanita Elementary School, located at 4131 North Nora Avenue, Covina, CA 91722. Thus, the Project would not be within one-quarter mile of an existing school. However, the Project is directly adjacent to existing residences (Initial Study, p. 48, Draft EIR, p. 6-38).

Construction

Project construction would involve the use and disposal of various hazardous materials. However, all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are regulated by federal and state regulations and will be subject to County guidelines, such as those included as PPP HAZ-1 and PPP HAZ-2. In addition, PPP AQ-1 and Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would ensure that contaminated soils are not released into the environment. Therefore, while the Project would involve the use and disposal of various hazardous materials, compliance with federal and state regulations, and implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (Initial Study, p. 48, Draft EIR, p. 6-38).

Operation

Operation of the Project includes activities related to single-family residential development, which generally uses common hazardous materials including solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, batteries, and aerosol cans. Normal routine use of these products pursuant to existing regulation would not result in a significant hazard to the environment, sensitive adjacent residences, or school facilities in the vicinity of the Project, and impacts would be less than significant [Impact HAZ-3] (Initial Study p. 48, Draft EIR, p. 6-38).

Plans, Programs, or Policies

PPP HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, as listed above.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, as listed above.

Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with other approved and pending Cumulative Projects, may potentially result in cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the Project's potential incremental contribution to cumulatively significant environmental impacts regarding hazards and hazardous materials to less-than-cumulatively-considerable levels.

Rationale for Finding

Development of the Project in combination with the Cumulative Projects has the potential to increase the risks associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. As with the Project, each of the Cumulative Projects would require evaluation for potential risks associated with the use, storage, transport, and/or disposal of hazardous materials. Since hazards and hazardous materials issues are largely site-specific, this evaluation would occur on a case-by-case basis, in conjunction with development proposals on these properties. Furthermore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3, which would reduce impacts related to hazardous materials to a less than significant level. Cumulative Projects would be required to implement similar measures to those proposed for the Project. Therefore, with compliance of all applicable local, state, and federal rules and regulations, cumulative impacts with respect to hazardous materials would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-40).

4. Noise

Potential Effect

The Project could result in the 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.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project, which would mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the Project's impact related to the 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.

Rationale for Finding

Construction

Noise generated by construction equipment would include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that, when combined can reach high levels. Construction is expected to occur in the following stages: demolition, excavation and grading, building construction, architectural coating, paving. Noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 74 dBA to 90 dBA when measured at 50 feet. Section 12.08.440 of the Los Angeles County Code limits construction activities to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays and restricts construction activities from occurring on Sundays or holidays. During the allowable times of construction, Section 12.08.440 limits mobile equipment construction noise impacts to 75 dBA and stationary equipment construction noise impacts to 60 dBA at the nearby single-family homes. Construction noise would be temporary in nature as the operation of each piece of construction equipment would not be constant throughout the day, and equipment would be turned off when not in use. (Draft EIR, p. 6-47).

Mobile Construction Equipment. Due to the nature of all phases of building construction, especially demolition and grading, where the equipment would be focused on one sub-area of the Project site, it is not likely that mobile construction equipment would operate continuously in the direct vicinity of any nearby home. The Noise Control Ordinance regulates construction noise and the hours of operation of mobile equipment. As demonstrated by the Noise Impact Analysis prepared for the Project, the existing ambient noise level at single-family homes to the west, east, and north of the site are approximately 67.6 dBA equivalent sound level (Leq) and the ambient noise level at single-family homes to the south of the Project site is approximately 68.4 dBA Leq. Mobile construction equipment would result in noise levels ranging from 71 to 73 dBA Leq at the sensitive receptors west and east of the Project site, which would result in an increase of

5.4 dBA above ambient noise levels of 67.6 dBA Leq. At the single-family homes to the north and south of the Project site, mobile construction equipment would result in noise levels ranging from 64 to 66 dBA Leq and 63 to 65 dBA Leq respectively, which would be below existing ambient noise levels of 67.6 and 68.4 dBA Leq respectively. In all locations, the resulting noise levels would be lower than the County's mobile equipment threshold of 75 dBA Leq. Mobile construction-related noise would exceed the existing ambient noise by up to 5.4 dBA at the single-family homes on the east and west sides of the Project site. As such, mobile construction equipment activities would create an exceedance of the plus 5 dBA above ambient threshold at the single-family homes located on the west and east sides of the Project site. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is included to require a minimum of 8-foot-high temporary sound blanket or wall along the east or west property lines prior to the start of grading. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, impacts related to mobile construction noise would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-47 to 6-48).

Stationary Construction Equipment. Additionally, Project construction equipment would include the use of stationary construction equipment including air compressors, generators, and welders, among others. Since the Project is only 470-feet-wide, which limits the placement of the stationary equipment to a maximum of approximately 235 feet from the nearest homes, the stationary construction equipment was calculated at 100-foot, 160-foot, and 230-foot distances. Stationary construction equipment would result in noise levels ranging from 64 to 68 dBA Leq at distances of 100 feet from the nearest single-family residences, which would be 0.4 dBA above the ambient noise levels of 67.6 dBA. At distances of 160 feet from the nearest single-family residences, stationary equipment noise levels would range from 60 to 64 dBA Leq, which would be below ambient noise levels. At distances of 230 feet, stationary equipment noise levels would range from 56 to 60 dBA Leq, which would be below ambient noise levels. Therefore, operation of stationary construction equipment within 100 feet from the nearby homes would exceed the County's stationary equipment threshold of 60 dBA by as much as 8 dBA. In order to reduce stationary construction equipment noise, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is included to require a minimum 8-foot-high temporary sound blanket or sound wall to be placed next to the stationary equipment on the side of the nearest homes and that the stationary equipment shall be located a minimum of 100 feet away from any offsite residential property line. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the noise levels at 100 feet would be 60 dBA for an air compressor, and 56 dBA for a generator and welder/torch, which would all be within the County's 60 dBA stationary construction

noise standard. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, stationary construction noise impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-48).

