

FINDINGS OF FACTS
ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2022100204)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction	1-1
2. Project Summary	2-1
3. Environmental Review and Public Participation	3-1
4. Findings Regarding Project Environmental Effects Determined to Have No Impact on the Environment, or Have a Less Than Significant Impact on the Environment	4-1
5. Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	5-1
6. Findings Regarding Project Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable	6-1
7. Findings Regarding Alternatives	7-1
8. Findings Regarding Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project	8-1

1. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code Section 21081, and the Guidelines for Implementation for the California Environmental Quality Act, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15091 ("State CEQA Guidelines"), require that a public agency consider the environmental impacts of a project before a project is approved and make specific findings. Public Resources Code Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Public Resources Code Section 21002 goes on to provide that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which Environmental Impact Reports are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an Environmental Impact Report for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, Findings, specifically provides as follows:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final Environmental Impact Reports
 - 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can or should be adopted by such other agency.
 - 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final Environmental Impact Reports.
- (b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

- (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- (d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this Section.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, Statement of Overriding Considerations, provides as follows:

- (g) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, 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 proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
- (h) Where the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final Environmental Impact Report but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (i) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, the findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines Section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565 (Goleta II).) The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410; 417 (City of Del Mar); *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant's project objectives]; see also

California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (CNPSJ ["an alternative 'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'" (quoting Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (Kostka), § 17.39, p.

825); In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (Bay-Delta) ["[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary project objectives"; "a lead agency may structure its Environmental Impact Report alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal"].) Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (City of Del Mar, supra, 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417; see also CNPS, supra, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 ["an alternative that 'is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint' may be rejected as infeasible"] [quoting Kostka, supra, § 17.29, p. 824]; San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

For purposes of these findings, the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is "avoid[ed] or substantially lessen[ed]," these findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been "avoided" (i.e., reduced to a less than significant level).

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving ... any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced." (Goleta II, supra, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.) The EIR for the Royal Vista Residential Project (Project) concluded the Project will create significant and unavoidable impacts; thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

These findings constitute the County of Los Angeles' (County's) best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, the County hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the County adopts a resolution approving the Project.

In addition, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") has been prepared for the Project and is being approved by the Board of Supervisors by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final MMRP is attached to and incorporated into the environmental document approval resolution and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR") for the Royal Vista Residential Project Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2022100204), as well as other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the Regional Planning Commission of the County in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency hereby finds, determines, and declares the following Findings and Facts, in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code.

These Findings set forth the environmental basis for the discretionary actions to be undertaken by the County for the development of the Project. These actions include the approval of the following for the Royal Vista Residential Project:

- General Plan and Community Plan Amendments (Rowland Heights Community Plan): OS (Open Space) to Urban 2 ((U2); 3.3 to 6.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5; to Urban 3 ((U3); 6.1 to 12.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1 and 5; and to Urban 4 ((U4); 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) for a portion of Planning Area 3.
- Zone Change from A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000-6U and RPD-5000-12U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-6 Dwelling Units Per Acre and 12 Dwelling Units Per Acre, respectively) for the 62.25 acres of proposed single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, with an affordable housing component and open space for Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 and to RPD-5000-17U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-17 Dwelling Units Per Acre) for the 6.0 acres of townhomes with an affordable housing component and open space for proposed Planning Area 3.
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map: Subdivision of six (6) existing parcels into 248 lots, consisting of 200 single family lots, 29 residential condominium lots with a total of 58 duplex units, 5 residential condo lots with a total of 30 triplex units, 1 residential condo lot with 72 attached townhomes, 13 open space lots to be

privately owned and maintained by the HOA but accessible to the public, and a street frontage waiver for the private driveway and fire lane system within PAs-1, 2, and 5.

- Conditional Use Permit (CUP): For grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards, and a Residential Development Program, walls over 6 feet in height, buildings over 35 feet in height, setback reduction for townhome (front) and triplex (front and rear) yards, and residential lot widths less than 50 feet.
- Housing Permit to reserve 22.7 percent (82 units) of subdivision units for sale to middle- and moderate-income households and to allow single-family lots smaller than 5,000 square feet and waive the parkway requirement along private driveways within Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5. Single-family Lots #18, #47, and #155 are slightly less than 5,000 sf in size (net size). Lot #18 is undersized due to a side yard utility easement, Lot #47 is a corner lot with a curved front side yard to accommodate the entrance of the residential development, and Lot #155 is undersized due to a utility easement.

Additional agency actions which require other permits and approvals known to be needed, or which may be needed, in order to implement various components of the Project, include the following:

- Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 permit under the federal Clean Water Act
- U.S Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit under the federal Clean Water Act
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife for a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Fish & Game Code 1602

These actions are collectively referred to herein as the Project.

A. Document Format

These Findings have been organized into the following Sections:

- (1) Section 1 provides an introduction to these Findings.
- (2) Section 2 provides a summary of the Project, overview of the discretionary actions required for approval of the Project, and a statement of the Project's objectives.
- (3) Section 3 provides a summary of environmental review related to the Project and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the Project.
- (4) Section 4 sets forth findings regarding the potential impact areas identified in the EIR for which the County has determined that there is no impact or the impact is less than significant. Because there is either no impact or a less than significant impact, no mitigation is required.

- (5) Section 5 sets forth findings regarding potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that the County has determined can be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance and implementation, all of the mitigation measures will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and adopted as conditions of the Project by the Lead Agency. Where potentially significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level through mitigation, these findings specify how those impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level.
- (6) Section 6 sets forth findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR that will or may result from the Project and which the County has determined will remain significant and unavoidable, despite the identification and incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures.
- (7) Section 7 sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the Project.
- (8) Section 8 contains findings regarding growth-inducing impacts.
- (9) Section 9 contains the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

B. Custodian and Location of Records

The Royal Vista Residential Project Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2022100204) consists of:

- 1. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Appendices A through N, dated October 2023; and
- 2. Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) dated May 2024.

The following findings of fact are based in part on the information contained in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, (together, the EIR) for the Project, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings. The EIR is hereby incorporated by reference and is available for review during normal business hours at the County of Los Angeles, Subdivisions Section, Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 170, Los Angeles, California 90012.

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Project Location

The Project is located in the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights in the County of Los Angeles (County). The Project would be developed on a 75.65-acre site consisting of six contiguous parcels located both north and south of Colima Road, consisting of Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 8762-022-002, 8762-023-001, 8762-023-002, 8762-027-039, 8764-002-005, and 8764-002-006 (Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor 2021), and located in the 20100 block of Colima Road, Rowland Heights, California 91789 (Project Site). The Project Site generally comprises 13 holes and the driving range of the existing 27-hole Royal Vista Golf Club. The Project Site is bisected by Colima Road, with four parcels comprising approximately 53 acres located north of Colima Road, and two parcels comprising approximately 23 acres located south of Colima Road.

The Project Site is bounded by East Walnut Drive South to the north, Fairway Drive to the west, residential neighborhoods along Chapel Hill Drive and Morning Sun Avenue to the south, and residential neighborhoods along Tierra Luna, Calbourne Drive, and Fairlance Drive to the east. These residential neighborhoods are within the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights in the County and the City of Diamond Bar. The City of Diamond Bar is located immediately east of the Project Site, sharing a common boundary with the east sides of Planning Areas 4 and 5. The City of Walnut is further north of the Project Site, across State Route 60 (SR-60, or the Pomona Freeway).

The Project Site is located within a developed and urbanized area. Single-family residential uses and portions of an existing golf course are immediately adjacent and surround the Project Site on all sides except the north, where commercial and hotel uses are located along East Walnut Drive South, including a hotel, warehouse/office space, self-storage facility, LA County Public Works facility, religious facility, and associated surface parking lot uses. South of Colima Road are the existing golf course, landscaping, and residential uses surrounding the southwestern most edge of the Project Site. Land uses further north of the Project Site, north of SR-60, include business parks and commercial uses such as, car wash, restaurants, dance studio, gas station, storage facilities, and several retail stores. The remaining portions of the existing Royal Vista Golf Club golf course not included as part of the Project Site are separately owned and operated and are not within the control of the Applicant and are not part of the Project. Any future land use changes to the portions of the Royal Vista Golf Club that are not included in the Project Site would be speculative and are not addressed in the EIR.

The Project Site is near four major freeways. It is approximately 0.15 miles south of SR-60, approximately 1 mile west of State Route 57 Freeway (SR-57, or Orange Freeway), approximately 5 miles south of U.S. Interstate 10 (I-10), and approximately 10 miles east of U.S. Interstate 605 (I-605, or San Gabriel River Freeway). Regional access to the Project Site is from SR-60 and SR-57, with interchanges at Fairway Drive and Golden Springs Drive. Major arterial access to the Project Site is provided by Valley Boulevard from the north and Grand Avenue to the east. Primary arterial access is

provided from Colima Drive, via Fairview Drive, which extends south of Colima Road as Brea Canyon Cutoff Road. East Walnut Drive South is the northern boundary of the Project Site.

The Project Site is served by existing bus transit service operated by Foothill Transit, governed by a Joint Powers Authority of 22 San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys member cities and the County of Los Angeles. Foothill Transit lines 482 and 493 run east and west along Colima Road and Golden Springs Drive. Line 482 serves the cities of Pomona, Diamond Bar, Walnut, Baldwin Park, and Industry. Line 493 serves Downtown Los Angeles, the community of Rowland Heights, and the City of Industry. In addition, the County provides the community of Rowland Heights with the Rowland Heights Hopper Shuttle (Heights Hopper) that runs Monday through Saturday.

B. Project Description

The Project proposes to redevelop the Project Site with 360 residential units in four residential planning areas (Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5) and two open space planning areas (Planning Areas 4 and 6). Planning Area 1 would consist of a 31.6-acre area north of Colima Road; Planning Area 2 would consist of a 9.55-acre area north of Colima Road and south of East Walnut Drive South; Planning Area 3 would consist of a 6-acre area south of East Walnut Drive South; Planning Area 4 would consist of a 5.81-acre area north of Colima Road and east of Tierra Luna; Planning Area 5 would consist of a 21.09-acre area south of Colima Road; and Planning Area 6 would consist of a 1.59-acre area south of Colima Road and west of Walnut Leaf Drive, for a total of 75.65 acres.

Three of the four proposed residential planning areas (Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5) will include 200 detached single-family homes, and 88 condominium units provided as 58 duplex units, and 30 triplex units. The fourth residential planning area (Planning Area 3) will include 72 townhouse condominium units. The 200 detached single-family homes will be developed on individual lots with a minimum net lot size of 5,000 sf. (with minor exceptions). The single-family lots will be configured as either 60 feet by 84 feet or 47 feet by 107 feet in area. Single-family residential structures on the 60-foot-by-84-foot lots will range in size from 2,800 sf to 3,200 sf, with 5 to 6 bedrooms plus bonus room and 3.5 to 4.5 bathrooms. Single-family residential structures on the 47-foot-by-107-foot lots will range in size from 2,600 sf to 3,000 sf, with 4 to 5 bedrooms plus bonus room and 3 to 4.5 bathrooms. The two-story single-family residences on Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 would have a maximum height of 35 feet above grade level (excluding rooftop features) as required by Section 22.18.060, Maximum Height, of the Los Angeles County Code (LACC). The units within the 29 duplex residential structures will range in size from 1,575 sf to 1,895 sf, with 3 to 4 bedrooms plus loft and 2 to 2.5 bathrooms. The units within the 10 triplex residential structures will range in size from 1,125 sf to 1,555 sf, with 2 to 3 bedrooms and 2 to 2.5 bathrooms. The duplex and triplex buildings in Planning Areas 1 and 5 will be two-stories and would have a maximum height of 35 feet above grade (excluding rooftop features) as required by Section 22.18.060, Maximum Height, of the LACC. The proposed townhouse units would be contained in 14 buildings in Planning Area 3. Individual townhouse units would range in area from approximately 1,100 square feet to approximately 1,600 sf. Townhouse units will range from 2 to 4 bedrooms and 2 to 3.5 bathrooms. The townhome buildings would be three stories in height and 38 feet tall above grade, exceeding 35 feet in

height; however, as allowed by LACC Section 22.18.060, Development Standards and Regulations for Zone RPD, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is proposed to allow the exceedance of height standards.

Planning Area 4 would remain as a 5.81-acre open space area with a publicly accessible trail system for walking, with no formal recreation activities, and Planning Area 6 would remain as a 1.59-acre open space area. Planning Areas 4 and 6 would be owned by the homeowner's association (HOA) and would be accessible to the public from the proposed trail system. The Project's residential component would comprise 47.34 net acres and would develop 360 residential units (200 detached single-family units, and 160 condominiums provided as 58 duplex units, 30 triplex units, and 72 townhomes). The Project would also include 28 acres of onsite retained open space which is made up of open space buffers between Planning Areas, a trail system, and open space on Planning Area 4 and 6. The Project will include the planting of approximately 1,453 new trees. The Project will increase the number of trees on the Project Site from 411 trees to 1,864 trees. The new trees would include oaks, sycamores, cedar, acacia, olives, peppers, crepe myrtle, ash, pines, sweet bay, and jacaranda throughout the Project Site.

The County's inclusionary housing ordinance would require 81 middle- and moderate-income units, 20 percent of the maximum number of residential units possible, which is 403. The Project will exceed the County's inclusionary housing ordinance requirements, with a total of 82 units set-aside for sale to middle- and moderate-income households, which equals approximately 22.7 percent of the Project's 360 units. The 82 units set aside for middle- and moderate-income households will consist of 72 townhome units (in Planning Area 3) and 10 triplex units (6 units in Planning Area 1 and 4 units in Planning Area 5). The affordable units in Planning Areas 1 and 5 will be distributed within each of the triplex buildings (one unit in each of the 10 triplex buildings).

Access and Circulation

Project vehicular access would be provided via East Walnut Drive South and Colima Road. A traffic signal at the Colima Road/Tierra Luna Intersection is proposed and the existing Colima Road golf cart crossing signal east of Tierra Luna would be removed. Driveway entrance/exits would be located at each of the single-family residential neighborhood access points: one would be provided on East Walnut Drive South (Planning Area 2 access), one would be provided on the north side of Colima (Planning Area 1 access), and one would be provided on the south side of Colima (Planning Area 5 access). Two driveway entrance/exits would be located on the south side of East Walnut Drive South (Planning Area 3 townhome access).

Internal circulation would include a new private street between East Walnut Drive South and Colima Road. The neighborhoods in Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5 would have private streets maintained by the Project HOA.

The southern half of the East Walnut Drive South right-of-way between Bellavista Drive and the east end of the Project Site would be widened approximately 12 feet to meet County standards and curb, gutter and sidewalk infrastructure would

be installed, which currently does not exist. This would connect the existing sidewalk located to the west of the Project Site with the existing sidewalk located to the east of the Project Site.

LACC Section 22.18.060 requires automobile parking for a planned residential development in an amount adequate to prevent traffic congestion and excessive on-street parking; provided that in no event shall the development provide less than one covered parking space per dwelling unit, or less than 50 percent of the required number of parking spaces for public assembly or recreational uses. Detached single-family units, duplexes, triplexes, and the townhome units will all have two-car attached garages. The townhome development includes 63 guest parking spaces. Additional uncovered parking for guests and residents would be located adjacent to and in the surrounding area of the units.

Bicycle parking would be provided for the townhouses in Planning Area 3. Eighteen shared short-term bicycle parking spaces would be provided outside of the townhome buildings in three locations (6 spaces each location), and each of the 72 townhomes would have bicycle parking located within the unit's attached 2-car garage. This complies with the County's requirements for multifamily residential uses (townhouses) to provide 1 short-term space for every 10 attached dwelling units and 1 long-term space for every 2 attached dwelling units (LACC Section 22.112.100). In addition, each of the 200 single family detached homes, 58 duplex homes and 30 triplex homes would have bicycle parking located within each unit's attached garage.

Lighting and Security Features

All lighting on the Project Site would be light-emitting diode (LED). In addition, Project design would include general principles of Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design (CPTED) as recommended by the Walnut-Diamond Bar Sheriff Station, where applicable. The CPTED reduces opportunities for criminal activities by employing physical design features that discourage anti-social behavior, while encouraging legitimate use of the site (LASD 2021). The overall design features that would incorporate CPTED for the Project include defensible space, lighting, and landscaping. The Project HOA will maintain the open space areas, landscaping and lighting throughout the Project Site to minimize overgrown vegetation and prevent dark hiding places, void of light.

Utility and Infrastructure Improvements

As part of Project construction, all of the existing infrastructure within the Project Site (water, sewer, electrical, telephone, etc.) would be inspected and replaced, if needed. The Project would include the installation of new roadways, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, fire hydrants, streetlights, landscaping, and irrigation to serve the Project.

Walnut Valley Water District (WVWD) is the water purveyor for the Project Site. The Project would provide new water distribution lines within the Project Site for both domestic and reclaimed water. Existing water distribution lines would be inspected and replaced, if needed, as a result of converting the site from an existing golf course to a residential development.

The Project would retain the existing stormwater management system within the Project Site, which serves the surrounding existing residential areas. The Project would also add a new stormwater system within the Project Site that would serve the new proposed residential development. These two stormwater systems would be maintained and managed separately.

Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment and Zone Change

The Project would require a General Plan and Community Plan Amendments (Rowland Heights Community Plan) from OS (Open Space) to Urban 2 ((U2); 3.3 to 6.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5; to Urban 3 ((U3); 6.1 to 12.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1 and 5; and to Urban 4 ((U4); 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) for a portion of Planning Area 3 to facilitate the proposed subdivision..

Project Design Features

PDF AES-1: Project Lighting. All light sources associated with the Project would be shielded and/or aimed so that no illumination would spill outside of the Project Site boundary. Lighting would be designed to improve safety and to add visual interest to the Project Site, including accentuating key landscape and architectural features. Additionally, street lighting would be shielded to illuminate the streets, promote dark skies, and inhibit any unnecessary nighttime lighting or glare.

PDF AQ-1: Operations. The Project shall incorporate the following energy and emission saving features as project design features:

- The 360 dwelling units will be wired for solar roof panels which can save energy by producing solar electricity and offer credit for excess solar electricity produced.
- Each garage will be wired for EV car charging.
- Radiant barrier roof sheathing to improve cooling energy efficiency.
- Low-E, dual pane windows block 95 percent of UV rays will reduce window heat gain by 64 percent compared to ordinary glass.
- Improved insulation techniques will help to minimize gaps and higher thermal properties (R-value) add to energy efficiency.
- Designed and properly sealed duct system will improve comfort and efficiency.
- Programmable thermostats will be included to regulate home temperatures year-round.
- High efficiency ENERGY STAR® rated water heaters, refrigerators, and dishwashers will help save money by using less power.
- All lighting on the Project Site would be light-emitting diode (LED).

- The Project would include open space buffers adjacent to most existing adjacent residential land uses, within which public trails will be included to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation within the Project Site.

PDF GHG-1: Non-quantifiable GHG Reduction Measures.

Each dwelling unit shall incorporate the following design features:

The 360 dwelling units will be wired for solar roof panels which can save energy by producing solar electricity and offer credit for excess solar electricity produced.

- Each garage will be wired for EV car charging.
- Radiant barrier roof sheathing to improve cooling energy efficiency.
- Low-E, dual pane windows block 95 percent of UV rays.
- Improved insulation techniques to help to minimize gaps and higher thermal properties (R-value) add to energy efficiency.
- Designed and properly sealed duct system to improve comfort and efficiency.
- Programmable thermostats will be included to regulate home temperatures year-round.
- Open space buffers adjacent to most existing adjacent residential land uses that include public trails to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation within the Project Site as depicted on the approved Vesting Tentative Tract Map.
- To incorporate teleworking, each residential unit would be sized to accommodate home offices and be equipped with new and efficient internet and phone cable systems. (2021 GHG Handbook Measure Transportation T-4)

PDF GHG-2: Quantifiable GHG Reduction Measures.