Operation

Once the proposed residences are constructed and inhabited, noise levels generated at the Project site would occur from stationary equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units that would be installed for the new development, internal street and driveway vehicle movements, trash removal activity, and activity at outdoor gathering areas. Typically, air conditioning units are located away from sensitive receivers and shielded to ensure that noise from operation of the units does not have the potential to result in an impact. Additionally, Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.570 exempts outdoor activities and refuse collection vehicles from the noise standards set forth in County Code Chapter 12.08. County Code Section 12.08.530 sets forth thresholds of 50 dBA at nearby sensitive receptors for air conditioning equipment. The noise level created from both the proposed 3 Ton and 4 Ton condenser units for both cooling and heating modes would be a maximum of 40.2 dBA at three feet from the Project property line, which would be within the County's 50 dBA noise standard. Therefore, the proposed air conditioner units would create a less than significant noise impact at the adjacent residential properties. The lowest measured ambient noise level near the Project site is 67.6 dBA Leq. As such, the onsite operational noise sources would be below existing ambient noise levels.

The Project would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County Noise Ordinance or the General Plan Noise Element. The Project site is not near a noise-generating site (e.g., airport, industrial site). The Project would conform with Title 12 Chapter 12.08 of the Los Angeles County Code, which provides a maximum exterior noise level of 45 dB between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and 50 dB from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. in residential areas. The Project site will not create noise in excess of these limits, nor will residents of the Project be exposed to noise in excess of these limits, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft EIR, p. 6-48 to 6-49).

Offsite Traffic Noise. The Project would generate traffic-related noise from vehicles traveling to and from the Project site. To identify the potential of traffic from the Project to generate noise impacts, modeling of vehicular noise on area roadways was conducted by the Noise Impact Analysis. Since neither the General Plan nor the County Code provide any policies or regulations defining what constitutes a "substantial permanent

increase to ambient noise levels”, the noise increase thresholds developed by the Federal Transit Administration for a moderate impact were utilized, which determined a significant impact would occur if a project would increase the noise by 3 dB, where the ambient noise level is 55 dB or less, 2 dB, where the ambient noise level is between 55 and 60 dBA CNEL, or would increase the noise by 1 dB, where the ambient noise level is between 60 and 75 dBA CNEL. In the existing year with Project conditions, noise would range from 62.5 to 67.1 dBA CNEL. Implementation of the Project would generate a noise level increase of up to 0.1 dBA CNEL on the study area roadway segments, which is less than the 1 and 2 dBA CNEL thresholds. Thus, offsite traffic noise impacts in the opening year plus Project condition would be less than significant.

In the opening year (2023) with Project conditions noise would range from 62.7 to 67.3 dBA CNEL. Implementation of the Project would generate a noise level increase of up to 0.1 dBA CNEL on the study area roadway segments, which is less than the 1 and 2 dBA CNEL thresholds. Thus, offsite traffic noise impacts in the opening year plus Project condition would be less than significant [Impact NOI-1] (Initial Study pp. 63-68, Draft EIR, p. 6-48 to 6-49).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction plans and specifications shall require that a minimum eight-foot-high temporary sound barrier (e.g., fiberglass core sound blanket or a 0.5-inch-thick wooden panel sound wall) shall be placed on the eastern and western property lines prior to commencement of Project grading. Temporary sound blankets or sound walls shall be maintained until the permanent six-foot-high concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall that are depicted in the Wall Plan for the Project are constructed along the east and west property lines. Construction plans and specifications shall also state that stationary construction equipment shall be located a minimum of 100 feet from the property line of any offsite residence. Noise control requirements shall be noted and depicted on Project construction drawings/plans.

Potential Effect

The Project could result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which

mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the impact of the Project related to the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Rationale for Finding

Construction

Construction activities would include demolition, excavation, and grading activities, which have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. People working in close proximity to the construction could be exposed to the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels related to construction activities. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Site ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can be perceived in the audible range and be felt in buildings very close to a construction site.

Demolition, excavation, and grading activities are required for implementation of the Project and can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. Based on the reference vibration levels provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), a large bulldozer represents the peak source of vibration with a reference velocity of 0.089 in/sec PPV at 25 feet. Section 12.08.570 of the County Code exempts construction activities from the vibration standards, provided construction activities occur between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, excluding holidays. In order to analyze the vibration source levels, Caltrans standards have been utilized, which defines the threshold of perception from transient sources that include mobile construction equipment to 0.25 inch per second PPV.

At distances of 25 feet from construction, vibration levels are anticipated to range from 0.003 to 0.21 in/sec PPV. These vibration levels would not be sustained during the entire construction period but would occur only during the times that heavy construction equipment is operating in the vicinity of the sensitive receivers. Based on typical propagation rates, the vibration level at the nearest sensitive receptors (two feet away from the Project) would be 1.43 inch per second PPV, which would exceed the Caltrans

distinctly perceptible vibration level of 0.25 inch per second PPV for transient sources. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is provided to restrict any off-road equipment with 150 horsepower engine or greater from operating within ten (10) feet of either the east or west property lines. Based on typical propagation rates, the vibration level at the nearest homes (12 feet away from proposed construction activities with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2) would be 0.03 inch per second PPV, which is within the 0.25 inch per second PPV threshold. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, construction-related vibration impacts would be less than significant (Initial Study, p. 68-69, Draft EIR, p. 6-49).

Operation

Inhabitation of the proposed single-family uses would include heavy trucks for residents moving in and out of the residential units and garbage trucks for solid waste disposal. Truck vibration levels are dependent on vehicle characteristics, load, speed, and pavement conditions. However, typical vibration levels for heavy truck activity at normal traffic speeds would be approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV, based on the FTA Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment. Truck movements on site would be travelling at very low speed, so it is expected that truck vibration at nearby sensitive receivers would be less than the vibration threshold of 0.08 in/sec PPV for fragile historic buildings and 0.04 in/sec PPV for human annoyance, and therefore, would be less than significant [Impact NOI-2] (Initial Study, p. 69, Draft EIR, p. 6-49 to 6-50).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: The Project construction plans and specifications shall state that operation of off-road construction equipment that is 150 horsepower or greater shall not occur within 10 feet of either the east or west property lines in order to limit construction-related vibration levels at the nearby residences. Typical construction equipment that is less than 150 horsepower include backhoes, skid steers, skip loaders, and tractors, that are capable of performing all grading and excavation activities within the 10-foot-wide areas adjacent to the east and west property lines. Noise control requirements shall be noted and depicted on Project construction drawings/plans.

5. Tribal Cultural Resources

Potential Effect

The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal

cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 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 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) or 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the Project's substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

Rationale for Finding

The Project has complied with AB 52 regarding tribal consultation. Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014 (i.e., AB 52), requires that Lead Agencies evaluate a project's potential to impact "tribal cultural resources." Such resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register or included in a local register of historical resources (PRC Section 21074). AB 52 also gives Lead Agencies the discretion to determine, supported by substantial evidence, whether a resource falling outside the definition stated above nonetheless qualifies as a "tribal cultural resource."