The project shall incorporate the following design features:

- Each unit shall be equipped with high-efficiency ENERGY STAR® rated water heaters, refrigerators, and dishwashers. (2021 CAPCOA GHG Handbook Measure Energy E-2)
- All lighting on the Project Site would be light-emitting diode (LED). (2021 CAPCOA GHG Handbook Measure Energy E-2)
- The proposed Project would not include any natural gas infrastructure. (2021 CAPCOA GHG Handbook Measure Energy E-15)

- Electricity would be provided by the Clean Power Alliance and would be 100 percent renewable, unless the resident(s) opt-out. (2021 CAPCOA GHG Handbook Measure Energy E-11)
- Low-flow water fixtures and native landscaping. (2021 CAPCOA GHG Handbook Measure Water W-5)

PDF NOI-1. Construction activities occurring as part of the Project shall be subject to the limitations, which state that construction activities may occur between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Mondays through Saturdays. No construction activities shall be permitted outside of these hours or on Sundays and federal holidays unless a temporary waiver is granted by the Chief Building Official or his or her authorized representative.

PDF T-1. Increase Residential Density. This measure accounts for the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction achieved by a project that is designed with a higher density (residential density of 2.72 dwelling units per acre) of dwelling units compared to the average residential density in the country. When reductions are being calculated from a baseline derived from a travel demand model, the residential density of the relevant TAZ is used for the comparison instead. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and provide greater options for the mode of travel they choose. Increasing residential density results in shorter and fewer trips by single-occupancy vehicles and thus a reduction in VMT.

The Project-generated VMT is derived from the County's VMT Tool, which is based on the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) travel demand model data. Therefore, the Project's potential VMT reduction is determined by comparing the residential density without and with the Project's proposed residential development proposed for Planning Areas 1, 2 and 3, and comparing the residential density TAZ without and with the residential development proposed for Planning Area 5. The residential density of each TAZ was determined based on parcel-level data obtained from the Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor, which reports the type of residential development (e.g., single family, duplex, multi-family), the number of units, and the acreage of each parcel.

PDF T-2. Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane. This measure requires projects to be located within a 0.5-mile bicycling distance from an existing Class I bike path or Class II bike lane. A project that is designed around an existing or planned bicycle facility encourages sustainable mode use. The project design should include a comparable network that connects the Project uses to the existing off-site facilities that connect to work/retail destinations.

The proposed Project Site is located within a 0.5-mile distance of the existing Class I bicycle lanes along Fairway Drive and along Golden Springs Road. Future bicycle lanes are planned for Colima Road and Brea Canyon Cutoff Road in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, which would provide connections to the existing bicycle lanes west and south of the site. Upon installation of the planned bicycle lanes, the Project Site would be served by regional-serving bicycle facilities that connect to work/retail destinations and facilitate bicycle commuting.

The proposed Project is planned to provide recreational multi-use trails within the Project Site which are expected to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and other non-motorized modes of travel. The multi-use trail system will connect to

the internal Project roadways as well as public sidewalks and roadways at various places, including along Colima Road. Therefore, the Project Site is planned to provide convenient connections to the future bicycle lanes for residents of the Project Site as well as the general public. It is expected that providing connections throughout the Project Site to regional bicycle facilities will result in greater substitution of bicycle trips for vehicle trips. Therefore, the Project is well-located and designed to attain expanded VMT reductions in the future when the planned bicycle facilities are installed.

PDF T-3. Fairway Drive/SR-60 Freeway Ramps. The exclusive northbound right-turn lane at the SR-60 Freeway EB on-ramp would be restriped to accommodate a shared through/right-turn lane, and the other northbound lanes would be restriped to accommodate the full extent of the forecast northbound left-turn queue. It is not anticipated that any roadway widening would be required in order to accommodate the proposed lane configuration on Fairway Drive. It should be noted that the reconfiguration of the northbound lanes at the SR-60 Freeway ramp intersections would require approval from Caltrans prior to being implemented by the Project Subdivider. If Caltrans does not concur with this improvement, this improvement will not be required.

PDF T-4. Fairway Drive/East Walnut Drive South. The westbound approach along East Walnut Drive South is approximately 20 feet wide and is currently striped to provide one 10-foot-wide shared through/left-turn lane and one 10-foot-wide right turn lane. In order to better accommodate the forecast right-turn queues, the westbound right-turn lane striping shall be extended to provide an additional 50 feet of storage space. The lane striping will terminate prior to the existing driveway along the north side of the roadway in order to maintain full access to the existing parcel. The roadway width along the westbound approach of East Walnut Drive South is adequate for vehicles to utilize the curb lane (i.e., a de facto turn lane) should additional storage space be required.

PDF T-5. Fairway Drive-Brea Canyon Cutoff Road/Colima Road.

Northbound Left-Turn: To better accommodate the left-turn queues and improve overall operations at the intersection, the raised concrete median adjacent to the northbound left-turn lane shall be modified and narrowed in order to accommodate the extension of the left-turn lane by 60 feet. In order to maintain full access to the existing parcel along the west side of the roadway, the median should not extend further to the south.

Northbound Right-Turn: In order to adequately accommodate the forecast right-turn queues, the lane striping would be extended to provide an additional 10 feet of storage space for the northbound right-turn lane.

Eastbound Left-Turn: In order to adequately accommodate the left-turn queues, the raised concrete median adjacent to the eastbound left-turn lane would be modified to accommodate the extension left-turn lane by 60 feet.

Westbound Left-Turn: In order to adequately accommodate the left-turn queues, the raised concrete median adjacent to the westbound left-turn lane will be modified to accommodate the extension left-turn lane by 105 feet.

PDF T-6. Project Driveway-Walnut Leaf Drive/Colima Road. The Walnut Leaf Drive approach would be restriped to accommodate eastbound left-turns into the Project driveway, located at north approach by an exclusive left-turn lane, restriped to provide one southbound departure lane, as well as one shared left-through lane and one right-turn lane on the northbound approach. It is not anticipated that any roadway widening would be required in order to accommodate the proposed lane configuration on Walnut Leaf Drive.

PDF T-7. Tierra Luna-Project Driveway/Colima Road. The proposed Project would construct a driveway at the existing Tierra Luna/Colima Road intersection. The Project driveway will tie-in to the intersection as the new south leg of the existing unsignalized "T"-intersection. The existing signalized pedestrian and golf cart crossing across Colima Road is planned to be relocated with a traffic signal at the future Tierra Luna/Colima Road intersection in order to maintain pedestrian access across Colima Road. The golf cart path south of Colima Road will be removed in order to accommodate the open space on Planning Area 4 and the proposed single-family homes on Planning Area 5; therefore, pedestrian crossings across Colima Road are planned to be accommodated at the Tierra Luna/Colima Road intersection instead. Colima Road shall be restriped to accommodate exclusive westbound left turns into the Project driveway.

PDF T-8. Lemon Avenue/Golden Springs Drive. The traffic signal shall be modified to provide a westbound right-turn overlap phase (i.e., the westbound right-turns would receive a green arrow concurrent with the existing protected southbound phase). The improvement is anticipated to result in a reduction in the westbound right-turn queues. This improvement will require approval from the City of Diamond Bar prior to implementing this improvement. If the City does not concur with this improvement, this improvement will not be required.

Construction

Construction of the Project would occur in the following phases: (1) demolition and removal of the golf course improvements, including the maintenance facility building and driving range on the Project Site; (2) site grading; (3) roadway, utilities, landscaping improvements; and (4) home construction. Estimated start of construction is the Fourth Quarter of 2024 with estimated completion in the Fourth Quarter of 2027.

Project grading will require approximately 387,100 cubic yards of cut and approximately 253,400 cubic yards of fill, with a net export of approximately 133,700 cubic yards for the Project Site. Over excavation and re-compaction of up to 1,544,500 cubic yards each is anticipated. The maximum depth of excavation within the Project Site would be approximately 25 feet in areas where fill was deposited during the construction of the golf course, except for one isolated area within Planning Area 5 that may be as deep as 30 feet. During Project excavation the 1,544,500 cubic yards would be temporarily stockpiled on site and when the site is ready for re-compaction, the 1,544,500 cubic yards soil would be redistributed on

site and compacted to create roadways and the residential lots (Project grading plus over-excavation, re-compaction and export totals approximately 3,863,200 cubic yards). Export materials will be hauled to the closest landfill, which is expected to be the Olinda Landfill in the City of Brea. The haul route is expected to be the SR-60 Freeway East from the Project Site using Colima Road and Fairway Avenue, to the SR-57 Freeway South, and then exiting at Imperial Highway (approximately 12 miles away). The final haul route will be reviewed by County DPW, Fire, and Sheriff prior to grading.

C. Discretionary Actions

Discretionary approvals required for implementation of the Project would include, but are not limited to, the following approvals from the County:

- General Plan and Community Plan Amendments (Rowland Heights Community Plan): OS (Open Space) to Urban 2 ((U2); 3.3 to 6.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5; to Urban 3 ((U3); 6.1 to 12.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1 and 5; and to Urban 4 ((U4); 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) for a portion of Planning Area 3.
- Zone Change from A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000-6U and RPD-5000-12U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-6 Dwelling Units Per Acre and 12 Dwelling Units Per Acre, respectively) for the 62.25 acres of proposed single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, with an affordable housing component and open space for Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 and to RPD-5000-17U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-17 Dwelling Units Per Acre) for the 6.0 acres of townhomes with an affordable housing component and open space for proposed Planning Area 3.
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map: Subdivision of six (6) existing parcels into 248 lots, consisting of 200 single family lots, 29 residential condominium lots with a total of 58 duplex units, 5 residential condo lots with a total of 30 triplex units, 1 residential condo lot with 72 attached townhomes, 13 open space lots to be privately owned and maintained by the HOA but accessible to the public, and a street frontage waiver for the private driveway and fire lane system.
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP): For grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards, and a Residential Development Program, walls over 6 feet in height, buildings over 35 feet in height, setback reduction for townhomes (front) and triplexes (front and rear) yards, and residential lot widths less than 50 feet.
- Housing Permit to reserve 22.7 percent (82 units) of subdivision units for sale to middle- and moderate-income households and to allow single-family lots smaller than 5,000 square feet and waive the parkway requirement along private driveways within Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5. Single-family Lots #18, #47, and #155 are slightly less than 5,000 net sf in size. Lot #18 is undersized due to a side yard utility

easement, Lot #47 is a corner lot with a curved front side yard to accommodate the entrance of the residential development, and Lot #155 is undersized due to utility easement.

Additional agency actions which require other permits and approvals known to be needed, or which may be needed, in order to implement various components of the Project include the following:

- Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 permit under the federal Clean Water Act
- U.S Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit under the federal Clean Water Act
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife for a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Fish & Game Code 1602

D. Statement of Project Objectives

Section 15124(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a project description shall contain “a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project.” In addition, Section 15124(b) further states that “the statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project.”

The proposed Project would redevelop a portion of a golf course to provide market-rate and middle- and moderate-income housing opportunities as well as open space areas and recreational resources. The proposed Project is designed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on neighboring residential uses through incorporation of open space buffers that include recreational trails. The following objectives are important to achieving the Project’s land use purpose:

- **Provision of New Housing.** Provide needed new housing within infill locations in unincorporated Los Angeles County.
- **Provide a Diverse Variety of Housing Types and Affordability.** Provide a diverse mix of for-sale housing product type, price and home size to support physical, social, and economic diversity, including both market and below-market options for middle- and moderate-income households that are distributed throughout the development.
- **Create a Healthy Community.** Create a dynamic community with opportunities for outdoor passive and active recreational opportunities.
- **Integrate Environmentally Responsible Practices.** Conserve natural resources and open space for a sustainable community. Minimize impact and use of natural resources, emphasizing healthy, safe, and responsible environments to balance community development with environmental considerations.
- **Create Connectivity.** Encourage community participation and interaction by providing a trail system to existing recreational amenities and open spaces.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Final EIR dated May 2024 includes the Draft EIR dated October 2023, all written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public review period, written responses to these comments, clarifications/changes to the Draft EIR, and the MMRP. In conformance with CEQA, the County conducted an extensive environmental review of the Project.

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15050, the County is the Lead Agency responsible for preparing the EIR for the Project. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, on October 7, 2022, the County issued an NOP, which was sent to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, and to responsible agencies, trustee agencies and other interested parties, including parties who requested a copy of the EIR in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 21092.2 The NOP comment period began on October 13, 2022, and ended on December 12, 2022, which included a 14-day extension. The NOP was also available for review on the County website at <https://case.planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/prj2021-002011>. The circulated NOP requested those agencies with regulatory authority over any aspect of the Project to review the issues that would be addressed within the Draft EIR and to identify any additional relevant environmental issues that should be addressed. A copy of the NOP and comment letters received in response thereto are included in the Draft EIR in Appendix A. Ninety-two comment letters and verbal comments were received in response to the NOP and public scoping meeting.

Two public scoping meetings were held to provide additional opportunities for the public to provide input on the scope and content of the EIR and to generally describe the Project and the CEQA process for the EIR. The notification of the scoping meeting was included within the NOP and advertised in two local newspapers, the La Opinion and the Daily Journal. In addition, the notice was also posted at the Project Site. The first public scoping meeting was held virtually on November 1, 2022, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. Fourteen verbal comments were submitted during the first scoping meeting, and included concerns about impacts to biological resources, air quality, health and safety, noise, and traffic. A second scoping meeting was held in person on December 6, 2022, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the Rowland Heights Community Center 18150 Pathfinder Road, Rowland Heights, CA 91748. Sixteen verbal comments and one written comment were submitted during the second scoping meeting, and included concerns about impacts to biological resources, air quality, health and safety, hydrology, noise, and traffic. The verbal comments received at both scoping meetings were transcribed and are included in the scoping comments set forth in Appendix A. Individuals who attended both scoping meetings were directed to submit written comments to the County during the NOP public review period.

4. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS DETERMINED TO HAVE NO IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT, OR HAVE A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The County hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project have no impact or are less than significant, and therefore, do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures. The County's findings are referred to herein as "Findings 1".

A. Aesthetics

1. Scenic Vistas

Impact AES-1: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: No scenic vistas are identified to be present within the Project Site or vicinity. Several mountain ranges are partially visible from the surrounding roadways. The Puente Hills are located approximately 2 miles southwest of the Project Site but are not visible from the Project Site due to intervening structures and topography. The Puente Hills are partially visible while looking west along the Colima Road corridor. Facing north from the Planning Area 3, San Gabriel Mountains are partially visible in the distance, but are obstructed by the commercial and retail businesses along East Walnut Drive South. Facing east from the Planning Area 1 and along the Colima Road corridor, partially obstructed views exist of the more distant San Bernardino Mountains, which are located in San Bernardino County. Due to the varying topography, mature vegetation, and the existing fencing from the driving range, the views of the San Bernardino Mountains from the Project Site (Colima Road) are largely screened. In addition, the implementation of the Project is an urban in-fill project that would not change or impact views of potentially scenic resources in the area from the surrounding public roadways. As such, there would be no adverse environmental impacts to scenic vistas during temporary construction or long-term operation of the Project.

2. Views from Trails

Impact AES-2: The proposed Project would not be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The nearest trail to the Project Site is the Rowland Heights Connector Trail, located approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the Project Site. The Rowland Heights Connector Trail is 0.3 miles in length and

presents a 52-foot elevation gain. The Project Site is not visible from the Rowland Heights Connector Trail due to intervening structures and topography. Therefore, there would be no impact regarding views from a regional riding, hiking, or multi-use trail.

3. Scenic Highways

Impact AES-3: The proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no officially designated or eligible state scenic highways within the vicinity of the Project Site (County of Los Angeles 2015; California Department of Transportation 2021). Additionally, there are no designated scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway that would be visible from the Project Site (County of Los Angeles 2015). The closest scenic highways and resources include Puente Hills and SR-57, neither of which would be visible from the Project Site. As such, there would be no impact to scenic resources within a scenic highway during temporary construction of the Project or during long-term operation of the Project.

4. Public Views of the Site

Impact AES-4: The proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point).

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the County and there are no existing scenic vistas or other significant visual resources visible within the Project Site or in the surrounding area. The Project would be consistent with the 2035 General Plan with the approval of a General Plan and Community Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Vesting Tentative Map Tract, and Conditional Use Permit proposed as part of the Project. The Project would also be consistent with applicable General Plan and Rowland Heights Community Plan policies relevant to aesthetics and scenic quality. The Project would develop compatible land uses that complements the existing character and natural environment of the residential community. The Project would develop residential uses and would include the creation of designated open space in Planning Areas 4 and 6 that would surround the new residences and buffer existing surrounding residential uses from the new uses. Trails, walkways, and private streets would connect the structures and facilitate circulation within the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the County of Los Angeles 2035

General Plan or the Rowland Heights Community Plan, and impacts would be less than significant. The Project would also be developed pursuant to the provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance.

Given the 75.65-acre size of the Project Site and its open nature, public views of the site from public streets, particularly of interior parts of the Project Site, are readily available. However, there are no existing scenic vistas or other significant visual resources visible within the Project Site or in the surrounding area. Demolition, grading, and construction of new buildings, roadway and sidewalk improvements, and installation of utilities and landscaping would result in a temporary change to the existing visual character of the Project Site and surrounding areas while these activities occur. Construction would occur over an approximate period of three years (36 months).

Following construction, the proposed residences, open space, and private streets and walkways would be similar to the surrounding residential uses in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. In addition, the Project would include the two open space areas of 5.81 acres and 1.59 acres and open space buffers adjacent to existing adjacent residential land uses, within which public-use trails will be included to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation/connections between the Project's residential component and the adjacent existing residential neighborhoods. These amenities would make a positive contribution to the aesthetic character of the area. Driveways for single-family residences and surface parking for the multi-family homes would be located throughout the Project Site near the proposed residences. Surface parking within Planning Area 3 would include guest and resident spaces that would be screened from the street by shrubs and shade trees. Landscaping would be provided within and along the perimeters of the surface parking area. All utility lines would be located below ground. Exterior lighting, including street lighting and security and ambient lighting within residential lots would be shielded and directed downward as required by PDF AES-1. The Project would result in a change in the existing visual environment because it would redevelop an existing golf course with residential and open space uses. However, because the Project Site is surrounded by development, most of which is residential, the Project would not substantially change the existing developed character of the area and would be similar to the surrounding existing aesthetic conditions.

The Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. In addition, although the Project would result in changes to the visual environment, it would be compatible with the general aesthetic character of the area and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other. Impacts would be less than significant.

5. Shadows, Light, or Glare

Impact AES-5: The proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities would occur primarily during daylight hours, and any construction-related illumination would be used for safety and security purposes only and would last only as long as needed during the temporary construction phase. The adjacent residential uses are screened from the Project Site by fencing, landscaping, or five-foot or higher walls that surround the existing residences and all construction material for roofing and exterior siding would be comprised of low glare materials in compliance with LACC Section 22.140.580 (d). Furthermore, existing residential lighting as well as street lighting currently introduce relatively high levels of ambient light in the Project vicinity, any artificial light associated with construction activities would not significantly impact existing residential uses in a manner that would adversely affect nighttime views or substantially alter the character of the uses surrounding the construction area.

All light sources associated with the Project would be shielded and/or aimed so that no illumination would spill outside of the Project Site boundary. Lighting would be designed to improve safety and to add visual interest to the Project Site, including accentuating key landscape and architectural features (PDF AES-1). While Project lighting would be visible from nearby light-sensitive land uses, including the residential neighborhoods surrounding the Project Site, these uses already look out at lighted areas along the Colima Road corridor, adjacent club house and driving range and existing residents lining the golf course. Furthermore, Project lighting would be shielded and directed downwards to minimize direct illumination and preclude light pollution or trespass on adjacent properties. Additionally, street lighting would be shielded to illuminate the streets, promote dark skies, and inhibit any unnecessary nighttime lighting or glare (PDF-AES-1). As a result, the implementation of PDF AES-1 would reduce the potential for light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Sources of glare that could result from the Project include windows, roofing, and exterior siding on proposed buildings; however, these glare sources would be consistent with the surrounding land uses and the Project would not use highly reflective materials for roofing or exterior siding as required by LACC Section 22.140.580 (d) of the County Code. An analysis of the maximum Project building heights (townhomes at approximately 38 feet) and surrounding uses determined that the townhomes would not cast a shadow on any existing uses. The duplexes and triplexes located in Planning Areas 1 and 5 would be taller than the proposed two-story residences and buffers of open space would be provided between these new buildings within Planning Areas 1 and 5 and the existing surrounding residences. As a result, implementation of the Project would not result in a shadow impact to the surrounding areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

6. Cumulative Impacts-Aesthetics

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would have no impact with respect to scenic vistas and scenic highways and resources. Accordingly, the Project could not contribute to cumulative impacts related to these topics.

Due to the distance and topography, any potential light and glare associated with construction of any cumulative project would not result in considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with the Project. Therefore, cumulative development, including the Project, would have a less than significant temporary cumulative impact with respect to light and glare during construction. The area surrounding the Project Site and cumulative projects is urbanized and generates ambient light. Due to the distance and topography, any potential light and glare associated with operation of any cumulative project would not result in considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with the Project. Thus, the incremental impact of the Project, when evaluated in relation to the cumulative projects, would not be expected to cause significant impacts to aesthetics during Project construction, demolition, and operation.

Cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Project Site may not have the same visual characteristics and are distinct from one another; however, all the projects, including the Project, would be required to comply with General plan, local Community Plans, and a County Code. The cumulative projects, when considered together, would not change the visual character of their respective existing conditions since the Project would comply with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality. The Project Site's visual character would be entirely internal and would not affect the visual character of any off-site cumulative projects.

The Project would not result in any shade or shadow impact due to the location of the taller buildings (e.g., townhomes, duplex, and triplex) and the fact that they are surrounded by buffers and open space that separate them from existing uses. Moreover, due to the distance from the Project to other cumulative projects, shade and shadow of cumulative projects would not contribute a cumulatively considerable impact in addition to the Project. The cumulative projects would not incrementally worsen the less than significant shade and shadow impacts of the Project on residences located east of the Project Site.

B. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

1. Conversion of Farmland

Impact AG-1: Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land and the areas surrounding the Project Site surrounding vicinity are classified as Urban and Built-Up Land or Other Land (California Department of Conservation 2022). The soil units beneath the Project Site and adjacent areas are Urban land complex soils, which are not considered suitable for growing crops (NRCS 2022). Furthermore, previous agricultural uses at the Project Site were removed and replaced by the existing golf course and previous agricultural uses in the surrounding area were similarly

developed upon and are no longer intact. Because the Project Site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP, no direct or indirect impacts would occur from implementation of the Project.

2. Zoning for Agricultural Use

Impact AG-2: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located on, or in proximity to any lands under a Williamson Act contract (California Department of Conservation 2016). Therefore, development of the Project would not result in changes to the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, would conflict with a Williamson Act contract or otherwise result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

The Project proposes a Zone Change from the current A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000-6U (Residential Planned Development) for the 62.25 acres of proposed single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, with an affordable housing component and open space for Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 and to RPD-5000-17U (Residential Planned Development) for the 6.0 acres of townhomes with an affordable housing component and open space for proposed Planning Area 3. Zoning for Planning Areas 4 and 6 would remain as A-1-1. With County approval of the requested entitlements the Project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use and impacts would be less than significant.

3. Zoning for Forest Land

Impact AG-3: Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The LACC does not include zones dedicated to forest land, timberland, or timberland production. The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-1 (Light Agricultural, one-acre minimum lot area) and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural, 10,000 square feet [sf] minimum lot area). Adjacent areas located south, west, and north of the Project Site are zoned for light agricultural, residential, and commercial uses. Lands east of the Project Site in the City of Diamond Bar are zoned RL (Low-Density Residential) (City of Diamond Bar 2023). Therefore, the Project would not be located on, or adjacent to land zoned by the County as forest land or timberland, and construction and operation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest or timberland. No impact would occur.

4. Loss of Forest Land

Impact AG-4: Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Title 22 of the LACC does not include zones dedicated to forest land. The Project Site includes an existing golf course and the surrounding area is characterized by dense, urban development. The Project Site is located near the northeastern boundary of Rowland Heights and would not impact the large complexes of oak woodland, oak riparian forest, or heavily forested areas of California Walnut identified in the Rowland Heights Community General Plan (DRP 1981). Therefore, construction and operation of the Project would not result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

5. Conversion of Farmland or Forest Land

Impact AG-5: Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site and areas adjacent to the Project Site do not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as defined by the FMMP. Previous agricultural uses at the Project Site were removed and eventually replaced by the existing golf course and previous agricultural uses in the surrounding area were similarly developed upon and are no longer intact. There are no existing forest lands on, or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project would not result in changes to the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

6. Cumulative Impacts- Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not involve the conversion of farmland, forested land or agricultural uses to other uses since no such uses exist at the Project Site. As such, the Project would have no impacts to farmland, forested land or agricultural uses and would, in turn, not be cumulatively considerable for impacts related to the conversion of farmland, forested land or agricultural uses.

The Project proposes a zone change from the Project Site's existing Light Agricultural zoning to Residential Planned Development and would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use following the approval of requested

entitlements. Related Project LC1 and Related Project LC2 propose construction and operation of seven residential dwelling units and a preschool, respectively, on properties that are zoned for Light Agricultural use. Residential and educational/childcare uses are permitted in Light Agricultural zones with County approval of a CUP. None of the other related projects would be located on land zoned for agricultural use and thus would not have the potential to conflict with zoning for agricultural use. Furthermore, related projects are subject to CEQA review and review by County or municipal regulatory agencies for consistency with applicable planning and zoning regulations. Each approved or pending project is evaluated against the specific regulatory land use and zoning designations of the individual Project Sites. Therefore, no cumulative significant impacts regarding conflict with agricultural use zones would occur.

The Project is fully consistent with the applicable regulatory framework with the approval of all requested entitlements, and its implementation would not have adverse effects on agriculture and forestry resources as no such resources are located the Project vicinity. Because the Project and related projects would be subject to existing land use and zoning regulations, cumulative impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not be expected to cause incremental impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, including the conversion of such lands to other uses, when considering related past, present, or foreseeable future projects, and no mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. Air Quality

1. Objectionable Odors

Impact AIR-4: Construction and operation of the Project would not result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the allowable amount of VOCs from architectural coatings and solvents. Since compliance with SCAQMD Rules governing these compounds is mandatory, no construction activities or materials are proposed that would create objectionable odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. In regards to operational impacts, the Project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being typically associated with objectionable or nuisance odors. Waste collection areas and disposal for the Project would be covered and situated away from the property line and sensitive off-site uses. Additionally, the Project and its uses would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 – Nuisance. Therefore, long-term Project operations would not introduce new sources of odors and would not create objectionable odors that could adversely affect a substantial number of people. No significant impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

D. Biological Resources

1. Local Policies and Ordinances

Impact BIO-5: The proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no oak trees or other regulated trees on the Project Site. There are five coast live oak trees located off-site in the southeast corner of the Project Site within adjacent residential lots. All of these coast live oak trees are off-site and outside the periphery of the Project Site and Project grading will avoid removal and encroachment by the Project by confining grading to be located outside of the dripline plus five feet of the five oak trees. As a condition of approval, protective fencing will be installed outside the protected zones prior to the start of construction to prevent removal or encroachment of these oak trees and an oak tree permit will not be required because the Project design will avoid removal and encroachment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the Los Angeles County oak tree ordinance. Additionally, no other policies or ordinances protecting biological resources apply to the Project because the Project Site is not located within a wildflower reserve area, a significant ecological area, nor a coastal resource area. The Rowland Heights Community Standards District does not contain policies regarding protection of biological resources.

2. Habitat Conservation Plan

Impact BIO-6: The proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project is not located in any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The Project would not impact or conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; therefore, there would be no conflicts and no impact attributable to a conflict.

E. Cultural Resources

1. Historical Resource

Impact CUL-1: The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Three potential historic architectural resources were evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and Los Angeles County Register of Landmarks and are recommended ineligible as a result of these investigations. The maintenance facility building (c. 1938) was evaluated as an individual resource as an example of a vernacular barn structure that was formerly associated with the original homestead and agricultural use of the property. The maintenance facility building does not appear to be eligible for listing under National Register Criterion A, California Register Criterion 1, Los Angeles County Landmark Criterion 1, National Register Criterion C, California Register Criterion 3, or Los Angeles County Landmark Criterion 3. Since it is not eligible as a historical resource, no potential impacts would occur as a result of its demolition under the Project and no further evaluation is required. The Royal Vista Golf Club was evaluated as a potential historic district under the context for Private Recreational Facilities for listing in the National Register/California Register under Criteria A/1-D/4 and as a Los Angeles County Historic District. The Royal Vista Golf Club does not appear to have made a significant contribution to the history of recreation and leisure as needed for listing under National Register Criterion A, California Register Criterion 1, or Los Angeles County Landmark Criterion 1. In addition, the Royal Vista Golf Club does not retain sufficient architectural associations that would make the golf course property eligible as a historic district to be eligible for listing under National Register Criterion C, California Register Criterion 3, or as a Los Angeles County Landmark. Since it is not eligible as a historical resource, no potential impacts would occur as a result of its partial demolition under the Project and no further evaluation is required. While not located within the Project Site, the Royal Vista Golf Clubhouse, constructed in 1964, was evaluated both as an individual architectural resource and as a contributor to a potential Royal Vista Golf Club historic district as a potential contributing feature of the golf course, and therefore was evaluated both as a part of the golf club as a whole and individually. The events hosted at the Clubhouse do not appear to rise to a level of significance necessary to satisfy National Register Criterion A, California Register Criterion 1, or Los Angeles County Landmark Criterion 1. Furthermore, the Clubhouse does not appear to be eligible for individual listing under National Register Criterion C, California Register Criterion 3, or Los Angeles County Landmark Criterion 3. The Clubhouse is situated outside of the Project Site and the Project would result in no change to the Clubhouse. Since the Clubhouse is not eligible as a historical resource, and no change would occur to the Clubhouse as a result of the Project, no impact would occur and no further evaluation is required. As a result of these investigations no historic architectural resources qualifying as historical resources under CEQA were identified within the Project Site or in the surrounding vicinity and no impact to historical resources would occur.

F. Energy

1. Wasteful Use of Energy

Impact ENE-1: The proposed Project would not cause wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction of the Project, energy would be consumed in the form of electricity for powering the construction office (lights, electronic equipment, and heating and cooling), water conveyance for dust control, and other construction activities. Electricity use from construction would be short-term, limited to working hours, used for necessary construction-related activities, and represent a small fraction of the Project's net annual operational electricity. Natural gas would not be supplied to support Project construction activities; thus, there would be no expected demand generated by construction of the Project. Project construction would also consume energy in the form of petroleum-based fuels associated with the use of off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Project Site, construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site, and delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling of demolition material to off-site reuse and disposal facilities). The Project would comply with State measures to reduce inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy including compliance with the CARB Pavley Phase II standards, the anti-idling regulation in accordance with Section 2485 in 13 CCR, and fuel requirements in accordance with 17 CCR Section 93115, as well as the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation (CARB 2016). The Project would benefit from fuel and automotive manufacturers' compliance with Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, which would result in more efficient use of transportation fuels (lower consumption). Furthermore, diversion of mixed construction and demolition debris would reduce truck trips to landfills, which are typically located some distance away from City centers, and increase the amount of waste recovered (e.g., recycled, reused, etc.) at material recovery facilities, thereby further reducing transportation fuel consumption. Therefore, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and impacts associated with transportation fuels for construction would be less than significant.

During operation of the Project, energy would be consumed for multiple purposes, including, but not limited to, HVAC; refrigeration; lighting; and the use of electronics, equipment, and appliances. Energy would also be consumed during Project operations related to water usage, solid waste disposal, and vehicle trips. Operation of the Project would result in a projected net increase in consumption of electricity totaling approximately 1,893 MWh per year and would not substantially increase future energy demand. The Project would comply with the applicable provisions of Title 24, the CALGreen Code, and the County's Plan to reduce energy and water consumption as well as encourage renewable energy use. The Project would not include any natural gas infrastructure (and instead provide residents with access to the Clean Power Alliance) and thus would not have any building natural gas demand. The Project would support federal and statewide efforts, including CAFE and Pavley Standards, to improve transportation energy efficiency and reduce transportation energy consumption with respect to private automobiles. The Project would encourage alternative modes of transportation by pre-wiring all homes with electric vehicle charging infrastructure and solar-ready rooftops, pursuant to the CALGreen Code. The Project would also implement measures to reduce VMT, including PDF T-1, Increase Residential Density; PDF T-2, Locate Project Near Bike Path/Bike Lane; and providing recreational multi-use trails within the Project Site that will connect internal roadways to public sidewalks and roadways. Reductions to VMT would result in reductions in gasoline and diesel fuel consumption. The Project would not conflict with the 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) goals and benefits and would not preclude attainment of its primary objectives and the Project is an infill development that would encourage teleworking by providing home office

amenities, active recreation and alternate transportation through the creation of a publicly accessible trail system, and an electric bike with purchase of a dwelling unit. The Project will also include an HOA funded subsidies program for a reimbursement subsidy of up to 50 percent of the cost of a pass for Metrolink and Foothill Transit Monthly Passes for five years and extending to no more than 10 years with the purchase of a dwelling. Thus, the Project would minimize operational transportation fuel demand in line with federal, state, regional, and County goals. Based on the above, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of electricity and the impacts related to electrical supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant.

2. Renewable Energy and Efficiency Plans

Impact ENE-2: The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would utilize construction contractors who must demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations including USEPA and NHTSA fuel efficiency standards and CARB regulations which limit truck idling and would reduce fuel consumption. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the energy standards applicable to construction equipment and construction-related impacts would be less than significant with respect to compliance with existing energy standards.

The Project would be designed in a manner that is consistent with relevant energy conservation plans designed to encourage development that results in the efficient use of energy resources. The Project would comply with CALGreen and Title 24 requirements, as well as the County's Green Building Standards and the Los Angeles County General Plan. The Project would support statewide efforts to improve transportation energy efficiency and reduce transportation energy consumption with respect to private automobiles including compliance with CAFE and Pavley Standards. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with SCAG's 2016–2040 and 2020–2045 RTP/SCS plans, would implement PDF T-1, and would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by constructing new trails and connecting sidewalks to reduce VMT and associated fuel use. Proximity to transit would also reduce VMT and associated fuel consumption generated by the Project. The Project would not include natural gas infrastructure and would use all-electric appliances without any natural gas connections. Therefore, the Project would support the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency and would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, the Project impacts would be less than significant.

3. Cumulative Impacts- Energy

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Future development, including the Project, would result in the increased use of electricity resources. However, SCE has determined that the use of such resources would be minor compared to existing supply and infrastructure within the SCE service area and would be consistent with growth expectations in 2028 (CEC 2018). Furthermore, like the Project, other cumulative developments would be required to incorporate energy conservation features in order to comply with applicable mandatory regulations including CALGreen Code, state energy standards under Title 24, and incorporate mitigation measures, as necessary. Cumulative development projects in the SoCalGas service area would result in the use of natural gas resources. However, the Project would not include any natural gas infrastructure and thus, would not have natural gas demand. Buildout of the Project and cumulative projects in the SCAG region would be expected to increase overall VMT; however, the effect on transportation fuel demand would be reduced by future improvements to vehicle fuel economy pursuant to federal and state regulations. Siting land use development projects at infill sites is consistent with the overall goals of the state to reduce VMT pursuant to SB 375. Cumulative development projects would need to demonstrate consistency with these goals and incorporate any mitigation measures required under CEQA, which would also ensure cumulative development projects contribute to transportation energy efficiency. As such, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy would not be cumulatively considerable.

It is expected that SCE would continue to expand its delivery capacity as necessary to meet demand increases within its service area. Development projects within the SCE service area would also be anticipated to incorporate site-specific infrastructure improvements, as necessary. Each cumulative project would be reviewed by SCE to identify necessary power facilities and service connections to meet individual project needs. Cumulative projects would also need to analyze potential environmental effects of infrastructure extensions, adhere to any applicable ground-disturbing design features, and implement necessary mitigation measures, which would also serve to reduce potential impacts from any infrastructure removal or relocation activities. Project applicants would be required to provide for the needs of their individual projects, thereby contributing to the electrical infrastructure in the surrounding area. Cumulative projects, as with the Project, would be required to evaluate electricity conservation features and compliance with applicable electricity efficiency plans and standards including the Title 24 standards and CALGreen Code, and incorporate mitigation measures, as necessary under CEQA. Cumulative projects would also be required to evaluate potential impacts related to consistency with the County's goals, and local and regional supplies or capacity based on regional growth plans, such as the SCE energy supply projections for long-term planning. Cumulative projects, as with the Project, would be required to evaluate natural gas conservation features and compliance with applicable regulations including the Title 24 standards and CALGreen Code, and incorporate mitigation measures, as necessary under CEQA. However, as discussed above, the Project would not have any natural gas. Cumulative projects would also be required under CEQA to evaluate if their respective developments would conflict with the energy efficiency policies emphasized by the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS promotion of

alternative forms of transportation, proximity to public transportation options, provisions for encouraging multi-modal and energy efficient transit such as by accommodating bicycle parking and EV chargers at or above regulatory requirements. As such, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts due to conflicts with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency would not be cumulatively considerable.

G. Geology and Soils

1. Erosion

Impact GEO-2: The proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction, the Project Site would be subject to ground-disturbing activities (e.g., removal of the existing vegetation, excavation and grading, foundation and infrastructure construction, the installation of utilities). The County would require submittal of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) prior to construction, in compliance with the conditions set forth under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The SWPPP would incorporate best management practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts during construction from erosion would be reduced to less than significant. Construction activities would also be required to comply with the statewide general stormwater construction permit in addition to the County's requirements to eliminate or reduce erosion or sedimentation and prohibit flows from the Project Site from causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality standards in downstream receiving waters. Further, the SWPPP would incorporate BMPs and Low Impact Development (LID) building requirements in accordance with the County regulations included in Chapter 12.80, Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control, and Chapter 12.84, Low Impact Development Standards, of the LACC, to control erosion during the Project's construction period to the satisfaction of LACDPW Division of Building and Safety. Therefore, the Project construction activities would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil and the impact would be less than significant.

Once construction is completed, the non-paved, exposed areas of fill would be landscaped which would reduce erosion that would occur. The Project would also be required to implement a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), which includes associated BMPs to reduce operational surface water pollution or erosion of topsoil. Therefore, the impacts associated with erosion or siltation during operation would be less than significant.

2. Soils Supporting Wastewater Treatment Systems

Impact GEO-5: The proposed Project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste Near Schools

Impact HAZ-2: The proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are no hospitals located within one quarter mile of the Project Site; however, the Ybarra Academy of Arts and Technology elementary school is located about 0.15 miles to the west of Project Site and specifically the maintenance facility building. The construction of the Project would include the handling of hazardous materials, but equipment and materials would be transported to the western portion of the Project Site using Fairway Drive or Colima Road and would not pass by the school. Furthermore, there are numerous regulations covering the transportation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities. The required compliance with these regulations would ensure that the nearby schools would not be exposed to hazardous materials. During operation, the residences and open space landscaping would use and store small quantities of chemicals typical in residences and landscape maintenance. Few of the chemicals would be considered hazardous materials (e.g., bleach, gasoline) and the anticipated volumes would be small (i.e., less than 5 gallons). Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact resulting from use and handling of hazardous materials in the proximity of schools.

2. Hazardous Materials Sites

Impact HAZ-3: The proposed Project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located on, adjacent or near a hazardous materials site listed on the Government Code Section 65962.5 list of hazardous materials sites (also referred to as the Cortese list). Therefore, no impact would occur.

3. Airport Land Use Plan

Impact HAZ-4: The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within two miles of an airport and there are no applicable airport land use plans that overlap the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4. Exposure to Wildland Fires

Impact HAZ-6: The proposed Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within or in proximity to a very high fire hazard severity area. The available public water supply is sufficient to serve the water requirements for the Project, including for fire flow standards. The proposed residential and open space use would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard (e.g., a chemical manufacturing facility) and impacts would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would use and store small quantities of chemicals typical in residences; however, given that the quantities would be small, the routine use or an accidental spill of hazardous materials would render this impact less than significant.