In compliance with these requirements, on July 15, 2021, the County sent letters to the following Native American tribes that may have knowledge regarding tribal cultural resources in the Project vicinity.

- Gabrieleno Tongva, San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation

Additionally, on July 22, 2021, the County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the Native American Heritage Commission. On August 19, 2021, the NAHC responded that the SLF search yielded negative results for known tribal cultural resources or sacred lands within a 1-mile radius of the Project site. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission

Indians-Kizh Nation requested consultation regarding the Project. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation considers the area sensitive for cultural resources as several sites are located nearby. As such, the consulting tribe requested inclusion of mitigation due to the potential of the Project to unearth previously undocumented tribal cultural resources during construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-3, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant [Impact TCR-1 and TCR-2] (Initial Study, p. 82, Draft EIR, p. 6-56 to 6-57).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities.

A. The Applicant/owner shall retain a Native American Monitor from or approved by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any “ground-disturbing activity” for the Project at all Project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the Project description/definition and/or required in connection with the Project, such as public improvement work). “Ground-disturbing activity” shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

B. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the lead agency prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

C. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or “TCR”), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the Applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribe.

D. On-site tribal monitoring shall conclude upon (1) written confirmation to the Kizh from a designated point of contact for the Applicant/owner that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the Project site or in

connection with the Project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the Kizh to the Applicant that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the Project site possesses the potential to impact Kizh TCRs.

E. Upon discovery of any TCRs, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Kizh monitor and/or Kizh archaeologist. The Kizh will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, in the Tribe's sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects

A. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute.

B. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods discovered or recognized on the Project site, then all construction activities shall immediately cease. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and all ground disturbing activities shall immediately halt and shall remain halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission, and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed.

C. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2).

D. Construction activities may resume in other parts of the Project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or burial goods, if the Kizh determines in its sole discretion that resuming construction activities at that distance is acceptable and provides the Project manager express consent of that determination (along with any other mitigation measures the Kizh monitor and/or archaeologist deems necessary).

(CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f).)

E. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCR) shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

F. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

Mitigation Measure TCR-3: Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains

A. As the Most Likely Descendant (“MLD”), the Koo-nas-gna Burial Policy shall be implemented. To the Tribe, the term “human remains” encompasses more than human bones. In ancient as well as historic times, Tribal Traditions included, but were not limited to, the preparation of the soil for burial, the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains.

B. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the discovery location shall be treated as a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created.

C. The prepared soil and cremation soils are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later; other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered as associated funerary objects. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure complete recovery of all sacred materials.

D. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to recommend diverting the Project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the Project cannot be

diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed, as described in item E.

E. In the event preservation in place is not possible despite good faith efforts by the Applicant/developer and/or landowner, before ground-disturbing activities may resume on the Project site, the landowner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the Project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects.

F. Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items should be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the Project site but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.

G. The Tribe will work closely with the Project's qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be prepared and shall include (at a minimum) detailed descriptive notes and sketches. All data recovery data recovery related forms of documentation shall be approved in advance by the Tribe. If any data recovery is performed, once complete, a final report shall be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does not authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive and/or destructive diagnostics on human remains.

Cumulative Tribal Resource Impacts

Potential Effect

Development of the Project, in conjunction with the Cumulative Projects, may result in cumulatively considerable impacts to tribal cultural resources.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the Project's potential incremental contribution to cumulatively significant impacts to tribal cultural resources less-than-cumulatively-considerable levels.

Rationale for Finding

The cumulative study area for tribal cultural resources includes the southern California region, which contains the same general tribal historic setting of the Gabrieleño. Other projects in the vicinity of the Project site would involve ground disturbances that could reveal buried tribal cultural resources.

Cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced by compliance with applicable regulations and consultations required by AB 52. As described above, the Project site and vicinity is not known to contain tribal cultural resources; however, Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-3 would be implemented to ensure that impacts would not occur in the case of an inadvertent discovery of a potential tribal cultural resources. These mitigation measures would provide that the Project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of tribal cultural resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-57).

6. Utilities

Potential Effect

The Project could 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.

Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate, to a less-than-significant level, the Project's impact with respect to 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.

Rationale for Finding

Domestic water services are provided to the Project site by Azusa Light and Water, and wastewater treatment services are provided to the area by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts ("Districts"). The Applicant would install new water and sewer infrastructure on the site and connect to the new 8-inch water main and 8-inch sewer main in San Bernardino Road. As per the Will Serve Letter provided by Azusa Light and Water, dated March 18, 2020, the Applicant would install a new 8-inch water main in San

Bernardino Avenue as a condition of approval.

Per the sewer will serve letter for the Project, dated August 14, 2020, from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, Districts has capacity to serve the Project. Per the City of West Covina's Sewer Outlet Approval Letter, dated December 3, 2020, LA County sewer discharges into an existing City of West Covina 8" sewer in East San Bernardino when it reaches the City of West Covina Boundary prior to connecting to the trunk line at Azusa Canyon Road. This segment of West Covina Sewer is theoretically "over-capacity" based on standard County of Los Angeles sewer criteria, however, the City of West Covina offered to accept direct compensation from the developer in lieu of performing the physical upgrade to the existing sewer.. As such, Mitigation Measure UT-1 is included to require the Project to pay all applicable in-lieu fees to the City of West Covina.

In addition, the Applicant would construct onsite storm water drainage facilities that would convey storm water into two onsite infiltration basins along San Bernardino Road. Runoff from properties adjacent to the Project site will be directly conveyed in a culvert to the stormwater drain in San Bernardino Road. The Project would also connect to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities that could cause environmental effects. Additionally, the construction of the new 8-inch water main would serve to replace the existing water main and would only serve the Project and surrounding, existing developments. Thus, with inclusion of MM UT-1, impacts would be less than significant [Impact UT-1] (Initial Study, p. 85, Draft EIR, p. 6-60).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure UT-1: Prior to the issuance of building permits, per the will serve letter dated December 3, 2020, the Applicant shall pay all applicable in-lieu sewer upgrade fees to the City of West Covina.

Cumulative Utilities and Service System Impacts

Potential Effect

Construction and operation of the Project, in conjunction with the Cumulative Projects, could increase the demand on existing utility infrastructure, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact to utilities and service systems.