The cumulative projects would require the transport, use, and storage of hazardous chemicals. However, all Project components involving the handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be required to prepare and implement an HMBP and comply with applicable regulations, including those governing containment, site layout, and emergency response and notification procedures in the event of a spill or release. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations regarding hazardous materials transport would reduce the risk of environmental or human exposure to such materials. The combined effects of the Project and cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact.

Cumulative projects within the County would be required to comply with applicable emergency response and evacuation policies, local fire codes, and the OAERP. Due to existing regulations, particularly the Fire Code, cumulative projects would

not result in a significant cumulative impact associated with the impairing or interfering with implementation of adopted emergency response and evacuation plans, specifically the movement of emergency vehicles by or onto a given site. Similar to the Project, related projects would be required to maintain and/or improve emergency evacuation response as it pertains to avoiding impairing or interfering with applicable adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans, in compliance with the Fire Code. As such, no significant cumulative impact with respect to adopted emergency response or evacuation plan would result. For the above reasons, the Project would not cause or contribute to a cumulatively significant impact with respect to impairing or interfering with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

I. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Groundwater Supplies and Groundwater Recharge

Impact HYDRO-2: The proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable management of the basin.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities would not require use of on-site groundwater supplies and dust suppression water during grading and site preparation work would come from the existing municipal water supply. Additionally, the current groundwater wells that serve the golf course would not be used as a water supply source for the Project. No depletion of groundwater supplies would occur during construction. Once operational, the Project would not require groundwater as the Project's water would be supplied by the WWD. The Project would result in an increase in impervious surface area since it would redevelop a portion of an existing, mostly pervious, golf course; however, rainwater runoff would be captured in the proposed storm drain and detention facilities designed for each planning area to meet a 25-year storm event (Fusco 2023a). The capacity of LACFCD (Los Angeles County Flood Control District) storm drain systems would not be exceeded following development of the Project (see Appendix J of the Draft EIR). As a result, the rainwater would be ultimately routed to on-site infiltration systems (e.g., infiltration swales) or to the storm drain system and returned to the environment for groundwater recharge. Therefore, environmental impacts to groundwater supply and groundwater recharge during long-term operation of the Project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

2. Drainage Pattern: Erosion or Flooding

Impact HYDRO-3: The proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water

which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The proposed Project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would require the removal of existing structures, grading of the Project Site, and the construction of new structures, which could alter existing drainage patterns and flows within the Project Site that could affect erosion or siltation on- or off-site. However, demolition and construction activities would be temporary in nature and the drainage patterns would be restored to capture all runoff onsite and convey any surface flows to the existing LACFCD storm drain systems. During construction, the Project would adhere to applicable regulatory requirements and plans including NPDES Municipal Permits and its local MS4 permit development standards, LID practices, and all applicable BMPs (e.g., bioretention, rainfall storage, and/or biofiltration) pertaining to water quality standards that would decrease the potential for drainage pattern alteration, polluted runoff, and decrease erosion and sedimentation effects during construction. There are no nearby streams or rivers within the immediate vicinity that would be affected by construction of the Project. The Project's compliance with applicable regulations and plans would ensure that drainage patterns, erosion or siltation, stormwater drainage systems, or polluted runoff would be less than significant.

Operation of the Project would include storm drains and detention facilities designed for each Planning Area to meet a 25-year storm event. The proposed storm drains and detention systems would reduce flows to the pre-Project conditions before releasing flows to the LACFCD existing storm drain facilities. The LACFCD storm drain facilities would continue to function as they do currently without adverse impact to the downstream storm drain reaches (Fusco 2023a). In addition, the Project would include new filtration BMPs to the Project design and new landscaped areas throughout the Project Site, all designed to meet a 25-year storm event. The intercepted storm flows would be treated onsite through applicable BMPs (e.g., bioretention, rainfall storage, and/or biofiltration) prior to being discharged into the storm drains. As such, impacts pertaining to drainage patterns, erosion or siltation, stormwater drainage systems, or redirect flood flows would be less than significant.

3. Pollutant Release Due to Flood, Tsunami, or Seiche

Impact HYDRO-4: The proposed Project would not risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation or being located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not in a location that would be impacted by a seiche or tsunami. The nearest dam or levee to the Project Site is the Puddingstone Reservoir, which is approximately 7.5 miles northeast of the site. Given the long distance to the nearest dam, as well as the relatively small size of the reservoir, flooding hazards are minimal. The Project Site is designated within flood Zone X, Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (FEMA 2008), and located

between the 100-year and 500-year flood zones. The Project would include storm drains and detention facilities designed for each Planning Area to meet a 25-year storm event. The proposed storm drains and detention systems would reduce flows to the pre-Project conditions before releasing flows to the LACFCD existing storm drain facilities. The LACFCD storm drain facilities would continue to function as they do currently without adverse impact to the downstream storm drain reaches (Fuscoe 2023a). As such, environmental impacts to drainage patterns that would result in a risk of the release of pollutants due to Project inundation or flooding hazards during long-term operation of the Project would be less than significant. As such, environmental impacts related to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving seiche, tsunami, and flooding is less than significant.

4. Water Quality Control Plan/Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan

Impact HYDRO-5: The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the LARWQCB Basin Plan because the Project would not change or affect any of the listed beneficial uses of water within the basin. A LID Plan has been developed for the Project as and includes identification of design considerations following a site assessment; applying site-specific source control measures; detail implementation of BMPs; assignment of long-term maintenance responsibilities; and a design plan that would be implemented in order to mitigate post-construction stormwater runoff pollution. Further, the Project Site would not use groundwater. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, and there would be no impact.

5. Cumulative Impacts-Hydrology and Water Quality

Finding: Less than Significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects that have the potential to impact hydrology and water quality would also be required to comply with NPDES Construction General Permit and its required SWPPP, the NPDES Municipal Permits and its MS4 BMP requirements, and the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program and its required HMBP, all designed to prevent impacts to water quality and have procedures in place for responding to spills. While it is possible that the Project and cumulative projects could result in releases of sediment and/or pollutants that could adversely affect water quality during construction, the responsible parties associated with each project would be required to control runoff and respond to spills to the same established regulatory standards. As a result, the cumulative impact with respect to water quality would not be cumulatively considerable. In addition, compliance with the NPDES Municipal Permits and its MS4 BMP requirements, would require that both the Project and the cumulative

projects include in their designs measures to manage stormwater runoff through the use of BMPs such as managing surface water runoff, on-site infiltration, and connecting to the existing stormwater drainage system. Compliance with these regulations would prevent erosion, siltation, and flooding. Accordingly, no significant cumulative impact with respect to hydrology would result. Therefore, construction of the Project would not cause or contribute to a cumulatively significant impact with respect to hydrology or water quality.

Once constructed, the designs of the Project and the cumulative projects would result in the drainage systems of each site incorporating the requirements of the regulations discussed above during construction. As a result, each project would have incorporated on-site runoff management measures to accommodate operational flows including on-site infiltration measures and adequate connections to the existing county stormwater drainage system. With compliance with these regulations and implementation of stormwater management measures, the Project would not cause or contribute to an operational cumulatively significant impact with respect to hydrology or water quality.

J. Land Use and Planning

1. Physically Divide an Established Community

Impact LUP-1: The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not result in the division of an established community. Rather, the Project would result in the infill of residential uses on an underutilized golf course surrounded by an existing residential community. The Project would establish new residential uses in an existing residential community and the Project's land uses would be organized in a manner that is compatible with the existing single-family homes surrounding the Site. Development within the Project Site would be guided by the Rowland Heights Community Plan, similar to the adjacent existing residential development and the implementation of the Project would not physically divide an established community. Furthermore, the Project would include on-site and off-site improvements that would improve the circulation within the site and within the immediate community. Therefore, impacts to land use and planning through the physical division of the Project Site or surrounding community would be less than significant.

2. Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans

Impact LUP-2: The proposed Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The existing General Plan Land Use and Rowland Heights Community Plan designate the entire Project Site as Open Space and the Project would require a General Plan Amendment (Rowland Heights

Community Plan) from OS (Open Space) to Urban 2 ((U2); 3.3 to 6.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5; to Urban 3 ((U3); 6.1 to 12.0 dwelling units per acre) for portions of Planning Areas 1 and 5; and to Urban 4 ((U4); 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per acre) for a portion of Planning Area 3; a Zone Change from A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000-6U and RPD-5000-12U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-6 Dwelling Units Per Acre and 12 Dwelling Units Per Acre, respectively) for the 62.25 acres of proposed single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, with an affordable housing component and open space for Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 and to RPD-5000-17U (Residential Planned Development-5000 Square Feet Minimum Lot Area-17 Dwelling Units Per Acre) for the 6.0 acres of townhomes with an affordable housing component and open space for proposed Planning Area 3; a Vesting Tentative Tract Map: Subdivision of six (6) existing parcels into 248 lots, consisting of 200 single family lots, 29 residential condominium lots with a total of 58 duplex units, 5 residential condo lots with a total of 30 triplex units, 1 residential condo lot with 72 attached townhomes, 13 open space lots to be privately owned and maintained by the HOA but accessible to the public, and a street frontage waiver for the private driveway and fire lane system; Conditional Use Permit (CUP): For grading in excess of 100,000 cubic yards, and a Residential Development Program, walls over 6-feet in height, buildings over 35-feet in height, setback reduction townhomes (front) and triplexes (front and rear) yards, and residential lot widths less than 50-feet, a Housing Permit to reserve 22.7 percent (82 units) of subdivision units for sale to middle and moderate-income households and to allow single-family lots smaller than 5,000 square feet and waive the parkway requirement along private driveways within Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5. Single-family Lots #18, #47, and #155 are slightly less than 5,000 sf in size (net size). Lot #18 is undersized due to a side yard utility easement, Lot #47 is a corner lot with a curved front side yard to accommodate the entrance of the residential development, and Lot #155 is undersized due to utility easement.

The Project would be consistent with applicable goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS as the Project is an infill project that would develop new housing by providing a mix of residential uses on an underdeveloped site that is well served by an existing transportation network, including public transportation options to provide an alternative to private automobiles. Further, the Project would enhance the pedestrian environment and improve pedestrian accessibility across the Project Site by providing publicly accessible recreational trails for walking, running and biking. The Project would implement design features and mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts, including the incorporation of energy-saving features and measures that would encourage alternative transit modes. The Project would support energy efficiency by including design features and building regulations to reduce demand for energy resources. Additionally, the Project would not include any natural gas infrastructure and would use all-electric appliances without any natural gas connections. Thus, the Project would be consistent with and would not preclude attainment of goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS.

The Project would be developed pursuant to the provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance (LACC Title 22), which implements the General Plan, inclusive of its Community Plans including the Rowland Heights Community Plan. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with the guiding principles and applicable measures included in the Los Angeles County General Plan and would be consistent with the goals and policies of the Rowland Heights Community

Plan. Finally, the Project would comply with the setback requirements and the LID Standards included in the LACC and is compatible with the surrounding land uses. Compliance with the aforementioned policies and regulations would ensure that the Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and the impact would be less than significant.

3. Cumulative Impacts Land Use

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: It is reasonable to assume that the identified cumulative projects would implement and conform to local and regional planning goals and policies. Impacts would not lead to significant physical effects on the environment that are cumulative in nature because all future projects that develop within the area of the Project, would be subject to the 2035 Los Angeles County General Plan, LACC (or other applicable local subdivisions, planning and zoning regulations), and the 2045 RTP/SCS. The Project would constitute an infill development that includes uses consistent with the use, scale, and design of residential development within the northeastern portion of the Rowland Heights Community. Cumulative projects seeking increases in permitted densities and buildings seeking higher densities than those permitted by the underlying zoning per the LACC are subject to review by the LA County Planning Department and other County departments and is evaluated against the specific regulatory land use and zoning designations of the individual project sites. Therefore, no cumulative significant impacts regarding consistency with applicable regulatory frameworks would result. The Project is fully consistent with the regulatory framework with the approval of all requested entitlements, and its implementation would not have adverse effects on the implementation of plans and regulations in the Project vicinity. Because cumulative projects would be subject to existing land use and zoning regulations and would not be located within the immediate Project vicinity, cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not be expected to cause incremental impacts to land use and planning when considering related past, present, or foreseeable future projects, and no mitigation measures are required to reduce cumulative impacts.

K. Mineral Resources

1. Loss of a Mineral Resource

Impact MR-1: The proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Based on the incremental demand that a typical construction project similar to the Project in size and intensity would create in relation to the overall regional supply and demand, the mineral construction material requirements for the Project are not expected to result in a substantial reduction in available supplies relative to demand.

The Project Site is not located within a known mineral resource area, and no mineral resources are known to exist on the Project Site and the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, and a less than significant impact would occur.

2. Mineral Resource Recovery Site

Impact MR-2: The proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ-2) designated by either the Los Angeles County General Plan or the Rowland Heights Community General Plan and is not identified as an important mineral resource recovery site on any other land use plan and there are no other known designated locally-important mineral resources located on or near the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on local land use plans.

3. Cumulative Impacts- Mineral Resources

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Impacts to mineral resources due to this Project in combination with other nearby projects are expected to be typical of new development. This Project would result in less than significant impacts to mineral resources. Depending on the location and characteristics of other projects, those projects may have impacts on mineral resources. In compliance with CEQA, projects resulting in significant impacts to mineral resources will be mitigated. Therefore, the Project in conjunction with nearby projects is expected to have a less than significant cumulative impact to mineral resources located in designated Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ-2) and on other known or potential mineral resource areas in the general region of the Project Site.

L. Noise

1. Airport Land Use Plan

Impact NOI-3: The proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the Project area to excess noise levels.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site and all associated potential Project-related activities would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public use airport. The nearest airport is the general aviation Brackett Field Airport at 1615 McKinley Avenue, La Verne, located approximately 8 miles to the northeast. Therefore, there would be no impact.

2. Cumulative Impacts- Noise

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: With respect to noise from stationary sources, only cumulative projects to occur within 500 feet of the Project Site would be likely to contribute to cumulative stationary source noise impacts. As none of the cumulative projects are within 500 feet of the Project, no cumulative on-site construction noise impacts would occur. With respect to construction traffic, cumulative projects along the same roadways would have to generate up to 275 truck trips per hour to increase noise levels by 5 dBA over ambient noise levels. It is unlikely that cumulative projects would overlap with Project construction and would generate enough trips to cause a significant construction traffic noise impact. Therefore, no significant cumulative construction traffic noise impacts would occur. Furthermore, cumulative projects are located at a sufficient distance from receptors immediately adjacent to the Project Site and would not combine with the Project's vibration impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

Cumulative noise would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to operation of the Project and cumulative projects, as traffic is the greatest source of operational noise in the Project area. Existing baseline plus Project traffic noise levels along roadway segments that would have the maximum traffic noise level increases would have noise level changes less than the 3 dBA increase normally considered to have potentially significant noise impact for sensitive land uses that are experiencing "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" noise levels. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impact under the future plus Project scenario would occur from the operation of the Project. With regard to operational vibration, neither the Project nor any of the cumulative projects consist of uses that would generate noticeable levels of operational vibration. Vehicles generate very low instantaneous levels of vibration that attenuate quickly and would be imperceptible. Therefore, operational vibration impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant. The Project Site and all associated potential Project-related activities would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, within two miles of a public use airport. Therefore, operational impacts with respect to a private airstrip or airport land use plan would not be cumulatively considerable and there would be no impact.

M. Population and Housing

1. Population Growth

Impact POP-1: The proposed Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Given the short duration of the work for each job, and the large size and mobility of the construction labor pool that can be drawn upon in the region, construction employees would not be expected to relocate their residences within this region or move from other regions into this region in response to the short-term Project-related construction employment opportunities. As a result, Project construction would have less than significant direct and indirect impacts related to population growth.

The Project's 1,260 residents would comprise approximately 5.7 percent of the unincorporated County's estimated growth at buildout in 2027. The Project's residents would comprise only 0.7 percent of SCAG's longer-term projected population increase for the unincorporated County in the SCAG 2045 Horizon Year. The Project's 360 units would comprise approximately 2.8 percent of the unincorporated County's estimated growth at buildout in 2027 and only 0.4 percent of SCAG's longer-term projected housing increase for the unincorporated County in the SCAG 2045 Horizon Year. The Project's increases in population and housing would be within SCAG's projections for the unincorporated County for both the near-term buildout year (2027) and for SCAG's projection horizon year (2045), and thus the Project would not induce unplanned substantial population growth in the area directly through the development of new housing. Furthermore, The Project would support and not conflict with the goals, objectives and policies in the General Plan's Land Use Element and Housing Element and would be consistent with the County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. The Project would not result in an unexpected direct impact on growth. Further, the Project would not have indirect effects on growth through such mechanisms as the extension of roads and infrastructure, since the Project would represent infill development and would utilize the existing transportation and utility infrastructure to serve the Project. As a result, the Project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly that cannot be reasonably accommodated, and operational impacts would be less than significant.

2. Displacement of People

Impact POP-2: The proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Finding: No Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project is an infill project that would replace a portion of an existing golf course with 360 residential units consisting of 200 detached single-family units, 72 townhouse units and 88 duplex and triplex units. Currently, there are no dwelling units on the Project Site; therefore, no existing dwelling units would be replaced and there would be no impact on displacement of people or housing. Rather, the Project would provide 360 new residential units with 82 units reserved for sale to middle and moderate-income households. The 82 units are comprised of the 72 townhouse units and 10 triplex units. Therefore, no impact would occur due to displacement of people or housing that would require the construction of replacement housing. No impact would occur.

3. Cumulative Impacts- Population and Housing

Finding: Less than Significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The estimated cumulative population growth of 1,505 people is equal to 0.85 percent of the population growth estimated in the SCAG projection for the unincorporated County by the 2045 horizon year. The Project and cumulative projects would result in the construction of approximately 430 housing units within the unincorporated County, which is 0.41 percent of unincorporated Countywide projected housing growth by the year 2045. The approximately 430 new housing units associated with the Project and cumulative projects on buildout would represent 0.41 percent of the projected new housing units within the unincorporated County by 2045. Therefore, the projected population and housing growth would be within the 2045 SCAG projections identified in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS for the unincorporated County. The increases in population (0.85 percent) and housing units (0.41 percent) show that the unincorporated County is achieving SCAG and County goals of expanding the housing supply and attracting proportionate amounts of housing in the unincorporated County. The increase in housing stock as infill projects in the urbanized unincorporated County provides opportunities for residents to locate within areas closer to existing employment centers and transit hubs, thereby reducing the demand for development in lower-density areas and achieving greater efficiency in the provision and use of existing services and infrastructure. The cumulative growth in the unincorporated County indicates that the unincorporated County's new proposed developments would improve its distribution of jobs and housing. For these reasons, the Project, considered together with cumulative projects, would not induce substantial unplanned population growth through contributions to population and housing either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative population and housing growth is consistent with projected growth patterns for the unincorporated County, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

N. Public Services

1. Performance Objectives for Schools

Finding: Less than Significant

Impact PS-3: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would increase the student population within the assigned local schools which could potentially impact the performance of the schools. School districts are authorized to collect fees for mitigation of the impact of new development on enrollment. As a result, the Project would be required to pay state-mandated school facilities fees to RWUSD to contribute to a fair-share amount to help maintain adequate school facilities and levels of service. Regulatory compliance ensures that there would be sufficient facilities to serve the Project's additional students and the Project impacts to school facilities would be less than significant.

2. Performance Objectives for Parks

Impact PS-4: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The closest park to the Project Site is approximately 1.5 miles away (Rowland Height Park) and the next closest park is approximately 3 miles away (Carolyn Rosas Park). The Project would generate a temporary increase in population during construction due to the influx of construction workers; however, the increase would be negligible because construction workers are highly transient in their work location and likely would utilize parks and recreation facilities near their place of residence. There is potential for construction workers to utilize parks and recreation facilities during their lunch breaks. However, any increase in the use of these facilities due to the construction of the Project would be minimal and temporary; therefore, construction of the Project is not expected to increase demand on existing park and recreation facilities to a meaningful extent. The temporary impact on park and recreation facilities during construction would not require the construction of additional parks and/or recreational facilities in the local vicinity and impacts would be less than significant.