Finding

With adherence to state and local regulations and guidelines, and implementation of Project-specific mitigation, the Project would not result in cumulative impacts to utilities and service systems.

Rationale for Finding

The Project would include onsite and offsite water, sewer, and wastewater infrastructure. With adherence to existing regulations the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to the construction of new infrastructure or the demand for water, generation of wastewater and stormwater, and generation of solid waste, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft EIR, p. 6-62).

SECTION 3

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

1. The Commission hereby finds that, although mitigation measures, design features included as part of the Project, and conditions of approval imposed on the Project will reduce the following effects, these effects cannot be feasibly or effectively mitigated to less than significant levels. Consequently, in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21081(b) and Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (see Section 8). **Transportation Impacts**

Potential Effects

The Project could conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b).

Finding

Despite the inclusion of mitigation measures and Project design features, the Project would result in VMT above the County's threshold and Project-specific and cumulative VMT impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

The above findings are made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the Project (see Section 8). For the reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 8), the Commission finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant impact on the environment.

Rationale for Finding

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focuses on determining the significance of VMT related transportation impacts. The County adopted VMT screening criteria within the County's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines. These criteria include 1) small projects that generate fewer than 110 trips, 2) projects located within a Transit Priority Area (within 0.5 mile of an existing major transit stop or a stop along a high-quality transit corridor), 3) projects that set aside 100 percent of units, excluding manager's units, as low income. Consistent with County Guidelines, projects that do not meet screening criteria are required to prepare a project level VMT analysis.

The County's VMT Screening threshold of 110 daily vehicle trips would be exceeded as the Project would result in 642 daily trips. Additionally, while the Project area is currently served by Metro Route 190/194, the peak headways are greater than 15 minutes during peak commute hours, which does not meet the requirements for high quality transit area or transit priority area. Therefore, the Project is not located within 0.5-mile of an existing major transit stop or along a high-quality transit corridor. The Project does not include any affordable housing. As such, since the Project does not meet any of the screening criteria, a VMT analysis was prepared for the Project.

The Project's baseline (2020) total VMT is 3,966 and home-based VMT per capita is 15.1. The County Guidelines provides VMT calculations for baseline (2020) conditions in South County; the Project is located in the South County area. The South County's HB VMT per capita for baseline (2020) conditions is 12.2 and the South County's HB VMT per capita for baseline (2020) conditions with a 16.8% reduction is 10.2. The Project's baseline HB VMT per capita of 15.1 is 48.04% above the County's current baseline HB VMT per capita of 10.2.

The baseline Project generated VMT exceeds the County's baseline VMT threshold by 48.04%. Transportation demand management (TDM) strategies have been evaluated for reducing VMT impacts determined to be potentially significant. The effectiveness of TDM strategies to reduce VMT has been determined based on the Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (CAPCOA, 2010). Multiple TDM measures are incorporated into the Project design, including PDF TR-1 and PDF TR-2, which include constructing onsite walkways to connect to offsite sidewalks and providing bike parking. These two TDMs provide a VMT reduction of 2.0%. Additionally, the Applicant would implement Mitigation Measure TR-1, which requires the Applicant to provide information on nearby transit, bike facilities, ridesharing, car sharing, and school carpool programs. Mitigation Measure TR-1 would provide a VMT reduction of 1% to 15%.

The CAPCOA Manual states that various TDM strategies to reduce VMT can interact, and that combining multiple strategies is subject to a global maximum project VMT reduction. For projects in suburban areas, the global maximum Project reduction is 15%. Even with implementation of the limited feasible TDM measures as discussed above, a potential reduction in Project VMT of a global maximum of 15.0% would not achieve the County's target threshold of 16.8% below current baseline HB VMT per capita. Therefore, with the implementation of the proposed TDM measures, which are included as PDF TR-1 and PDF TR-2, and Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-3, baseline Project

generated VMT would not be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, Project-specific and cumulative impacts are significant and unavoidable [Impact TRAN-2] (Draft EIR, p. 5.1-15 to 5.1-16).

Project Design Features

PDF TR-1: Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements (CAPCOA SDT-1). Sidewalks currently exist along the Project's frontage of San Bernardino Road and connections extend both east and west from the site to surrounding land uses. The Project includes construction of onsite, internal five-foot-wide walkways that will connect to the existing sidewalks along San Bernardino Road. Improvement plans for the proposed sidewalks shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval prior to final map recordation.

PDF TR-2: Onsite Bicycle Parking. As part of the Project design, the Project will provide bicycle parking in common areas in addition to private garages. Improvement plans shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval prior to final map recordation. A note shall be shown on the Exhibit A map showing bicycle parking.

PDF TR-3: Onsite Parks (inspired by CAPCOA LUT-3). The Project will construct two onsite park/open space areas that shall be made available for resident and public use. Improvement plans for the onsite open space shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval prior to final map recordation. The signage shall include "Open to the Public" and the Street Improvement Plans shall demonstrate sidewalk accessibility. Upon completion of the Project, the open space will be conveyed to the homeowners' association formed to manage the Project ("HOA"). Any recorded instrument that references the public's use of the open space shall provide that the public's use of the open space is subject to any rules and regulations promulgated by the HOA related to the public's use of such open space and all HOA members and the general public shall comply with the rules and regulations promulgated by the HOA.

Mitigation Measures

MM TR-1: Provide Ride Share Program (CAPCOA TRT-3). The Applicant/developer shall create a website in multiple languages describing and coordinating the following carpooling/ridesharing programs for the Project site that shall be made available to the greater community. The website shall function as a resource for encouraging and implementing VMT reduction measures by providing one consolidated location for people to connect with others within the community. The website shall be managed and maintained by the homeowners association (HOA) and property management company

for the Project. The website shall encourage and facilitate ridesharing by providing a means for community members to be matched with other members of the community and shall include matches for midday trips for shopping and medical appointments. The Project shall also provide carpool/vanpool loading/unloading area and parking spaces near the main open space area to discourage the use of single occupancy automobiles. The Applicant shall submit a memorandum to the Department of Public Works for review and approval detailing the metrics that will be used to measure program participation and the expected frequency of the reporting prior to final map recordation. The Project shall implement the websites and programs prior to certificate of occupancy. A bond shall be required prior to final map recordation to guarantee these items are completed.

SECTION 4

GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

Potential Effect

Development of the Project has the potential to induce growth by fostering economic or population growth either directly or indirectly.