During operation, the Project is estimated to result in a population of 1,260. Pursuant to the County Park obligation requirements, the Project would require three acres of parkland for every 1,000 people. Therefore, the Project would be required to dedicate .52 acres of park land or the payment of \$986,332 of in-lieu fees in compliance with the County Obligation Report from the County Department of Parks and Recreation. The Project will satisfy this obligation by paying the in-lieu fee pursuant to the County Park Obligation Report dated 3/1/23. Due to the Project's retained on-site open

space and recreation areas, the proximity of substantial regional park facilities within five miles of the Project Site, and the payment of the calculated in-lieu fee to the County, the expected increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities within the Rowland Heights community and greater Los Angeles County as a result of the Project is not expected to result in substantial deterioration or adverse effects to those existing parks or facilities, and is not expected to require the construction of additional parks and/or recreational facilities. Further, any future parks or facilities constructed with the in-lieu fees would be required to demonstrate compliance with CEQA prior to approval, which would help ensure that potential environmental impacts are adequately addressed. The remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club could continue modified golf course use if its owners choose to do so, and there are three other golf courses within 5 miles of the Project Site which could continue operation without substantial deterioration. Therefore, impacts to local and regional parks and other recreational facilities would be less than significant.

3. Performance Objectives for Libraries

Impact PS-5: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for libraries.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The estimated 1,260 residents of the Project would be serviced by the Rowland Heights Library. The Rowland Heights Library which currently has a deficiency of 8,969 sf of facility space, 63,414 collection items, and 27 public access computers. Based on the Los Angeles County Library's (LACL's) service guidelines, the introduction of residents associated with the Project Site would require approximately 630 sf of facility space, 3,465 collection items, and 1 public access computer. This would increase the LACL's current deficiency at Rowland Heights Library. The Project would be required to pay the County's Library Facilities Mitigation Fee as required by Chapter 22.264 of the County's Zoning Code (LACL 2022). The LACL also collects an annual special tax which is levied on parcels within ten cities (Cudahy, Culver City, Duarte, El Monte, La Canada, Flintridge, Lakewood, Lomita, Lynwood, Maywood, and West Hollywood) and unincorporated areas serviced by LACL. Future residential development associated with the Project would be required to pay the LACL's special tax rate, which is currently \$33.86 per parcel for the 2023-2024 fiscal year. In addition, the LACL has indicated that there are no plans to expand the Rowland Heights Library or build a new facility. Therefore, impacts to library facilities would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts- Public Services

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services would be reduced through each cumulative project's compliance with the relevant City Code for fire protection, County Fire Codes, and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) design review, fuel modification, and site-specific design and safety features, similar to the Project. Tax-based revenue from Project development together with revenues from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would generate funding for fire protection services which would support any needed increases in staffing, fire stations, and equipment to keep response times within acceptable limits (i.e., five minutes for first arrival and eight minutes for paramedic response within urban areas and eight minutes for first arrival and 12 minutes for paramedic response within suburban areas). It is reasonable to assume such compliance because these codes are fully enforced through the County. The Project's incremental contribution to a growing need for fire protection services and resulting need for new or physically altered facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

Cumulative projects would be subject to review on a case-by-case basis by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) to ensure that sufficient security measures are implemented to reduce potential impacts of Sheriff services. Each cumulative project would be required to assess the demands for Sheriff services. Furthermore, tax-based revenue from development of the Project as well as past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would generate funding for Sheriff services to provide needed increases in staffing and sheriff stations/equipment and to keep response times within acceptable limits. Therefore, the Project's incremental contribution to a growing need for law enforcement services and resulting need for new or physically altered facilities the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and there would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

Cumulative projects would be subject to assessment of applicable school fees at the rate in effect at the time of issuance of building permits. The payment of fees authorized for collection under SB 50 to RHUSD are conclusively considered full mitigation for impacts from the Project and cumulative projects. As a result, the Project would have a less than significant cumulative impact resulting from the establishment of new schools.

Deterioration that would occur to parks and recreational facilities from cumulative projects and associated regional population growth would be offset with funding from new development, such as in-lieu fees for parks or donation of parkland pursuant to the Quimby Act. Therefore, residents of the Project would not overburden existing park and recreation resources, or planned park and recreation resources needed to serve future growth. Furthermore, any cumulative projects that would create a demand for recreational facilities would be required to provide parkland or pay fees to their respective jurisdiction. If each cumulative project was not able to provide parkland or park improvements, then payment of the County's park fee would ensure that established park land and recreational facility standards are met with respect to the additional needs created by individual developments. In addition, the cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with CEQA prior to approval, which would help ensure that potential environmental impacts are adequately addressed at the project level, thereby minimizing the potential for cumulative impacts. Due to the availability of existing

recreational facilities and the Project amenities, implementation of the Project in conjunction with cumulative projects would not cause a substantial increase in use of existing facilities resulting in construction or alteration of facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts to parks and recreational facilities would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, less than significant.

Future cumulative development would be required to pay the County's Library Facilities Mitigation Fee, which supports the construction of new facilities to accommodate increased population, and the LACL's special tax. The Project's contribution to the cumulative demand for new libraries that would result in construction of new or altered facilities would not be considerable. The Project's contribution to the cumulative impact to libraries would be less than significant.

O. Recreation

1. Substantial Physical Deterioration of Park and Recreational Facilities

Impact REC-1: The proposed Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: There are five community and neighborhood parks and three golf courses located within approximately 5 miles of the Project Site. Pursuant to the County parkland dedication requirements, the Project would require four acres of parkland for every 1,000 people using the recommendations mentioned in the Rowland Heights Community Plan (County of Los Angeles 1981). Pursuant to County Code Section 21.28.140, a percentage of private recreation facilities can be counted towards the required amount of park acreage. The Project will provide approximately 28 acres of open space, which is larger than the 5.04 acres that would be required for dedication using the four acres per thousand people standard of the community plan and the General Plan or the 3.52 acres calculated in the County Parks' April 17, 2023, Park Obligation Report. However, the Project open space will be privately owned, not dedicated to the County, and the Applicant will pay the required in-lieu fees of fees of \$986,332 to satisfy the Project's Quimby park obligation requirements. With the Project's 28 acres of on-site open space and recreation areas, the substantial regional park facilities within five miles of the Project Site, and the payment of the calculated in-lieu fee to the County, the expected increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities within the Rowland Heights community and greater Los Angeles County is not expected to result in substantial deterioration or adverse effects to those existing parks or facilities. The remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club could continue modified golf course use if its owners choose to do so, and there are three other golf courses within 5 miles of the Project Site which could continue operation without substantial deterioration. Therefore, impacts to local and regional parks, and other recreational facilities would be less than significant.

2. Construction or Expansion of Park Facilities

Impact REC-2: The Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would replace a portion of the Royal Vista Golf Club with residential uses and publicly accessible private open space among four Planning Areas (Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5), as well as provide additional private open space available for use by the public. The Project would also provide publicly accessible recreational trails, more than 2 miles in length, within landscaped buffers for use by the public within residential Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5. In addition to recreational facilities that would be provided by the Project, residents of the Project would be able to access existing recreational resources including three County-maintained trails that are located within 4 miles of the Project Site. The Project has been designed to promote and enhance bicycling and walking through its provision of new recreational trails and open space, which will provide exercise stations to encourage physical fitness and the Project would promote community health with a design in substantial conformance with the County's Healthy Design Ordinance. There would not be a need for new or expanded recreational facilities in order to accommodate the residents of the Project. Therefore, impacts with respect to construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, would be less than significant.

3. Cumulative Impacts- Recreation

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative projects could result in the deterioration of parks and recreational facilities due to increased usage or necessitate the construction of new parks or recreational facilities. However, the potential for increased demand may be reduced by the provision of new publicly accessible open space and recreational facilities as part of new projects. In addition, potential deterioration to parks and recreational facilities from regional population growth will be offset with the payment of in-lieu fees to meet the park obligation pursuant to the Quimby Act. Moreover, the Project and the cumulative projects are located within five miles of substantial regional parks facilities. In addition, the Project would provide publicly accessible open space and trails that would contribute to meeting the needs of its residents and be accessible to the general public, including residents of the future cumulative projects. Therefore, residents of the Project would not overburden existing park and recreation resources, or planned park and recreation resources needed to serve future growth and may reduce additional demand from cumulative projects.

Only residential cumulative projects would create demand for recreational facilities. All past, present, and future residential subdivision projects in the surrounding area would be required to provide parkland or pay fees to their respective jurisdiction. If each cumulative subdivision project was not able to provide parkland or park improvements, then payment

of applicable park fees would ensure that established parkland and recreational facility standards are met with respect to the additional needs created by individual subdivision developments. In addition, the majority of cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with CEQA prior to approval, which would help ensure that potential environmental impacts are adequately addressed at the project level, thereby minimizing the potential for cumulative impacts. Due to the availability of existing recreational facilities and the Project amenities, implementation of the Project in conjunction with cumulative projects would not cause a substantial increase in use of existing recreational facilities, nor result in or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of these facilities. The cumulative projects would not interfere with regional trail connectivity, although they could benefit trail connectivity. Impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

P. Transportation

1. Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System

Impact TR-1: The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the County of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Rowland Heights Community General Plan are the plans, programs, and policies that are relevant to the Project. The Project is an infill residential development project that would locate 360 residential units adjacent to or near multiple transit lines, major highways, and bicycle facilities, and would include the creation of a trail system to promote active recreation and non-auto transportation options. The Project would be consistent with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS and would not preclude attainment of its primary goals to improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods; reduce GHG emissions and improve air quality; support healthy and equitable communities; and encourage development of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options. The Project would also be consistent with the transportation-related measures included in the County General Plan including Policy M 2.2 and Policies M 2.6 through M 2.9. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with the Circulation Element of the Rowland Heights Community General Plan. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with plans, programs, and policies addressing the circulation system including SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the County of Los Angeles General Plan, and the Rowland Heights Community General Plan and the impact would be less than significant.

2. Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature

Impact TR-3: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: No existing hazardous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections exist at the Project Site or in the Project study area. On-site traffic signage and striping would be incorporated into the detailed construction plans for the Project. Pedestrian access throughout the Project Site would be accommodated by ADA-compliant sidewalks as well as a proposed recreational multi-use trail network. Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via five driveways, two of which are proposed to be along Colima Road (Walnut Leaf Drive and Tierra Luna) and had traffic signal warrants prepared as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), due to the relatively high vehicular volumes documented on Colima Road during peak hours. The TIA determined that, based on the strict application of the warrant criteria, none of the traffic signal warrants were met for either intersection. However, the satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant is not necessarily justification for the installation of a traffic signal and other factors may be just cause for consideration of a traffic signal installation. At the Tierra Luna-Project Driveway/Colima Road intersection, the expected increase in pedestrian activity, the approach speeds along Colima Road, and the safety of users, along with a reduction in minor street delays, justify the relocation of the existing signal to the future intersection. The existing signalized pedestrian and golf cart crossing across Colima Road is planned to be relocated to the future Tierra Luna-Project Driveway/Colima Road intersection in order to maintain pedestrian access across Colima Road. The golf cart path south of Colima Road will be removed in order to accommodate the development of the planned open space on Planning Area 4 and the proposed single-family homes on Planning Area 5; therefore, pedestrian crossings across Colima Road are planned to be accommodated at the Tierra Luna-Project Driveway/Colima Road intersection instead. Furthermore, the TIA evaluated vehicle queuing at the Project driveways, and concluded that vehicle queues would be accommodated by the existing available turn-lane queue storage areas and would not result in queue spill-backs that would block adjacent through-lanes or intersections. Although the TIA concluded the Project would not substantially increase hazards, the Project would implement PDF T-3 through PDF T-8 (see Project Description, above) to further facilitate traffic flow. Further analysis of the Project's effect on freeway off-ramp queuing demonstrates that the Project would not cause, or contribute towards, slowing or stopped traffic on mainline travel lanes resulting in unsafe speed differentials between adjacent lanes. Pursuant to the Caltrans Interim Safety Review Practitioners Guidance, the Project would be considered to cause a less-than-significant safety impact, and no traffic safety impact mitigation is required. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to the establishment of new driveways or queuing on surrounding intersections. In addition, the Project would include roadway widening, sidewalks, curb and gutter and driveways along the Project frontage which would be constructed to Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) standards, and Project access and circulation have been reviewed by LACDPW with respect to Caltrans/Los Angeles County standards to ensure that the Project does not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

Q. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Water Supply Availability

Impact UTL-2: The proposed Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: It is anticipated that the Project would increase potable water demand from the Project Site by 137 acre-feet per year (AFY), which represents approximately 13 percent of the total increase in demand from 2025 to 2045 in the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and would not represent a significant new demand for water. For dry years, 137 AFY would represent approximately 15 percent of the projected demand (864 AFY) from 2025 to 2045. The proposed increase in recycled water demand from the Project of 77 AFY represents approximately 4 percent of the projected demand from 2025 to 2045 in the UWMP. Therefore, as addressed in the WWWD will-serve letter, WWWD would be able to supply the demands of the Project and future growth and impacts on water supply will be less than significant.

2. Wastewater Capacity

Impact UTL-3: The proposed Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Wastewater generated by the Project would be treated at the San Jose Creek WRP. The Project is anticipated to generate less than 0.25 percent of San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant's (WRP's) remaining capacity of 100 million gallons per day (mgd) of primary, secondary, and tertiary wastewater and 0.13 percent of San Jose Creek WRP's current average flow. As San Jose Creek WRP's daily capacity is well above the sum of the current daily treatment levels and the Project's projected wastewater generation, San Jose Creek WRP currently has the capacity to accommodate the additional wastewater generated by the Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it does not have adequate capacity to accommodate the Project's wastewater demands, and impacts would be less than significant.

3. Solid Waste Capacity

Impact UTL-4: The proposed Project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The community of Rowland Heights contracts with Athens Services, a private waste collection company, to provide solid waste disposal services, which take solid waste to one of the County's landfills or to a materials recovery facility prior to solid waste disposal. The remaining disposal capacity for the County's Class III landfills is estimated at approximately 148.4 million tons as of September 2020. The Project's generation of construction waste would be recycled in accordance with CALGreen requirements of 50 percent. Therefore, construction of the Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. During operation, it is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 6,930 lbs/day to the Project Site or approximately 2,529,450 lbs per year (approximately 1,249 tons per year), prior to implementation of waste diversion strategies. The Project's operational solid waste generation prior to diversion would account for approximately 0.0008 percent of the remaining capacity of 148.4 million tons at the County's Class III landfills. In addition, the Project would adhere to the requirements of the County and the provisions of AB 341, which focuses on increased waste recycling to reduce daily waste removal. Therefore, the Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient space to accommodate the Project's waste disposal needs and impacts would be less than significant.

4. Solid Waste Management and Reduction Strategies and Regulations

UTL-5: The proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would generate solid waste during both construction and operation. The County of Los Angeles Integrated Waste Management Program (CoIWMP) (AB 939) requires the County to attain specific waste diversion goals. In addition, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires expanded or new development projects to incorporate storage areas for recycling bins into the Project design. The Project would be required to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 and the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, during construction and operation. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations to reduce the amount of solid waste; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts- Utilities and Service Systems

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project has received a Will-Serve Letter from WWD for the 12-inch water lines that are adjacent to the Project Site. WWD is required to prepare and periodically update the UWMP to plan and provide

water supplies to serve existing and projected demands. The 2020 UWMP prepared by WWD accounts for existing development within the County, as well as projected growth through the year 2045. The increase in potable water demands of 122,544 gallons per day (gpd) (137 AFY) from the Project is well within the planned increases in water demands within the WWD service area (1,020 AFY anticipated from 2025 to 2045 for normal and 864 AFY for dry year scenarios). Therefore, it is anticipated that WWD would be able to supply the demands of the Project as well as future growth. WWD is able to account for changes in development around the Project Site and can mitigate for deficiencies as needed. Therefore, cumulative impacts on water supply would be less than significant.

The Project will result in the additional generation of sewer flow and a will-serve letter has been provided by LACSD for the Project Site. The Sewer Area Study concluded that adequate capacity within the sewer infrastructure exists to serve the Project. In addition, the County regularly updates and tracks various developments that may impact infrastructure and has the ability to charge impact fees and can request additional upgrades to infrastructure if future project have the potential to exceed current infrastructure capacity prior to providing sewer services. The County also corresponds periodically with regional wastewater LACSD to confirm regional infrastructure capacity exists. The Project's total estimated wastewater generation increase of 79,502 gpd comprises less than 0.25 percent of the available capacity in the WRP system (37.3 mgd). Based on these forecasts, the Project's increase in wastewater generation would be adequately accommodated by the San Jose Creek WRP. Cumulative projects must go through the same analysis to determine if any facilities will need to be upgraded to accommodate for the increase in capacity. It is not anticipated that increases in sewer flows from Project buildout, or redevelopment of the area surrounding the Project Site would adversely impact the capacity of local or regional wastewater infrastructure or the wastewater treatment plant. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Although the Project and cumulative projects would result in an increase in the amount of solid waste sent to landfills, compliance with state and local waste diversion requirements would contribute to the longevity of existing and proposed landfills that would serve the projects and ensure that cumulative impacts to solid waste are less than significant. Through compliance with the applicable regulations, the cumulative projects would significantly reduce the amount of solid waste that would be generated and distributed to landfills. Cumulative impacts associated with adequate solid waste capacity in landfills would be less than significant.

The Project and cumulative projects would result in an increase in the construction of additional telecommunications equipment, all of which is readily available. The equipment would be installed on each site and would not affect surrounding sites. Similar to the Project, the cumulative projects would be required to coordinate their respective projects, sites, and requirements with the service provider(s) to ensure that connectivity is not disturbed and that proper conduits are installed relative to their respective projects. Cumulative impacts associated with adequate telecommunications capacity would be less than significant.

R. Wildfire

1. Exacerbate Wildfire Risks that would Expose Occupants to Pollutant Concentrations from Wildfire

Impact WDF-2: Would the proposed Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors; exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within a fire hazard severity zone (FHSZ) or a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and no portion of the Project Site interfaces with undeveloped wildland, with distances between proposed housing and wildland areas ranging from 700 to 4,500 feet. While a small portion of Planning Area 5 is located within an area that has been mapped as part of the wildland urban interface (WUI) for the very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) that lies to the east of Planning Area 5, a section of long-established housing lies adjacent to Planning Area 5. This, together with recent residential development within the westernmost portion of the VHFHSZ itself, provides substantial separation of Planning Area 5 from undeveloped wildland. In addition, Planning Area 5 would comply with applicable development standards included in the California Fire Code (CFC) Chapter 49, which contains minimum standards for development in the wildland–urban interface and fire hazard areas. Due to the site’s location in relation to the undeveloped wildland, the Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks during construction or operation.

During construction, all construction activities and work crews would be required to comply with applicable fire protection and prevention requirements specified in the CFC and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) Regulations. This includes various measures such as easy accessibility of firefighting equipment, proper storage of combustible liquids, no smoking in service and refueling areas, and worker training for fire extinguisher use. Therefore, construction of the Project would not pose a wildfire risk to people and property with possible ignition sources, such as internal combustion engines, gasoline-powered tools, and equipment that could produce a spark, fire, or flame.

With respect to operational impacts, the California Attorney General’s 2022 guidance document, Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Project’s Under the California Environmental Quality Act, includes a number of recommendations for determining impacts to wildfire risk including considerations of project density, project location in the landscape, and water supply and infrastructure. The Project would meet the “Project Density” criteria, as development as part of the Project would provide for higher density housing rather than low density development, thus reducing the availability of fuels and lessening the placement of scattered housing within matrices of wildland vegetation. The Project would meet the “Project Location in the Landscape” criteria, as the Project would provide for development of housing in an area that is not subject to high wildfire risk, since it does not present features of topography, vegetation, and other factors that contribute to heightened wildfire risk and is separated from wildland areas by intervening residential development and roadways. The Project would also meet the “Water Supply and Infrastructure” criteria as it would be

located in an area with well-established urban infrastructure and would provide for housing in areas with access to infrastructure related to circulation, water supply for firefighting, and access to emergency services. Furthermore, the Project Site is located within an area that contains a network of arterial and secondary roadways that provide enhanced capacity for emergency response and evacuation. SR-60 and SR-57 both lie in close proximity to the Project Site, as do any number of multi-laned arterial roadways. When considered against the Attorney General's criteria, the Project performs well, and does not present characteristics that would indicate that the Project would be subject to heightened risk of wildfire or that Project occupants would be subject to substantial wildfire risk. Therefore, impacts related to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire would be less than significant.