Finding

The Project does not meet a growth-inducing criterion specified under CEQA, and, therefore, the Project is not considered to be growth inducing.

Rationale for Finding

Growth inducing impacts are discussed on pages 6-1 through 6-4 of the Draft EIR. The following facts support the above finding:

The Project site consists of one parcel totaling 9.61-acres. The Project site is comprised of the former Griswold School, and is currently improved with six permanent structures, as well as associated improvements, such as paved recreational areas, parking lots, and patio areas. The existing buildings were constructed in 1953 for use as the Griswold School through 1974. The school was reopened in 1978 for use by Tri-Community Adult Education. The school buildings have been vacant for approximately three years and the entire property, with the exception of the parking lot along San Bernardino Road, is fenced.

The Project would redevelop the Project site to provide 68 single-family residences for a density of approximately 7.15 dwelling units per acre on a site that allows for residential development at up to 9 dwelling units per acre. The Project would create temporary construction jobs during the approximately 21-month to 27-month construction period. However, the Project would develop housing in an area designated for residential uses. Additionally, the proposed single-family residences would be adequately served by existing commercial services within the vicinity of the Project. Overall, the Project would provide housing and would not establish substantial new permanent employment opportunities or result in the need for additional housing, businesses, or services to support increased economic activities.

The elimination of a physical obstacle to growth is considered to be a growth inducing impact. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The Project would induce growth if it would provide public services or

infrastructure with excess capacity to serve lands that would otherwise not be developable or to expand the development potential of redevelopment areas.

The Applicant would develop the onsite infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed single-family residential uses. The Applicant would construct private domestic water lines and private fire water lines onsite to connect with existing water mains in San Bernardino Road or the Applicant might be required to install new 8-inch water lines in East San Bernardino Road that would connect to the existing 8-inch water pipeline in Hartley Avenue. A new line would be required, depending upon the condition of the existing 8-inch water line. The new onsite water line would be solely for purposes of providing water supplies to the proposed residences and landscaping through plumbing/landscaping fixtures that are compliant with the CalGreen Plumbing Code for efficient use of water. Additionally, should a new 8-inch water line be installed into East San Bernardino Road, it would be sized to serve the proposed development and would not have additional capacity. The Applicant would install new 8-inch private sewer lines onsite that would connect to the existing 8-inch sewer pipeline in San Bernardino Road. Stormwater runoff in the Project vicinity currently flows from north to south to San Bernardino Road. A series of onsite storm drain facilities with Low Impact Development (LID) and Peak Storm elements are proposed. One infiltration basin is being proposed along the southern property line. Additionally, an onsite drainage swale is being proposed along the eastern property line to convey drainage from adjacent residences to the existing stormwater infrastructure in San Bernardino Road.

Overall, the Applicant would install new onsite infrastructure systems and upon approval, would connect to existing offsite systems that currently have capacity to serve the Project area, with the potential exception of the 8-inch line in East San Bernardino Road. The new onsite and offsite infrastructure would not provide additional capacity beyond what is needed to serve the Project. In addition, development of the Project would not result in an expansion of overall infrastructure capacity, or extension of major infrastructure. Therefore, infrastructure improvements would not result in significant growth inducing impacts.

The Project site has a County General Plan land use designation of Public and Semi-Public (P) and a zoning designation of Light Agricultural (A-1-6,000). A Project could directly induce growth if it would remove barriers to population growth such as change to a jurisdiction's general plan and zoning code, which allows new development to occur in underutilized areas. The Project does not include amendments to the Los Angeles County General Plan or Zoning as residential development up to nine dwelling units per acre is allowed pursuant to the General Plan.

The Project is surrounded by single-family residences or areas planned for urban development. In addition, based on the SCAG model population data, with an estimate of

3.85 persons per household within the community of unincorporated Covina, the Project would result in a net increase of approximately 262 new residents. Overall, the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy's (2020-2045 RTP/SCS) population and household growth forecast from 2016 through 2045 for the County's unincorporated area envisions 213,500 additional persons, yielding an approximately 20.4% growth rate. The unincorporated areas of Los Angeles are projected to have a population of 1,258,000 persons and 419,300 housing units by 2045. The Project would generate approximately 262 persons, which represents approximately 0.0002 percent of the forecasted population in 2045 and approximately 0.001 percent of the forecasted growth between 2016 and 2045 for the County's unincorporated area. Thus, the proposed increase in housing units and population as a result of the Project is within SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast. Therefore, impacts related to growth from changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development would be less than significant.

The Project is expected to incrementally increase the demand for fire protection and emergency response, police protection, and school services. However, the 262 new residents associated with the Project would not require development of additional facilities or expansion of existing facilities to maintain existing levels of service. Based on service ratios and build out projections, the Project would not create a demand for services beyond the capacity of existing facilities. Therefore, an indirect growth inducing impact as a result of expanded or new public facilities that could support other development in addition to the Project would not occur. The Project would not have significant growth inducing consequences that would require the need to expand public services to maintain desired levels of service.

The Applicant does not propose changes to any of the County's building safety standards (i.e., building, grading, plumbing, mechanical, electrical, or fire codes). The Project would comply with all applicable County plans, policies, and ordinances. In addition, Project features and mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that the Project minimizes environmental impacts. The Project would not involve any precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that significantly affect the environment.

SECTION 5 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes Which Would Be Involved In The Project Should It Be Implemented

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter likely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the Project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

As concluded in Section 6.3 of the Draft EIR, lands in the Project area that are currently developed with vacant school buildings would be committed to single-family residential uses once the proposed buildings are constructed. Secondary effects associated with this irreversible commitment of land resources include:

- Changes in views associated with construction of the new buildings and associated development (see Section 1, *Aesthetics*, of the Initial Study).
- Increased VMT from vehicles traveling to and from the Project site (see Section 5.1, *Transportation*).
- Emissions of air pollutants associated with Project construction and operation (see Section 3, *Air Quality*, of the Initial Study).
- Consumption of non-renewable energy associated with construction and operation of the Project due to the use of automobiles, lighting, heating and cooling systems, appliances, and the like (see Section 6, *Energy*, of the Initial Study).
- Increased ambient noise associated with an increase in activities and traffic from the Project (see Section 13, *Noise*, of the Initial Study).

Construction of the Project would require the use of energy produced from non-renewable resources and construction materials.

In regard to energy usage from the Project, as demonstrated in the analyses contained in Section 6, *Energy*, of the Initial Study, the Project would not involve wasteful or unjustifiable use of non-renewable resources, and conservation efforts would be enforced during construction and operation of proposed development. The proposed development

would incorporate energy-generating and conserving project design features, including those required by the California Building Code, California Energy Code Title 24, which specify green building standards for new developments. In addition, the Project includes project design features that result in additional energy-efficiency. Project specific information related to energy consumption is provided in Section 6, *Energy Resources*, of the Initial Study.

Potential Effects of Mitigation Measures

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) requires the effects of the proposed mitigation measures be discussed (in less detail than the significant effects of the Project) if a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the Project. With regard to this section of the State CEQA Guidelines, the potential impacts that could result with the implementation of each mitigation measure proposed for the Project was reviewed. The Commission finds with respect to each potential secondary impacts that could occur as a result of the implementation of the Project mitigation measures that no significant impact will occur as a result of implementation of the mitigation measures as required pursuant to the MMRP.

1. Biological Resources

Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1, MM BIO-2 and MM BIO-3 require surveys for various species on the Project Site. These mitigation measures also allow the temporary halting of grading/construction activities under certain circumstances. The measures would also require relocation of bats, if necessary. Any secondary impacts resulting from implementation of these measures would be beneficial in that Project impacts to biological resources would be minimized.

2. Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1 pertains to archaeological resources. **Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1** requires archaeological monitoring and that if archaeological resources are found, construction activities shall cease, a qualified archaeologist shall be notified, and the archaeologist shall ensure that any resources are treated in accordance with Federal, State, and local guidelines. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing impacts to archaeological resources and would ensure compliance with applicable regulations. No adverse secondary impacts would result as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure MM CUL-2 pertains to paleontological resources. **Mitigation Measure MM CUL-2** requires all encountered significant fossils to be collected by a qualified paleontologist. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing impacts to paleontological resources. No adverse secondary impacts would result as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure MM CUL-3 requires the ceasing of construction excavation and grading activities if human remains are found and requires notification of the California Native American Heritage Commission. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing impacts to human remains and would ensure compliance with applicable regulations. No adverse secondary impacts would result as a result of implementation of this mitigation measure.

3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-1 requires preparation of a soils testing plan for arsenic and proper disposal for certain soils. Adherence to this measure would ensure safety on the Project site and would not result in any secondary effects.

Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-2 requires preparation of a Health and Safety Plan. Adherence to this measure would ensure safety on the Project site and would not result in any secondary effects.

Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-3 requires provision of educational materials regarding household hazardous waste as part of the Home Buyer's package. Adherence to this measure would ensure proper disposal of hazardous wastes and would not result in any secondary effects.

4. Noise

Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 includes requirements for sound barriers adjacent to existing residences and location of stationary construction equipment. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing noise impacts and not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2 includes requirements limiting vibration causing construction equipment near homes. Implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial in reducing vibration impacts and not result in adverse secondary impacts.

5. Transportation

Mitigation Measure MM TR-1 requires a provision of a ride share program. No secondary effects would occur.

6. Utilities

Mitigation Measure MM UT-1 is a procedural action that requires the Applicant to pay in-lieu fees to the City of West Covina. No secondary effects would occur.

SECTION 6 FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the Project described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered. The Commission hereby finds that the alternatives discussed in the Draft EIR constitute a reasonable range of alternatives for consideration and allowed for informed decision making among the alternatives as well as the Project.

The Draft EIR concluded that the “No Project/No Development” Alternative (Alternative 1) was the environmentally superior alternative. However, as specified in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives would be the Reduced Project Alternative, which would involve redevelopment of the site with 11 single-family residences and 7.6 acres of recreational amenities and common open space.

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the Project’s significant and unavoidable transportation impacts to a less than significant level, would implement the existing General Plan land use and zoning designations for the Project site, and would not require a CUP for grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would include 80 percent fewer residences, it would not require implementation of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-3, which provide VMT reductions. Additionally, the Reduced Project Alternative would avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable VMT impacts. However, this alternative would continue to require mitigation related to biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, contaminated soils onsite, tribal cultural resources, and payment of in-lieu fees to the City of West Covina.

In addition, while the Reduced Project Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives, it would not do so to the same extent as the Project. This alternative would not meet the objective to provide housing to meet the region’s need for housing to the extent that the Project would because residential units are reduced by 57 units, or 80 percent. Additionally, while this alternative would provide increased buffering from surrounding residences, it would be at a significantly less dense scale when compared to surrounding residential densities.

Project Objectives

- Provide for additional market-rate housing opportunities consistent with the County's Housing Element and State housing goals.
- Develop a Project that constructs new single-family residential units, which would help meet the region's demand for housing.
- Redevelop existing land uses that would utilize existing infrastructure, including: water, sewer, arterial roadways, transit, and freeways; and provide non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) circulation.
- Redevelop an infill site to minimize environmental impacts.
- Develop a mix of housing to assist the County in meeting its jobs/housing balance.
- Ensure new residential development includes adequate open space and high-quality recreational amenities for future residents;
- Eliminate and prevent the spread of blight by redeveloping vacant buildings;
- Provide a new single-family residential neighborhood that is scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods.

Alternatives Considered But Not Evaluated.

Several potential alternatives were considered but rejected as infeasible, and therefore were not analyzed in detail in the Draft EIR. An alternate site for the Project was eliminated from further consideration. The Project site building is underutilized in the existing condition. The Project objectives are to redevelop an existing underutilized parcel and implement new single-family housing near employment and utilize existing infrastructure, all of which are consistent with the opportunities provided by the Project site. In addition, due to the urban and built out nature of the County of Los Angeles, development of 68 single-family residences with 62,443 square feet of common open space area on another 9.61-acre site at a different location would likely require demolition of existing structures, require similar mitigation, and have similar impacts as the Project. Furthermore, development of the Project on a vacant site of similar size would likely be located further from job centers and would increase VMT. CEQA specifies that the key question regarding alternative site consideration is "whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project at another location." Given the size and nature of the Project and the Project objectives, it would be infeasible to develop and operate the Project on an alternative site with fewer environmental impacts. Therefore, the Alternative Site Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

Renovation of the existing onsite buildings was eliminated from further consideration. The existing onsite buildings are heavily deteriorated in their existing condition and have been impacted by building fires which have previously occurred onsite. As such, renovation and reopening of the existing Griswold School as a school campus would likely require extensive renovations or reconstruction of school buildings, which would require similar mitigation, and have similar impacts as the Project. Furthermore, this alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives and would not supply housing in Los Angeles County. Therefore, the Reuse of Existing Griswold School Buildings Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

Alternative 1, The “No Project/No Development” Alternative

Description of Alternative

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR is required to “discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.”