2. Wildfire Risks Associated with Infrastructure

Impact WDF-3: Would the proposed Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project includes construction and operation of new roadways, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, fire hydrants, streetlights, landscaping, and irrigation to support the residential developments. Since the Project Site lies within an area that is already urbanized and provided with extensive urban services and is also not located in an area of substantial wildfire risk, construction of fire roads, fuel breaks, and emergency water sources would not be required for future development in this already urbanized area. Electrical infrastructure, which can be a source of ignition if located aboveground in areas containing wildfire fuels, would be undergrounded for the Project, thus avoiding this potential risk. Furthermore, no new wildfire-related infrastructure would be required since the Project Site is not located in an area of substantial wildfire risk. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

3. Flooding or Landslides

Impact WDF-4: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within a FHSZ or an SRA and the site is not located in an area of heightened risk for wildfire. No portion of the Project Site interfaces with undeveloped wildland, with distances of the proposed housing from wildland areas ranging from 700 feet to 4,500 feet. While a small portion of Planning Area 5 is located within an area that has been mapped as part of the wildland urban interface (WUI) for the very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) that lies to the east of Planning Area 5, a section of long-established housing lies adjacent to

Planning Area 5. This, together with recent residential development within the westernmost portion of the VHFHSZ itself, provides substantial separation of Planning Area 5 from undeveloped wildland. In addition, Planning Area 5 would comply with applicable development standards included in the California Fire Code (CFC) Chapter 49, which contains minimum standards for development in the wildland–urban interface and fire hazard areas. Due to the Project Site’s location in relation to undeveloped wildlands and the intervening development and distance between the Project Site and the nearest wildlands, the likelihood of post-fire impacts would be minimal. The Project itself would not exacerbate the risk of such impacts, since it is not located in a wildfire-prone area, would not introduce new sources of ignition to an area containing wildland fuels, and would not contribute to post-fire impacts on other properties. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

4. Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death

Impact WDF-5: Would the proposed Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires? (Less than Significant)

Finding: Less than Significant Impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Site is not located within a FHSZ or an SRA and the Site is not located in an area of heightened risk for wildfire. No portion of the Project Site interfaces with undeveloped wildland, with distances of the proposed housing from wildland areas ranging from 700 feet to 4,500 feet. While a small portion of Planning Area 5 is located within an area that has been mapped as part of the wildland urban interface (WUI) for the very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) that lies to the east of Planning Area 5, a section of long-established housing lies adjacent to Planning Area 5. This, together with recent residential development within the westernmost portion of the VHFHSZ itself, provides substantial separation of Planning Area 5 from undeveloped wildland. In addition, Planning Area 5 would comply with applicable development standards included in the California Fire Code (CFC) Chapter 49, which contains minimum standards for development in the wildland–urban interface and fire hazard areas. Further, the Project meets criteria established by California Attorney General Rob Bonta’s Best Practices for Analyzing and Mitigating Wildfire Impacts of Development Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act (2022), and the Project meets all favorable criteria related to project density, the project’s location in the landscape, and proximity to adequate water supply and infrastructure. Therefore, there is no indication that the Project would be subject to heightened risk of wildfire or that Project occupants would be subject to substantial wildfire risk. The impact would be less than significant.

5. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The following potentially significant impacts were analyzed in the EIR, and the effects of the Project were considered. Because of the environmental analysis of the Project and identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes, and statutes, and the identification and incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the following potentially significant impacts have been determined by the County to be reduced to a level of less than significant; and the County has found - in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and the State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) - that "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment". The County has determined - pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and State Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2) - that "Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency." The County's findings are referred to herein as "Finding 2"

A. Air Quality

1. Air Quality Plans

Impact AIR-1: The Project's construction and operations would not conflict with implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD).

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project's construction would result in a relatively small increase in short-term employment compared to existing conditions that would not conflict with the long-term employment projections upon which the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is based. Control strategies in the AQMP with applicability to short-term emissions from construction activities include strategies denoted in the 2022 AQMP as MOB-06 and MOB-11 and are intended to reduce emissions from on-road and off-road heavy-duty vehicles and equipment by accelerating replacement of older, emissions-prone engines with newer engines meeting more stringent emission standards. The Project would comply with the implementation of the applicable control strategies in the AQMP, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Air Toxic Control Measure, applicable Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements, the CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation, and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulations for controlling fugitive dust. Compliance with these regulations is consistent with and meets or exceeds the AQMP requirements for control strategies intended to reduce emissions from construction equipment and activities. Furthermore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires the use of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Tier 4 Final construction equipment for all construction equipment greater than 50 hp. Thus, the Project would not conflict with implementation of these strategies and the construction impact would be less than significant.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, reduce the levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, return clean air to the region, and minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections used in the formulation of the AQMP. The Project's population growth of 1,224 people would fall within the growth projections contained in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, which forms the basis of the growth projections in the 2022 AQMP. The total projected population in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County is expected to grow from 1,044,500 people in 2016 to 1,258,000 in 2045. The Project's estimated increase in population would represent approximately 0.10 percent of the growth in population projected for unincorporated Los Angeles County in the 2020–2044 RTP/SCS between 2016 and 2045. Therefore, the Project would also fall within the growth projections as contained in the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, and ultimately the growth projections in the 2022 AQMP. Projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable growth projections and control strategies used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality reductions identified in the AQMP, even if their emissions exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance. As discussed further below, the projected operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and the Project would incorporate operational control strategies listed in PDF AQ-1 to reduce energy and emissions from operation of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP and regional operational impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The construction contractor shall require that all off-road diesel equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) used during construction of the Project shall be registered with CARB and meet CARB Tier 4 final off-road emission standards. Such equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices including a California Air Resources Board-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter. In order to ensure compliance with this measure, all contractors that utilize off-road diesel equipment that is greater than 50 horsepower shall participate in CARB's DOORS which is the State's online tool for Off-Road Diesel Reporting and shall submit a copy of the report to LA County Planning prior to issuance of a grading permit. Documentation of equipment emissions standards or Tier 4 certification shall also be kept onsite at all times during construction activities.

2. Air Quality Standard

Impact AIR-2: Project construction would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The maximum daily construction emissions for the Project were estimated for each construction phase. Construction-related daily nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for the grading/excavation phase in 2025 and with respect to regional emissions from unmitigated

construction activities, NOx impacts would be significant. Therefore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1 which requires the use of CARB Tier 4 Final off-road diesel equipment for any construction equipment that is greater than 50 horsepower to reduce exhaust emissions. With Mitigation Measure AQ-1 the Project's NOx emissions, as well as other criteria pollutant emissions, would be below the SCAQMD regional thresholds. Thus, the construction of the Project would have a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation.

During operation, the Project would implement PDF T-1 Increase Residential Density which would reduce operational impacts associated with the Project by reducing VMT and associated operational mobile-source emissions generated by the Project. The increase in operational-related unmitigated daily emissions for the criteria and precursor pollutants (volatile organic compounds [VOCs], NOx, carbon monoxide [CO], sulfur oxides [SOx], particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM10], and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM2.5]) would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for any non-attainment pollutants. Therefore, operational impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

3. Sensitive Receptors

Impact AIR-3: The proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Finding: Less than significant with mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Maximum localized construction and operational emissions for sensitive receptors would not exceed the applicable SCAQMD localized threshold of significance for any criteria pollutant. As the Project's maximum localized emissions from construction and operation would not exceed the localized thresholds of significance, localized construction and operational emissions impacts would be less than significant.

CO levels in the Project area are substantially below the federal and state standards. No exceedances of CO have been recorded at the SRA 10 monitoring stations in the last five years and the South Coast Air Basin (Air Basin) is currently designated as a CO attainment area for both the CAAQS and NAAQS. Thus, it is not expected that CO levels at Project-impacted intersections would rise to the level of an exceedance of these standards. Furthermore, based on the Project's TIA, the two worst performing studied intersections are Fairway Drive-Brea Canyon Cutoff Road and Colima Road, and the street segment analysis shows that traffic volumes of all studied segments do not exceed 2,941 average daily trips. As a result, CO concentrations are expected to be approximately 2.04 ppm (one-hour average) and 1.69 ppm (eight-hour average) or less, inclusive of background CO concentrations, which would not exceed the thresholds. Total traffic volumes at the maximum impacted intersection would likely have to increase by 20 times or more to contribute to a CO hotspot.

Thus, the Project would not contribute considerably to the formation of CO hotspots and no further CO analysis is required. The Project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to CO hotspots.

Construction activities would occur on the Project Site over approximately 36 months; however, Construction activities will move around the Project Site, and construction near any single receptor is expected to be of a much shorter duration than the estimated 36-month construction schedule. This construction duration would be significantly lower than the 30-year residential exposure period associated with cancer health risks. Health risk impacts would not be anticipated due to the short-term and temporary construction duration, the buffers to nearby sensitive receptors, the movement of construction activities around the Project Site and short time frame near any single receptor, and the small number of construction equipment. Furthermore, the Project would incorporate Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires the use of Tier 4 Final off-road diesel construction equipment for any equipment greater than 50 horsepower which would reduce diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions and associated impacts at nearby sensitive receptors. In addition, construction contractors would be required to comply with regulations that limit diesel emissions, such as the CARB Air Toxics Control Measure, the Truck and Bus regulation, and the In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets regulation. Thus, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, construction toxic air contaminant (TAC) impacts would be less than significant. During operation, the Project would generate only minor amounts of diesel emissions from mobile sources, such as delivery trucks and trash trucks. Furthermore, the Project trucks would be required to comply with the Truck and Bus regulations to minimize emissions from existing diesel trucks. Therefore, Project operation would not be considered a substantial source of DPM. The Project is expected to generate minimal emissions from use of consumer products and architectural coatings, as Project land uses would not include installation of industrial-sized paint booths or require extensive use of commercial or household cleaning products. Furthermore, the Project's operational VOC emissions would be below the adopted SCAQMD threshold. As a result, toxic or carcinogenic air pollutants are not expected to occur in any substantial amounts in conjunction with operation of the proposed land uses within the Project Site. Based on the uses expected on the Project Site, operation of the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations, and operational impacts would be less than significant.

Construction activities for the Project could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to *Coccidioides immitis* growing in the soil and dirt of the Project Site. The Project would have the potential to expose persons to the spores that cause Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. Therefore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2 to reduce the risk of Valley Fever exposure by following the requirements and guidelines listed in the 2019 County of Los Angeles Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever) Management Plan: Guidelines for Employers, to help reduce the risk of Valley Fever to workers and the surrounding community. Furthermore, the Project would implement SCAQMD fugitive dust control rules and Cal/OSHA requirements that would control and mitigate sources of construction-related fugitive dust, and thereby potential sources of airborne *Coccidioides immitis* spores, to at or below applicable regulatory limits for on-site and off-site receptors. These regulatory requirements, together with Mitigation Measure AQ-2, would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: During the construction phases with any soil disturbance, the construction contractor(s) shall comply with the 2019 County of Los Angeles Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever) Management Plan: Guidelines for Employers, as well as the following measures, as feasible, to reduce potential Valley Fever impacts. Compliance with the 2019 County of Los Angeles Valley Fever Management Plan would reduce Valley Fever impacts for on-site workers, as well as the off-site neighboring communities.

- Equipment, vehicles, and other items shall be thoroughly cleaned of dust before they are moved off-site to other work locations.
- Wherever possible, grading and trenching work shall be phased so that earth-moving equipment is working well ahead or downwind of workers on the ground and nearby sensitive uses.
- The area immediately behind grading or trenching equipment shall be sprayed with water before ground workers move into the area to limit dust from blowing off-site.
- To the greatest extent feasible, heavy-duty earth-moving vehicles shall be closed-cab and equipped with a high-efficiency particulate (HEP)-filtered air system.
- Workers shall receive training in procedures to minimize activities that may result in the release of airborne *Coccidioides immitis* spores on-site and off-site, to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and shall be instructed to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor. Evidence of training shall be provided to the Los Angeles County Department of Planning within 5 days of the training session.
- A Valley Fever informational handout shall be provided to all onsite construction personnel, as well as neighboring off-site sensitive uses within 100 feet of the Project Site. The handout shall, at a minimum, provide information regarding the symptoms, health effects, preventative measures, and treatment.
- On-site personnel shall be trained on the proper use of personal protective equipment, including respiratory equipment. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health–approved respirators shall be provided to on-site personnel, upon request. When exposure to dust is unavoidable, provide appropriate National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health-approved respiratory protection to affected workers and off-site receptors. If respiratory protection is deemed necessary, employers must develop and implement a respiratory protection program in accordance with Cal/OSHA's Respiratory Protection standard (8 CCR 5144).

4. Cumulative Impacts-Air Quality

Finding: Less than Significant with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook states that the “Handbook is intended to provide local governments, project proponents, and consultants who prepare environmental documents with guidance for analyzing and mitigating air quality impacts of projects” (SCQMD 1993). The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook also states that “[f]rom an air quality perspective, the impact of a project is determined by examining the types and levels of emissions generated by the project and its impact on factors that affect air quality. As such, projects should be evaluated in terms of air pollution thresholds established by the District” (SCQMD 1993). The SCAQMD has also provided guidance on an acceptable approach to addressing the cumulative impacts issue for air quality as discussed below (SCAQMD 2018b):

“As Lead Agency, the AQMD uses the same significance thresholds for project specific and cumulative impacts for all environmental topics analyzed in an Environmental Assessment or EIR ... Projects that exceed the Project-specific significance thresholds are considered by the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. This is the reason project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant.”

The Project would not exceed the established SCAQMD regional mass emission thresholds or SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for construction and operations. Thus, as the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, the Project would not be cumulative considerable. Furthermore, the Project would not hinder SCAQMD from implementing its AQMP goals of attaining the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.

B. Biological Resources

1. Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species

Impact BIO-1: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site contains no native habitat and is fully surrounded by dense urban and commercial development. Four special-status plant species have recorded occurrences in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, all of these species are anticipated to be absent from the Project Site because these special-status plant species are associated with specific native vegetation communities and micro-habitats that are not found on the Project Site due to prior development and agricultural use. No special-status plant species are expected to occur within the Project Site. As such, there would be no impact to rare, threatened, and endangered or other special-status plant species during construction or operation of the Project.

There are 27 special-status wildlife species that have recorded occurrences in the vicinity of the Project Site. There is moderate potential for Cooper's hawk to nest on-site, but a high potential for this species to forage on-site. Cooper's hawk (nesting) is a CDFW Watch list species (CDFW 2021c). This species was not observed on the Project Site during the site visits. Construction could impact Cooper's hawk if it were nesting on-site and since this species is protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), impact to a Cooper's hawk nest would be potentially significant. Therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would be implemented to reduce impacts to Cooper's hawk and nesting birds to less than significant by avoiding breeding bird nests. There is a high potential for Cooper's hawk to forage on the Project Site, portions of which would be unavailable to the species during and after construction. However, Planning Areas 4 and 6 would remain as undisturbed open space and off-site parks, open space areas, and residential communities could provide foraging habitat for Cooper's hawk. Therefore, impacts to Cooper's hawk foraging habitat during construction would be less than significant because other foraging habitats are available.

Construction could impact the fourteen California Species of Special Concern with low or low to moderate potential to occur: (coastal whiptail, San Diego coast horned lizard, western pond turtle, burrowing owl, pallid bat, western mastiff bat, Yuma myotis, western red bat, big free-tailed bat, southern California legless lizard, northwestern San Diego pocket mouse, western yellow bat, hoary bat, and San Diego desert woodrat) if these species occur on-site. However, there is no potential for significant impacts to the seven nonbat species determined to have either low to moderate or low potential to occur.

The Project site contains limited potential habitat for special status species bats including small sheds, a golf course maintenance building with a metal roof and no attic or crevices and a few trees with cavities, all of which exhibit limited potential for roosting. While dead fronds of Mexican Fan Palm trees could provide potential habitat for some bat species, the palm trees on the Project Site are regularly maintained to remove the dead fronds in order to limit the potential for fire and pest species such as Norwegian rats that are known to utilize palms. Thus, based on routine maintenance requirements and practices on the Project Site, no long-term habitat is maintained and therefore the existing palm trees are not appropriately considered suitable habitat.

Because there is a low or low to moderate potential for these species to occur, and the majority of the habitat found on-site is not suitable to support these species, any populations of these species present would be in limited amounts and

any potential impacts associated with the proposed Project would be expected to be less than significant to regional populations of these species.

In addition, to Mitigation Measure BIO-3 provides that prior to construction activities, a qualified bat specialist shall conduct bat surveys within the Project Site, which will ensure that individual bats are not harmed and impacts remain less than significant..

Upon Project buildout, Cooper's hawk, if present, would not be disturbed, as the species is known to occur in residential areas. In addition, the remaining 26 species are expected to not be present on the Project Site because there is no suitable general or micro-habitat on-site to support these species, or they have only a low or low to moderate potential to occur. As such, there would be no impact to rare, threatened, and endangered species during long-term operation of the Project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: (Designated Biologist).

Prior to initiating ground- or vegetation-disturbing activities, subdivider shall submit to CDFW for review and approval a list of biological monitors (Designated Biologist) that will be involved with the Project. The list shall include their names, qualifications, experience, and contact information. Designated Biologists shall: a) be knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local plant and wildlife resources; b) be able to identify resources that are or have the potential to be present at the Project area; c) have previous biological monitoring experience on construction Projects; d) for any required nesting bird surveys, the biologist must have at least three (3) years of field experience conducting general and protocol-level surveys related to finding nests and monitoring them for a specific purpose of determining breeding status, egg incubation, chick maturity, and estimating fledge date; e) have the necessary experience and/or certifications for conducting protocol and focused surveys for species that may be present in the Project area; f) when needed, have obtained the proper documentation in regards to Scientific Collecting Permits (SCP) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Nesting and/or Breeding Bird Avoidance. Subdivider shall not conduct vegetation alteration or removal from February 1 to September 15 (January 1 to June 30 if raptors are present) to avoid impacts to breeding/nesting birds and other special status and common species. For all other activities if the nesting season cannot be avoided, a Designated Biologist shall complete surveys to identify active nests which may be impacted directly or indirectly by Project activities. If the survey identifies an active nest, a buffer shall be established between the construction activities and the active nest so that nesting activities are not interrupted. The buffer shall be delineated by temporary fencing if site conditions allow and does not create additional disturbance, and shall be in effect throughout construction or until the nest is no longer active. If the survey

identifies and active nest, Permittee shall implement one of the following to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting bird species:

- a) Implement default 300-foot minimum avoidance buffers for all non-special status passerine birds and 500-foot minimum avoidance buffer for all special status passerine and raptor species. The breeding habitat/nest site shall be fenced and/or flagged in all directions, and this area shall not be disturbed until the nest becomes inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, and the young will no longer be impacted by the Project.
- b) Subdivider may propose an alternative plan for avoidance of nesting birds for CDFW concurrence.
- c) Should at any time during monitoring, the Designated Biologist determine that an active nest is potentially subject to adverse impacts from construction in any way, the Designated Biologist will be empowered to suspend work to ensure protection of the nest and will monitor the nest site until the nestlings have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Bat Surveys

Prior to site disturbance for Project construction, including removal of any vegetation, sheds and/or maintenance building that could be used by roosting bats, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction bat roost survey for roosting bats. The survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to site disturbance and shall include daytime surveys to search for sign such as guano, visual “emergence” surveys at dusk, followed by night time surveys using acoustic recognition equipment specific for bat detection. The pre-construction bat roost survey shall consist of a minimum of two bat surveys (conducted consecutively or as determined by the qualified biologist). If roosting bats are detected onsite outside of the bat maternity season, the roost tree or building shall be removed in a manner to avoid and/or minimize injury to roosting bats. This may include using mechanical equipment to gently nudge the tree trunk multiple times or building as directed by the qualified biologist prior to removal or for palm trees and other tree species, to de-frond or de-branch the tree using a mechanical lift and gently lower the cut branches to the ground. Regardless of the method, the fallen tree and/or material shall be left undisturbed overnight until at least the next morning to give roosting bats time to exit before complete removal of the tree or structure. Similar and appropriate measures shall be implemented for building removal.

If roosting bats are detected onsite during the maternity season (March 1 to September 30), the Project shall avoid the subject roost(s) and incorporate an avoidance buffer (as determined by a qualified biologist) until after the maternity season or until a qualified biologist determines no maternity roosting is occurring. Once the qualified biologist approves removal of the subject roost tree(s), or buildings, the same tree and building removal procedures as outlined above shall be implemented prior to tree or building removal.

2. Sensitive Natural Communities

Impact BIO-2: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would impact various golf course drainage features including concrete V-ditches, earthen drainage ditches, and the mostly unvegetated golf course irrigation ponds including up to 0.26 acres of potential waters of the United States (WOTUS), subject to Section 404 and 401 jurisdictions, up to 0.36 acres of potential waters of the state subject to the Waste Discharge Requirements of the Porter-Cologne Act, and up to 0.42 acres of potential Lake and Streambed subject to the Notification Requirements of Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Of the potential WOTUS, only an earthen drainage ditch contains riparian habitat that would be affected by Project grading and cause potentially significant impacts to riparian habitat associated with Section 404 or 401 jurisdiction. Of the potential waters of the state, only 0.04-acre of Earthen Drainage Ditch in the northwest corner of the Project Site contains riparian habitat that would be affected by Project grading and cause potentially significant impacts to riparian habitat associated with RWQCB jurisdiction under Porter-Cologne. With respect to potential Lake and Streambed subject to the Notification Requirements of Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, only 0.10-acre of Earthen Drainage Ditch in the northwest corner of the Project Site includes riparian habitat that would be affected by Project grading. Impacts to these riparian habitats would be potentially significant; therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would be implemented to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. As concluded by the biological reconnaissance prepared for the Project, the Project Site does not support sensitive natural communities. As such, there would be no impacts to sensitive natural communities from the Project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Riparian Habitat/Jurisdictional Resources.

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for permanent impacts in the areas designated as jurisdictional features or riparian habitat (e.g., Earthen Drainage Ditch), the Project subdivider shall obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from the USACE, a CWA Section 401 certificate from the RWQCB, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement permit under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code from the CDFW, where the Project warrants. The following would be incorporated into the permitting, subject to approval by the regulatory agencies:

On- and/or off-site restoration and/or enhancement of USACE/RWQCB/CDFW jurisdictional “waters of the U.S.”/“waters of the State” and wetlands at a ratio no less than 1:1 for permanent impacts. The mitigation program would be developed in consultation with the regulatory agencies and would be based on the maximum amount of impact which is expected to be CDFW jurisdiction. For temporary impacts, restore impact area to pre-project conditions (i.e., revegetate with native

species, where appropriate) or through off-site restoration or enhancement. Off-site restoration and/or enhancement at a ratio no less than 1:1 may include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved off-site mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program (e.g., Soquel Canyon Mitigation Bank).

On- and/or off-site restoration and/or enhancement of CDFW jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat at a ratio no less than 1:1 for permanent impacts, and for temporary impacts, restore impact area to pre-project conditions (i.e., revegetate with native species, where appropriate). Off-site restoration and/or enhancement at a ratio no less than 1:1 may include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved off-site mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program (e.g., Soquel Canyon Mitigation Bank).

3. Wetlands

Impact BIO-3: The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Wetlands within the golf course are limited to the Earthen Drainage Ditch near the northwest corner of the Project Site accounting for 0.04 acres of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and RWQCB jurisdiction and 0.10 acre of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) jurisdiction (Figure 4.4-2C). The Earthen Drainage Ditch in the northwest corner of the Project Site consists of a predominance of non-native Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta*), non-native yellow iris (*Iris pseudacorus*) with small patches of southern cattail (*Typha domingensis*). Castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) was also found at this location. Another 0.32-acre of non-riparian Project Site features may not clearly meet CDFW's definition of a stream or a lake as discussed within the Jurisdictional Delineation; however, CDFW would request notification regarding the 0.32-acre of non-riparian features on the site to determine whether they would require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement for these other features on the golf course. The Project would impact the Earthen Drainage Ditch area with Project grading and thus, there would be potentially significant impacts to protected wetlands and waters associated with the Project. Therefore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2 which would reduce impacts to wetlands and waters to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2.

4. Wildlife Movement

Impact BIO-4: The proposed Project would not 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: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Due to the existing development surrounding the Project Site, there are no wildlife corridors or habitat connectivity between the Project Site and any natural areas in the region that might support the movement of native wildlife. However, the landscaped trees and developed infrastructure on the Project Site do provide suitable nesting habitat for bird species that are protected under federal and State regulations. If any construction or demolition activities occur during the general avian breeding season of February 1 to through September 1, Project activities could result in direct impacts to active bird nests due to the removal existing structures or vegetation removal that may be used for nesting. Indirect impacts to active nests may also occur due to construction-related noise and nighttime lighting and by construction personnel or vehicles being in proximity to the nests. Impacts to bird nests would be significant during construction activities; therefore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1 prior to and during construction activities to reduce impacts to active bird nests to a less than significant level. During operation, tree and landscape maintenance is expected to occur during the operation of the new residential development. This maintenance would be conducted from September 2 to January 31 to avoid conflicts with nesting birds protected under the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code which may occur onsite and operational impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

5. Cumulative Impacts- Biological Resources

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The twelve cumulative projects are almost entirely located within urban settings where there would be no change to biological resources. The Project does not contain sensitive biological resources, aside from the regulated jurisdictional features described above, but it does have the potential to support nesting by birds protected by State and federal regulation. Impacts to nesting birds for the Project and the cumulative projects would be below the level of significance with the incorporation of the stated mitigation measure and compliance with regulations protecting nesting birds. Thus, impacts to biological resources would not be cumulatively significant. Further, given the developed nature of the Project Site and limited potential impacts of the Project, implementation of the Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on biological resources. Therefore, cumulative impacts to biological resources as a result of implementation of the Project would not be expected to be significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1

C. Cultural Resources

1. Archaeological Resources

Impact CUL-2: The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The records search results from the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) indicated that no archaeological resources have been recorded within the Project Site or 0.5-mile radius. Additionally, the geoarchaeological review concluded that the Project Site has a low potential for encountering prehistoric archaeological resources. The geoarchaeological review also concluded that the Project Site has a low potential for encountering historic-period archaeological resources. The potential for encountering archaeological resources (historic-period and prehistoric) qualifying as either historical resources or unique archaeological resources as defined by CEQA is considered low. However, unknown archaeological resources could be discovered during grading and excavation activities. In the event that archaeological resources are encountered during construction, Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 will reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant levels under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, a Qualified Archaeologist (defined as meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology) shall be retained in the event of an archaeological find and to conduct cultural resources sensitivity training for all construction personnel. Construction personnel shall be informed of the types of archaeological resources that may be encountered, the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or human remains, and safety precautions to be taken when working with archaeological monitors. The Subdivider shall ensure that construction personnel are made available for and attend the training and retain documentation demonstrating attendance. A copy of the retainer shall be provided to the LA County Planning prior to grading plan approval.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: In the event that historic (e.g., bottles, foundations, refuse dumps/prives, railroads, etc.) or prehistoric (e.g., hearths, burials, stone tools, shell and faunal bone remains, etc.) archaeological resources are unearthed, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted in the vicinity of the find and a Qualified Archaeologist shall be notified. An appropriate buffer area shall be established by the Qualified Archaeologist around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until resources have been recovered. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the

buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the Qualified Archaeologist. The County shall consult with appropriate Native American representatives in determining treatment for prehistoric or Native American resources to ensure cultural values ascribed to the resource, beyond those that are scientifically important, are considered. If a resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to constitute a “historical resource” pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a “unique archaeological resource” pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g), the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the Subdivider and the County to develop a formal treatment plan that would serve to reduce impacts to the resources. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. The treatment plan shall include measures regarding the curation of the recovered resources that may include curation at an accredited public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no accredited institution accepts the materials, they may be donated to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes. The Qualified Archaeologist shall determine the need for archaeological construction monitoring in the vicinity of the find thereafter.

The Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a final report and appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms at the conclusion of treatment and/or any follow-up archaeological construction monitoring. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, results of the artifact processing, analysis, and research, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historical Resources. The report and the Site Forms shall be submitted by the Subdivider to the County, the South Central Coastal Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures.

2. Human Remains

Impact CUL-3: The proposed Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: No dedicated cemeteries or other burial places are known to exist within the Project Site. However, since the Project would involve ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would be implemented to reduce potential construction-related impacts to unknown human remains to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If human remains are encountered during implementation of the Project, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If human remains are discovered during excavation activities, the following procedure shall be observed:

- Stop immediately and contact the County Coroner:
- If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).
- The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the MLD of the deceased Native American.
- The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods.
- If the owner does not accept the MLD's recommendations, the owner or the MLD may request mediation by the NAHC.

3. Cumulative Impacts-Cultural Resources

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Since the Project would have no impact to historic architectural resources qualifying as historical resources, the Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on historical resources. Cumulative impacts to archaeological resources could occur if any of these projects, in conjunction with the Project, would have impacts on resources that, when considered together, would be significant. No archeological resources have been identified on the Project Site and while there is the potential for impacts to unknown archaeological resources that could potentially qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA, the potential is low. Furthermore, in the event that significant archaeological resources are encountered, implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would ensure that potential impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, as part of the environmental review processes for the cumulative projects, it is expected that similar mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address the potential for uncovering archaeological resources. Therefore, Project impacts to archaeological resources would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Project impacts on human remains are not anticipated and, if they were to occur, would be addressed and reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3. In addition, in the event human remains are encountered with development of the cumulative projects, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98, as amended, would apply which includes procedures in the event of discovery of human remains during Project implementation. Therefore, in light of the Project's mitigation measure to address inadvertent discovery of human remains,

and applicability of Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98 to cumulative projects, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures CUL 1 through CUL-3

D. Geology and Soils

1. Earthquakes

Impact GEO-1: The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking.
- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
- iv. Landslides.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: No known active or potentially active faults underlie the Project Site, and the Project Site is not located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Proposed development would not be affected by ground rupture resulting from earthquake faulting and the Project would not result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure or expose people to substantial risk of injury involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, impacts from fault rupture would be less than significant.

The nearest active fault is the Whittier section of the Elsinore Fault zone located approximately 3 miles southwest of the Project Site. Like most of Southern California, the Project Site is in a seismically active area and is subject to some level of ground shaking as a result of movement along the major active fault zones that characterize this region. Moreover, due to the proximity of other faults located around the Project Site, such as the San Jose fault, the Chino, and the Puente Hills Thrust System, there is the potential for strong seismic ground shaking within the Project Site. Geologic investigations performed on the Project Site have not documented any evidence of recent seismic ground shaking due to nearby faults (LGC 2021). However, since the Whittier section of the Elsinore Fault zone is considered potentially active, it is likely that strong seismic ground shaking would occur over the course of the Project's lifetime and impacts could be potentially

significant. Preliminary design recommendations are set forth in the Geotechnical Reports with regard to seismic design, slope stability, and other geotechnical issues, which include but are not limited to the removal of artificial fill, landslide materials, and potential dewatering groundwater prior to importing fill material. Additionally, in connection with the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical evaluation to be reviewed and approved by the County in conformance with Los Angeles County Building Code (LACBC) Section 111, the Project would be required to comply with all applicable seismic standards and requirements contained in the latest version of the LACBC, the California Building Code (CBC), and the latest Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Greenbook), as well as the recommended stabilization measures set forth in the Geotechnical Reports (Mitigation Measure GEO-1), all of which would reduce hazards from strong seismic ground shaking to less than significant levels.

Liquefaction more often occurs in earthquake-prone areas underlain by young, sandy alluvium where the groundwater table is less than 50 feet below the ground surface. The Project Site is located in a seismically active area and includes older artificial fill soils that are considered unsuitable for structural fills and would require removal from the Project Site. Additionally, perched groundwater was encountered at depths as shallow as 2.5 feet below existing grade and could be potentially uncovered in other low-lying areas of the Project Site and a relatively small portion of the Project Site is located in a zone identified as being potentially susceptible to seismically-induced liquefaction. The vast majority of geotechnical distress issues are directly related to improper drainage of the Project Site. Potential movement of foundations and other improvements could occur as a result of soil saturation and loss of soil support of foundations and pavements, settlement, collapse, liquefaction, internal soil erosion, and/or expansion. Additionally, off-site properties and improvements may be subject to seepage, springs, instability, movements of foundations, or other impacts as a result of water infiltration and migration from the Project Site. Implementation of the recommendations identified in the Project's Geotechnical Evaluation Study would reduce the potential for liquefaction by excavation and re-compaction of potentially liquefiable soils (LGC 2021). Implementation of the LACBC requirements and the appropriate geotechnical recommendations during design and construction would be ensured through implementation of the recommendations in the Geotechnical Reports and the required final geotechnical report as required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans. As such, liquefaction impacts would be less than significant with compliance to the LACBC and the implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

Portions of the Project Site are located within areas that are potentially susceptible to seismic-related landslides and slope stability issues and potential ground settlement may occur in the landslide area without mitigation. Impacts related to landslides would be reduced with development of a final geotechnical engineering report after the approval of 40-scale grading plans and the adherence to all recommendations in final geotechnical report. Additionally, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 includes the preliminary recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Reports that includes recommendations for slope modifications in accordance with CBC and the LACBC requirements. Final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans would be reviewed and approved by the LACDPW before the County issues a grading permit which would ensure that the Project would implement recommendations contained within the Geotechnical Reports and final geotechnical

engineering investigation to minimize the potential for landslides to the satisfaction of Public Works prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Accordingly, impacts from landslides or seismically induced landslides would be less than significant with compliance to the County Building Code and implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Final Geotechnical Engineering Investigation. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the subdivider shall prepare and obtain approval from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) of a Final Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report based on the final Project design and 40-scale grading plans to address the Project's specific foundation design. Specific field work, additional and/or modified geotechnical recommendations, and laboratory testing may be required in connection with the preparation of the Final Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Report, in order to comply with the recommendations contained within the Updated Summary of Geotechnical Evaluation and Feasibility Study, Proposed Residential Development, Portions of Royal Vista Golf Course, Rowland Heights, California (July 26, 2021), Geotechnical Addendum Report and Response to Geotechnical Review Comments Regarding the Proposed Residential Development, Portions of Royal Vista Golf Course, Rowland Heights, Los Angeles County, California (May 1, 2023), and Response to Geotechnical Review Comments dated May 31, 2023 and July 7, 2023 regarding the Proposed Residential Development, Portions of Royal Vista Golf Course, Rowland Heights, California (September 27, 2023). The subdivider shall comply with the conditions contained within the LACDPW Geology and Soils Report Approval Letter for the Project, and as it may be subsequently amended or modified by LACDPW. Furthermore, the Project's final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans must be reviewed and approved by LACDPW before the issuance of a grading permit.

2. Landslides

Impact GEO-3: The proposed Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The existing soils within Project Site, including but not limited to undocumented fill, colluvium, alluvium, and weathered bedrock, may not be considered suitable for the support of structures. To minimize significant settlements, the Geotechnical Reports recommend that the unsuitable soils in areas to be over-excavated be removed and replaced with compacted fill. With the removal of alluvial soils from the Project Site, and with the over-excavation/recompaction of older alluvium, alluvium, colluvium, and weathered bedrock within proposed structural areas as recommended by the Geotechnical Reports, ground settlement would be reduced to levels that can be accommodated by conventional foundation designs. As indicated in the Geotechnical Evaluation Study, the potential for liquefaction is present within a small portion of Project Site, and that liquefaction-induced ground surface settling could occur if site soils

were to liquefy (LGC 2021). Implementation of the recommendations identified in the Project's Geotechnical Evaluation Study would reduce the potential for liquefaction by over-excavating and re-compaction of potentially liquefiable soils (LGC 2021). Implementation of the County Building Code requirements and the appropriate geotechnical recommendations during design and construction would be ensured through implementation of the recommendations in the Geotechnical Reports and the required final geotechnical report as required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans. As such, liquefaction impacts would be less than significant with compliance to the County Building Code and the implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1. Implementation of the stabilization recommendations included in the Geotechnical Reports and the final geotechnical report as required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1, as well as the standard plan checking requirements which would ensure stabilization of proposed cut slopes that are potentially unstable, would result in less than significant impacts with respect to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1. The Project Site has a mapped geologic unstable landslide and LGC (2023c and 2023d) recommends complete removal of the onsite landslide. Implementation of the stabilization recommendations included in the Geotechnical Reports and the final geotechnical report as required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would result in less than significant impacts with respect to on- or off-site landslides and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

3. Expansive Soils

Impact GEO-4: The proposed Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Samples of the on-site soils were obtained during the investigation of the Project Site for laboratory expansion index testing. The results of the testing indicates that the undocumented fill generated from the on-site soils will have a "medium" potential for expansion (LGC 2021). Given that on-site soils include expansive characteristics, impacts in this regard are determined potentially significant. Where expansive soils are found, site-specific design criteria (i.e., foundation design parameters, retaining walls) and remedial grading techniques (i.e., primarily removal, moisture conditions and re-compaction of unsuitable soils) would be identified and implemented per the Geotechnical Reports and final geotechnical report to minimize the potential for risks due to expansive soils. Implementation of the recommendations included in the Geotechnical Reports and the final geotechnical report as required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1, would result in less than significant impacts with respect to expansive soils and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

4. Paleontological Resource/Unique Geologic Feature

Impact GEO-6: The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The geologic map review showed that the Yorba Member of the Monterey (Puente) Formation is located within the Project Site, and the paleontological sensitivity analysis indicated that this formation has a high paleontological potential. The underlying Soquel Sandstone Member is of undetermined potential. The small valleys underlain by younger Quaternary alluvium is assigned low-to-high paleontological sensitivity, increasing with age and potential at depth. Therefore, project-related excavation has the potential to expose paleontological resources or unique geologic features. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-2 through GEO-5, potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Prior to grading permit issuance, the subdivider shall retain a paleontologist who meets the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's (SVP 2010) definition for qualified professional paleontologist (Qualified Paleontologist) to carry out all mitigation related to paleontological resources and provide a copy of the retainer to the LA County Planning. Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, the Qualified Paleontologist or their designee shall conduct construction worker paleontological resources sensitivity training for all construction personnel. Construction personnel shall be informed on how to identify the types of paleontological resources that may be encountered, the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources, and safety precautions to be taken when working with paleontological monitors. The Subdivider shall ensure that construction personnel are made available for and attend the training and retain documentation demonstrating attendance.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Paleontological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor (SVP, 210) working under the direct supervision of the Qualified Paleontologist for the three formations along the following lines: during all ground-disturbing activities below 5 feet in Quaternary alluvium; at all depths within the Yorba Member of the Puente Formation; and initial excavations into the Soquel Sandstone Member of the Monterey Formation. Monitoring within the Soquel Sandstone Member of the Monterey Formation may be discontinued or extended based on geologic conditions at surface at depth. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains and, where appropriate, collecting sediment samples to wet or dry screen to test promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, based on the specific

geologic conditions at the surface or at depth, the Qualified Paleontologist may recommend that monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely.

Mitigation Measure GEO-4: If a potential fossil is found, the paleontological monitor shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation of the discovery. An appropriate buffer area shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. At the monitor's discretion, and to reduce any construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock/sediment samples for initial processing and evaluation. If a fossil is determined to be significant, the Qualified Paleontologist shall implement a paleontological salvage program to remove the resources from their location, following the guidelines of the SVP (2010). Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification, catalogued, and curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the material and with retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, if such an institution agrees to accept the fossils. If no institution accepts the fossil collection, they shall be donated to a local school in the area for educational purposes. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository and/or school.

If construction personnel discover any potential fossils during construction while the paleontological monitor is not present, regardless of the depth of work or location, work at the discovery location shall cease in a 50-foot radius of the discovery until the Qualified Paleontologist has assessed the discovery and recommended and implemented appropriate treatment as described earlier in this measure.