Therefore, under this alternative, no development would occur on the Project site, and it would remain in its existing condition with six existing school buildings, paved recreational areas, parking lots, and patio areas. However, the existing school buildings have been vacant for approximately 3 years and are significantly deteriorated. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the Project site would remain underutilized in the long-term. Thus, in the No Project/No Build condition it is reasonably expected that the school buildings are not reoccupied. Hence, this alternative compares impacts of the Project with existing site conditions.

Comparison of Effects

The No Project/No Build Alternative would result in the continued vacancy of the existing school buildings within the Project site. As a result, the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts that would occur from the Project and all of the potential construction impacts. Additionally, operational impacts would be reduced and the mitigation measures would not be required, which include measures related to biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities. However, the environmental benefits of the Project would also not be realized, such as

improvements to storm water quality, improvements to the jobs/housing balance, and provision of needed housing within Los Angeles County. Additionally, safety hazards would continue to exist onsite given the poor condition of existing buildings. The No Project/No Build Alternative would not install storm water filtration features in accordance with LID design guidelines that would filter and slow the volume and rate of runoff; and this alternative would not provide additional needed housing to meeting the regions housing demands.

Finding

The “No Project/No Development” alternative is rejected because it fails to meet any of the Project objectives identified in the Draft EIR and would not provide any of the Project benefits as set forth herein.

Rationale for Finding

The No Project/ No Build Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives. The site would not be redeveloped to provide housing to help meet the region’s demand for housing, would not provide a development consistent with surrounding residential densities, would not develop housing to assist the County in meeting its jobs/housing balance, would not redevelop an underutilized site, and would not prevent the spread of blight by redeveloping vacant buildings. Overall, this alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the Project.

Alternative 2, Reduced Project Alternative

Description of Alternative

Under this alternative, a reduction in the number of single-family residences would be built, which would result in increased setbacks and increased recreational area. The Project site has a General Plan land use designation of Public and Semi-Public (P) and a zoning designation of Light Agricultural (A-1-6,000). This allows for development of single-family residences on lots that have a minimum of 6,000 square feet. This alternative would develop 11 single-family residences, which would be developed on individual lots and result in a density of 1.14 dwelling units per acre. Each individual single-family residence would be constructed on an individual 8,000 square foot lot. The buildout of the site at a decreased density would result in 57 fewer residential units than the Project.

To support the Reduced Project Alternative, parking spaces would be provided at the same rate as the Project at 2.63 spaces per dwelling unit. The Reduced Project

Alternative would include 29 parking spaces, including 22 garage spaces. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the recreational amenities would be increased to 7.6 acres.

Like the Project, this alternative would require a Tentative Tract Map Approval and Site Plan Approval but would likely not require a Conditional Use Permit for grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards. Like the Project, this alternative would not require a General Plan Amendment from the existing land use designation of P (Public and Semi-Public) or a Zone change from A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural) designation.

Comparison of Effects

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce residential density on the site by 80 percent or by 57 residential units. With fewer units, this alternative would result in reduced light and glare from fewer residential structures, reduced air quality and GHG emissions from construction and operation, reduced energy usage, and reduced operational noise from fewer residents and vehicles. While reduced, these impacts are less than significant without mitigation under both the alternative and the Project. Furthermore, this alternative would require the same mitigation measures that are required for the Project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level for biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, construction noise and vibration, tribal cultural resources, and utilities. The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the trips generated to an extent that would result in less than significant impacts related to VMT. As such, the Reduced Project Alternative would not require the mitigation measures related to VMT and would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable VMT impacts.

Finding

The Alternative fails to most of the Project objectives and would not be consistent with surrounding residential densities. For these reasons, this Alternative is rejected.

Rationale for Finding

This alternative would require the same mitigation measures that are required for the Project related to biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, construction noise and vibration, tribal cultural resources, and utilities. The Reduced Project Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives, but not to the same extent as the Project. This alternative would not meet the objectives to provide housing opportunities consistent with the County's Housing Element and State Housing goals, or to meet the region's need for housing to the extent that the

Project would because residential units are reduced by 57 units and 80 percent. Additionally, while this alternative would provide increased buffering from surrounding residences, it would be at a significantly less dense scale when compared to surrounding residential densities, making this alternative less compatible with the objective to design the Project so that it is scaled in conformance with existing uses and the adjacent neighborhoods.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15131(c), provides that “housing factors shall be considered by public agencies together with technological and environmental factors in deciding whether changes to a project are feasible to reduce or avoid the effect on the environment identified in the EIR.” Further, CEQA generally discourages a public agency from reducing the proposed number of housing units as a project alternative. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21159.26.)

CEQA does not require the County of Los Angeles to choose the environmentally superior alternative. Instead, CEQA requires the County to consider environmentally superior alternatives, weigh those considerations against the environmental impacts of the Project, and make findings that the benefits of those considerations outweigh the harm. Based on the considerations described herein, the County of Los Angeles finds that the Reduced Project Alternative is infeasible based on these economic, social, and public policy factors.

Alternative 3, Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative

Description of Alternative

Under the Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning alternative, the Project site would be developed to the maximum allowable density pursuant to the Los Angeles County General Plan and would result in a density of 8.9 dwelling units per acre. An increase in the number of residential units would be built, which would result in reduced setbacks, smaller lots, and less open space. This alternative would consist of developing 85 multi-family residential units. The buildout of the site at an increased density would result in 17 more residential units than the Project.

To support the Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative, parking spaces would be provided at the required rate of 2 covered spaces per dwelling unit and 1 guest parking spaces per 4 units. The Reduced Project Alternative would include 29 parking spaces, including 22 garage spaces. Under the Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative, the recreational amenities would be reduced, and the northern open space

area would be removed in order to accommodate the additional units. Additionally, the backyard area for each home would be reduced to patio areas.

Like the Project, this alternative would require a Tentative Tract Map Approval and Site Plan Approval and would likely require a Conditional Use Permit for grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards. Like the Project, this alternative would not require a General Plan Amendment from the existing land use designation of P (Public and Semi-Public), or a Zone change from A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural) designation.

Comparison of Effects

The Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would increase residential density on the site by 25 percent or by 17 residential units. With more units, this alternative would result in increased impacts related to light and glare from more residential structures, increased air quality and GHG emissions from construction and operation, increased energy usage, and increased operational noise from more residents and vehicles. While increased, these impacts are less than significant without mitigation under both the alternative and the Project. Furthermore, this alternative would require the same mitigation measures that are required for the Project to reduce impacts to a less than significant level for biological resources, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, construction noise and vibration, tribal cultural resources, and utilities. The Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would increase the trips generated and would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable VMT impacts. Overall, this alternative would not reduce any of the Project's impacts.

Finding

The Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to vehicle miles traveled, while failing to achieve several of the basic Project Objectives, such as provision of adequate open space and properly scaled and buffered housing. For these reasons, the Alternative is rejected.

Rationale for Finding

While Alternative 3, like the Project, results in significant and unavoidable impacts related to vehicle miles traveled, it would also result in increased emissions of air quality pollutants and greenhouse gasses and would result in additional noise impacts. The Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives but would not provide as high quality of development that would be consistent

with surrounding development. The Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would not meet the objective to provide single-family housing and would not include adequate onsite open space and high-quality recreational amenities for future residents. Additionally, the Buildout of Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would not be properly scaled or buffered as proposed setbacks would be reduced in order to accommodate the additional residences.

SECTION 7
FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when a public agency is making the findings required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), codified as Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the public agency shall adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (“MMRP”) for the changes to the Project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval, in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is attached as Exhibit A to these Findings and incorporated in the Project’s entitlement approvals, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions to mitigate or avoid potential environmental effects in a manner designed to ensure compliance during Project implementation.

SECTION 8

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Section 21081(b) of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in the EIR that are not substantially lessened or avoided, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. Chapter II of the County's CEQA Guidelines incorporates all of the State CEQA Guidelines and thereby requires, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, that the decision maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. To adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the decision-maker must balance the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable." These findings incorporate and state the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted for the Project. The findings and this Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record as a whole, including but not limited to the EIR, including the references in and appendices to the EIR, staff reports, and documents and materials submitted to the County by the Applicant. The Draft EIR identified and discussed significant effects that will occur as a result of the Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Draft EIR, these effects can be mitigated to levels of insignificance except for the potential unavoidable significant impact regarding vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as identified in Section 3 of these findings. The Commission recognizes that a significant and unavoidable impact related to VMT would result from implementation of the Project. Having (i) reduced the significant adverse environmental effects of the Project by incorporating the Project Design Features into the Project, (ii) adopted all feasible mitigation measures described above and in the Draft EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (iii) rejected certain alternatives to the Project (as analyzed in the EIR), (iv) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (v) balanced the benefits of the Project against the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the Commission hereby finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant adverse impacts, and that the unavoidable significant adverse impacts are nonetheless acceptable, based on the following overriding considerations.

Summarized below are the benefits, goals and objectives of the Project. These provide the rationale for approval of the Project, despite its significant and unavoidable impact

related to VMT. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project and justify the approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the Project and the certification of the completed Final EIR.

1. The Project will improve upon the current aesthetics of the blighted and visually degraded Project Site.
2. The Project will provide a well-designed development that is compatible with and complementary to surrounding uses.
3. The Project will provide new housing to accommodate projected regional growth in a location that is adjacent to existing and planned infrastructure, services, transportation corridors, and major employment centers.
4. The Project will provide a residential development with numerous recreational opportunities and common amenities such as open space, recreational amenities, and landscaping.
5. The Project will provide needed housing on a site that is currently vacant and underutilized.
6. The Project will conform to all required sustainability and conservation measures and will include additional sustainable features.
7. The Project will mitigate, to the extent feasible, its potential environmental impacts.

In addition, the development and use of the Project will accomplish the Project Objectives described in the EIR, including the following:

- Provide for additional market-rate housing opportunities consistent with the County's Housing Element and State housing goals.
- Develop a Project that constructs new single-family residential units, which would help meet the region's demand for housing.
- Redevelop existing land uses that would utilize existing infrastructure, including: water, sewer, arterial roadways, transit, and freeways; and provide non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) circulation.
- Redevelop an infill site to minimize environmental impacts.
- Develop a mix of housing to assist the County in meeting its jobs/housing balance.
- Ensure new residential development includes adequate open space and high-quality recreational amenities for future residents;

- Eliminate and prevent the spread of blight by redeveloping vacant buildings;
- Provide a new single-family residential neighborhood that is scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods.

SECTION 9
SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the Regional Planning Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant adverse effects of the Project:

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid many of the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR.
- b. Some changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

- a. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
- b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the overriding considerations set forth in the foregoing Statement of Overriding Considerations.

SECTION 10
SECTION 21082.1(c)(3) FINDINGS

In approving the Project, the County decision-makers have reviewed and considered the Draft EIR and appendices, the Final EIR and appendices, and all other pertinent evidence in the record of proceedings.

The Applicant's consultants prepared the screen check versions of the Draft EIR, Final EIR and technical studies. All such materials and all other materials related to the EIR were extensively reviewed and, where appropriate, modified by the Department of Regional Planning or other County representatives. As such, pursuant to Public Resource Code § 21082.1(c)(3), the Commission finds that the Draft EIR, Final EIR, technical studies, and all other related materials reflect the independent judgment and analysis of the Lead Agency.

SECTION 11 NO RECIRCULATION

The Final EIR documents changes to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR provides additional analysis that was not included in the Draft EIR. Furthermore, Responses To Comments contained in the Final EIR fully considered and responded to comments claiming that the Project would have significant impacts or more severe impacts not disclosed in the Draft EIR. Furthermore, the Responses To Comments include substantial evidence that none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the Project would result in changed circumstances, significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR. The County staff and Commission have thoroughly reviewed the public comments received regarding the Project and the Final EIR to determine whether any of the public comments provide substantial evidence that would require recirculation of the EIR prior to its adoption.

The Commission hereby finds, consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, that no significant new information requiring further recirculation of the EIR has occurred. Specifically, the Commission finds, based on the substantial evidence presented to it during the period between circulation of the Draft EIR and the date of adoption by the Commission of these findings that: (1) no new significant environmental impact would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented; (2) no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result from the Project; (3) no feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed has been proposed that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project; and (4) the Draft EIR is not so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

SECTION 12
CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Regional Planning Commission's decision is based is the Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.