Mitigation Measure GEO-5: At the conclusion of paleontological monitoring and prior to the release of the grading bond, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvage efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The subdivider shall submit the report to the LA County Planning and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Release of Hazardous Materials or Waste into the Environment

Impact HAZ-1: The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction equipment and materials would include fuels, oils and lubricants, solvents and cleaners, cements and adhesives, paints and thinners, degreasers, cement and concrete, and asphalt mixtures, which

are all commonly used in construction. Implementation of the Project would involve the demolition and removal of the existing maintenance facility building and associated structures. The maintenance facility building pre-dates the 1970s USEPA ban on the inclusion of certain hazardous building materials (e.g., asbestos containing materials [ACM], lead-based paint [LBP], polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs], mercury, and Freon) and such hazardous building materials may be present and could potentially have a significant impact on human health. However, construction activities would be required to comply with numerous hazardous materials regulations designed to ensure that hazardous materials are transported, used, stored, and disposed of in a safe manner to protect worker safety, and to reduce the potential for a release of construction-related fuels or other hazardous materials into the environment, including stormwater and downstream receiving water bodies. Specifically, the Project would be required to implement Hazardous Materials Business Plans (HMBPs), comply with the California Fire Code, and prepare and implement a SWPPP. The transportation of hazardous materials would be regulated by the US Department of Department of Transportation (USDOT), Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol (CHP) including driver-training requirements, load labeling procedures, and container specifications designed to minimize the risk of accidental release. If present, hazardous materials including, but not limited to, materials that consist of, contain, or are coated with ACM, LBP, PCBs, mercury, would be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The required compliance with the applicable laws and regulations discussed above would limit the potential for creation of hazardous conditions due to the routine use or accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, residual levels of petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), organochlorine pesticides (OCPs), and VOCs are present in soil and soil gas in the vicinity of the maintenance facility building. As a result, excavation of soil in the vicinity of the maintenance facility building could encounter higher contaminant concentrations, which could expose workers, the public, and the environment to higher concentrations of contaminants, which would be a significant impact. To reduce the potential impact to less than significant, the Project would include Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, Soil Management Plan. Environmental impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal or the accidental release of hazardous materials during construction of the Project would be less than significant with the compliance with federal, state and local regulations and the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

Once constructed, the residences would use and store small quantities of chemicals typical in residences, such as household cleaning solutions, paints and thinners, and motor fuel (e.g., vehicles and lawn mowers). Few of the chemicals would be considered hazardous materials (e.g., bleach) and the anticipated volumes would be small (i.e., less than 5 gallons). The maintenance of the open space landscaping would use and store small quantities of chemicals typical in landscaping maintenance, such as pesticides, herbicides, and motor fuel (e.g., vehicles and lawn mowers). Due to the small quantities, operation of the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to potential release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure HAZ 1: Soil Management Plan. The subdivider shall require that its contractor(s) develop and implement a Soil Management Plan (SMP) for the management of soil and soil gas before any ground-disturbing activity within the vicinity of the maintenance facility building. The SMP shall include the following, at a minimum:

- Site description, including the hazardous materials that may be encountered.
- Roles and responsibilities of onsite workers and supervisors.
- Training for site workers focused on the recognition of and response to encountering hazardous materials.
- Protocols for the materials testing, handling, removing, transporting, and disposing of all excavated materials in a safe, appropriate, and lawful manner.
- In the event that hazardous materials are encountered, reporting requirement to the local regulatory agency with jurisdiction, documenting that site activities were conducted in accordance with the SMP.
- The SMP shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works for their review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit.

2. Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan

Impact HAZ-5: The proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: During Project construction, temporary lane closures may be required. Any limitation or closure of a travel lane along the Project's frontage would be temporary (i.e., only for the period of time necessary to access the construction work site), and would be expected to occur outside the weekday AM and PM commute hours so as to maintain roadway capacity when the street system is typically most heavily constrained, as required by the Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan included as part of Mitigation Measure TR-3. The Project is not located along any facilities that provide emergency services such as hospitals or police/fire stations which would require frequent use of unobstructed roadways. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3, the Project construction activities are not expected to negatively affect adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and construction impacts would be less than significant. During operation, the Project would not require any lane restrictions or closures and Project-related traffic would not exceed the capacity of local streets. Therefore, the operational impact relative to impairing or interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure TR-3: Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan. Prior to commencement of Project construction, the Subdivider shall submit a detailed Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan (CSTMP) to the LACDPW, the LACSD, and the LACFD for review and approval. The CSTMP shall include any applicable street/lane/sidewalk closure information, a detour plan, haul route(s), identify emergency evacuation routes, and a staging plan. The CSTMP would be based on the nature and timing of the Project's specific construction activities and would consider other projects under construction in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, if any. The CSTMP also would include features such as notification to adjacent property owners and occupants of upcoming construction activities, advance notification regarding any temporary transit stop relocations, and limitation of any potential roadway lane closure(s) to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible. Accordingly, the CSTMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following features, as appropriate:

- Provide advanced notification to adjacent property owners and occupants, as well as nearby schools, of upcoming construction activities, including durations and daily hours of construction. Provide a posted sign on the Project Site with hotline information for adjacent property owners to call and address specific issues or activities that may potentially cause problems at on-and-off-site locations;
- Coordinate with the County and emergency service providers to ensure adequate access is maintained to the Project Site and neighboring businesses;
- Coordinate with Foothill Transit to provide advanced notifications of any temporary stop relocations and durations and follow all safety required procedures required by the transit agency;
- Limit any potential roadway lane closure/s to off-peak travel periods, to the extent feasible;
- Provide traffic control for any potential roadway lane closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation;
- To the extent feasible, store any construction equipment within the perimeter fence of the construction site. Should temporary storage of a large piece of equipment be necessary outside of the perimeter fence (e.g., within a designated lane closure area), that area must comply with County and/or State-approved detour/traffic control plans;
- Provide safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers. Should any temporary closure of an existing sidewalk be required, appropriate pedestrian detours will be established and signed as such so as to maintain public pedestrian circulation. The Subdivider shall submit all necessary permit applications prior to commencing construction activities which might encroach on public right-of-way;

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Project Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project;
- Require the Subdivider to keep all public roadways adjacent to the Project Site clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt as a result of its construction activities;
- Schedule delivery of construction materials and hauling/transport of oversize loads to nonpeak travel periods, to the extent possible;
- Obtain a Caltrans transportation permit for use of oversized transport vehicles on Caltrans facilities (i.e., the Orange and Pomona freeways), if needed;
- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic;
- Construction-related parking and staging of vehicles shall occur on-site to the extent possible;
- Coordinate deliveries to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to unload for protracted periods of times;
- Prohibit parking by construction workers on nearby streets and direct construction workers to available/designated parking areas within and adjacent to the Project Site; and
- The construction zone traffic control plans detailed in the CSTMP shall meet standards established in the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as well as Los Angeles County requirements. The traffic control plans should be prepared by either a Civil or Traffic Engineer licensed by the State of California.

F. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Groundwater Quality

Impact HYDRO-1: The proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The existing maintenance facility building that would be removed by the Project pre-dates the 1970s USEPA ban on the inclusion of certain hazardous building materials (e.g., ACM and/or LBP, PCBs, mercury, and Freon) and such hazardous building materials may be present. In addition, residual levels of TPH, OCPs, and VOCs are present in soil and soil gas in the vicinity of the maintenance yard (PlaceWorks 2021). Construction of the Project would result in soil erosion could result in sediment and other pollutants entering surface water bodies and adversely affecting water quality. However, construction activities would be required to comply with applicable hazardous materials

regulations designed to ensure that hazardous materials are transported, used, stored and disposed of in a safe manner to protect worker safety, and to reduce the potential for a release of construction-related fuels or other hazardous materials into the environment, including stormwater and nearby surface water bodies. Specifically, the Project would be required to implement HMBPs, comply with the California Fire Code, and prepare and implement a SWPPP. The Project would be required to comply with the conditions identified in the LID plan prepared in compliance with the LARWQCB NPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles County (Order No. R4-2012-0175 NPDES Permit No. CAS004001) and in accordance with the LACDPW LID Standards Manual (Fusco 2023b). Compliance with applicable laws and regulations would ensure that construction of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Further, the Project would include Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, Soil Management Plan. Construction impacts to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality would be less than significant with compliance with relevant regulations and the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

The Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces when compared to current conditions, which would increase stormwater flows during operation. Potential pollutants that may be generated by the uses of the Project could come into contact with stormwater runoff which would have the potential to adversely affect water quality. However, it is anticipated that any potentially hazardous materials used during Project operation would be stored in small volumes and all hazardous materials would be labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate storage, handling, and disposal procedures. Compliance with relevant regulations, primarily the Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, and the HMBP implemented to comply with this Law, would reduce the potential for the accidental release of these hazardous materials and have procedures in place to respond to any spills. Furthermore, compliance with applicable laws and regulations such as the NPDES Municipal Permits and its local MS4 permit development standards, LID practices, and all applicable BMPs (e.g., bioretention, rainfall storage, and/or biofiltration) pertaining to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements would ensure that operation of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Therefore, operation of the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to groundwater quality.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

G. Noise

1. Groundborne Vibration and Noise

Impact NOI-2: The proposed Project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The closest residential buildings to the Project Site are more than 50 feet from the nearest construction area on the Project Site. It was determined that it would take a vibration PPV level of more than 0.3 inch/sec (an equivalent of 98 VdB) to potentially result in any building damage. None of the construction activities anticipated on the Project Site would result in a vibration level that would reach 0.3 inch/sec PPV (or 98 VdB) at 25 feet from each of the Project construction equipment and/or activities. At 50 feet, these vibration levels would be attenuated by 0.19 inch/sec PPV to 0.11 inch/sec PPV (89 VdB); therefore, no building damage would occur as a result of vibration from Project construction. The highest construction vibration levels at residential buildings adjacent to the Project Site would be 85 VdB or lower at the closest distance of 50 feet and impacts related to human annoyance would be potentially significant. Because construction equipment vibration levels should not exceed the Caltrans' 0.04 in/sec PPV (or 80 VdB) threshold for annoyance of occupants in residential buildings, Mitigation Measure NOI-4 is required. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 requires that the vibratory pile driver and vibratory roller should not be used within 75 feet of adjacent residential buildings. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4, no significant construction vibration impacts related to human annoyance would occur and vibration impacts from construction would be less than significant. Operation of the Project's residential and recreational/open space uses would not include the use of equipment that would generate perceptible vibration. Operation of the Project would not result in an exceedance of the vibration criteria of 0.01 in/sec RMS (equivalent to 0.04 in/sec PPV). Therefore, no operational vibration impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure NOI-4: Restricting Pile Driving and/or Vibratory Roller Activities. During construction vibratory pile drivers and/or vibratory rollers shall not be used within 75 feet of residential buildings adjacent to the Project Site.

H. Public Services

1. Fire Protection

Impact PS-1: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities associated with the Project may temporarily increase demand for fire protection and emergency medical services and may cause the occasional exposure of combustible materials such as wood, plastics, sawdust, coverings and coatings, heat sources including machinery and equipment sparking, exposed electrical lines, welding activities, and chemical reactions in combustible materials and coatings. However, the Project would be required to comply with Cal/OSHA regulations and Fire Code requirements. In addition, fire suppression equipment specific to construction would be maintained on-site and Project construction would comply with applicable existing codes and ordinances related to the maintenance of mechanical equipment, handling and storage of flammable materials, and cleanup of spills of flammable materials. Therefore, demand for fire protection and emergency medical services would be less than significant during construction.

The fire flow requirement for the Project is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi minimum residual pressure for a duration of one hour. There are currently no fire hydrants on the Project Site and the applicant would be required to install fire hydrants that meet LACFD requirements. The fire service connection to the Project Site would be from existing 8-inch and 12-inch water mains that would provide connection from the fire hydrants. The proposed water system is expected to meet the fire flow requirements based on fire flow tests conducted by the WWD on April 2, 2021 (Fuscoe 2022a). Therefore, operational Project impacts with respect to fire flow requirements would be less than significant.

Private roadways constructed as part of the Project would be constructed consistent with LACDPW design standards for local roads and would adequately accommodate emergency vehicles as required by the LACFD. Therefore, the Project would not restrict or interfere with the flow of emergency vehicles or evacuation once constructed. In addition, the Project would not exceed the carrying capacity of the local streets. Further, the Project would include off-site improvements to streets and intersections that would promote mobility and safety. The County would be required to periodically update its emergency response and evacuation plan(s) as required under AB 747 and the County's General Plan and would be subject to the requirements of the Building Code, Fire Code, Utilities Code, and Subdivision Code. Compliance with the applicable regulatory and LACFD requirements would reduce Project impacts on fire safety to a less than significant level during operation.

Impacts on traffic that could cause delays in emergency response times are addressed through Mitigation Measures TR-3. This measure would require that the applicant prepare a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan (CSTMP) to the LACDPW

for review and approval. The CSTMP would include any applicable street/lane/sidewalk closure information, a detour plan, haul route(s), and a staging plan. The current emergency medical responses and fire incidence response times are being met by Fire Station 119 (LACFD 2021) and, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3, the Project is not expected to result in increased demand on existing fire protection and emergency medical services that would require new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. Operation of the project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to fire protection services.

Roadways constructed by the Project would meet applicable County design standards and would adequately accommodate emergency vehicles as required by LACFD. These requirements have been reviewed and conditionally approved by the LACDPW and LACFD to ensure that the Project provides adequate emergency access. The LACFD indicated that, while additional development creates greater demands on resources, the Project would not have a significant effect on service demands that would necessitate construction or expansion of existing fire stations (LACFD 2021). The Project would comply with the County of Los Angeles Fire Code to meet the requirements for fire equipment and personnel accessing the Project Site. In addition, the Project would include off-site improvements such as utility connections and signage which would improve emergency response and access to the Project Site. Therefore, operational Project impacts on emergency access would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3

2. Sheriff Protection

Impact PS-2: The proposed Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for sheriff protection.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction, LASD would be responsible for providing general law enforcement services to the Project Site. To reduce the potential need for LASD services security fencing would be installed around the construction areas to reduce trespassing, both directions of travel and access to the Project Site would be maintained in the event of partial lane closures, lane closures would be temporary, and the Project would implement Mitigation Measure TR-3: Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan. Therefore, construction of the Project is not expected to increase demand on existing police services during construction and impacts to sheriff protection services during construction would be less than significant with mitigation.

During operation, the Project would bring in approximately 1,260 people, resulting in potentially 10 additional calls for LASD service each month, and potentially 100 additional calls for service each year. The LASD has indicated that the average and/or anticipated response times for emergent, priority, and routine calls for service received at the Project Site would be 4.5 minutes for emergent calls, 6.9 minutes for priority calls, and 31 minutes for routine response calls. As a result, the average response time for emergent and priority calls would be within LASD's goal response times of 10 minutes for emergent calls, 20 minutes for priority calls, and 60 minutes for routine response calls (LASD 2021). Therefore, the potential increase in calls for service as a result of the Project would be less than significant. Furthermore, the Project would integrate the principles of CPTED as recommended by the Walnut-Diamond Bar Sheriff Stations, including defensible space, lighting, and landscaping. The Project homeowner association will maintain the open space areas, landscaping and lighting throughout the Project Site to minimize overgrown vegetation and prevent dark hiding places.

The Project would be subject to payment of the Development Impact Fees and would generate property tax and sales tax revenue that would help recover growth-related infrastructure and public service costs including maintenance of LASD staffing levels and equipment. These revenues would ensure that the development contributes its fair share of the cost of law enforcement facilities and equipment determined to be necessary to adequately accommodate new development in the County, which is serviced by the LASD. Further, LASD has no plans for expansion or construction of any new facilities at this time (LASD 2021). Therefore, expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities would not be required or included as a result of the Project. Impacts to sheriff protection would be less than significant with payment of applicable fees and CPTED Project design features.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3.

I. Transportation

1. Emergency Access

Impact TR-4: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction, closure of a portion of a travel lane on East Walnut Drive and a portion of a travel lane along Colima Road may be required. Any closure of a travel lane along the Project's frontage would be temporary and would be expected to occur outside the weekday AM and PM commute hours so as to maintain roadway capacity. In addition, the Project is not located along any facilities within the State Highway System or any nearby public emergency services such as hospitals or police/fire stations which would require frequent use of unobstructed roadways. Therefore, the Project construction activities are not expected to negatively affect circulation within the local transportation network, including circulation associated with emergency access. The Project would also implement Mitigation Measure TR-3, which would further reduce effects on the transportation network. Impacts from construction would be less than significant.

During operation, the Project would comply with all applicable County standards and would not result in hazards or congestion that would impede emergency vehicle travel and access. Vehicular circulation within the Project Site would be accommodated by private roadways that would be constructed consistent with LACDPW design standards and would accommodate emergency vehicles as required by LACFD. Therefore, Project operation activities are not expected to negatively affect circulation within the local transportation network, including circulation associated with emergency access, and no potential impacts will occur.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR 3

J. Tribal Cultural Resources

1. California Register of Historical Resources

Impact TCR-1: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC subdivision 5020.1(k).

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: A records search through SCCIC found that two historic architectural resources and no archaeological resources have been recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site. The Sacred Lands File search, which contains sites of traditional, cultural, or religious value to Native Americans, indicated that the results were positive and the response letter from the NAHC suggested contacting the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The Kizh Nation did not identify any known tribal cultural resources; however, they have indicated that the Project Site has a high potential to encounter tribal cultural resources given that tribal cultural resources exist in the vicinity of the Project Site. Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 which were recommended by the Kizh Nation, will reduce the potential to impact to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TCR 1: A qualified Native American Monitor from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall be retained to monitor all grading activities within the Project Site. Prior to ground disturbing activities, the subdivider shall provide evidence of a separate executed monitoring agreement with the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation for the monitoring of all grading activities, to the satisfaction of the monitoring agency. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during Project grading, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease. The Native American Monitor shall evaluate and record all tribal cultural resources. The Native American Monitor shall also maintain a daily monitoring log that contains descriptions of the daily construction activities, locations with diagrams, soils, and documentation of tribal cultural resources identified. The monitoring log and photo documentation, accompanied by a photo key, shall be submitted to the LA County Planning upon completion of the grading activity.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: If the Native American Monitor determines the resources are not tribal cultural resources, a qualified archaeologist shall be notified of the find and the action set forth in Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall be taken.

2. California Native American Tribe Resource

Impact TCR-2: 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 PRC section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The records search through SCCIC found that two historic architectural resources and no archaeological resources have been recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site. The Kizh Nation indicated that the Project Site has a high potential to encounter tribal cultural resources given that tribal cultural resources exist in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, Project-related ground disturbing activities associated with proposed excavation activities has the potential to physically impact unknown resource and, as a result, could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource resulting in a potential significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2.

3. Cumulative Impacts

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 will reduce project impacts to less than significant, and for projects that have the potential to cause significant impacts to tribal cultural resources, future AB 52 consultations with Native American tribes will be conducted as part of CEQA review in order to identify any tribal cultural resources and mitigate any impacts. Therefore, to the extent impacts on tribal cultural resources from related projects may occur, impacts from the Project are not expected and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2.

K. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Relocation of Utilities

Impact UTL-1: The proposed Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction, water will be required intermittently for dust control, equipment cleaning, soil grading and preparation during the early phases of the Project. Due to the proximity to recycled mainlines, temporary service(s) will provide construction water to the Project Site. The Project will require construction of new on-site water distribution lines to serve new buildings, as well as the potential relocation and extension of existing lines. Prior to ground disturbance, Project contractors would coordinate with WWWD to identify the locations and depth of all lines. Further, WWWD and the County of Los Angeles would be notified in advance of proposed ground disturbance activities to avoid water lines and disruption of water service. A site-specific SWPPP would also be prepared for the proposed construction activities and appropriate measures would be implemented to reduce or eliminate pollutants from entering the local drainage system. Further, final design criteria and specifications for all water facilities would comply with all applicable requirements and policies. Therefore, Project impacts on water infrastructure associated with construction activities would be temporary and less than significant.

The current groundwater wells that serve the golf course would not be used as a water supply source for the Project during operation. The Project therefore results in a net increase of potable water demand of approximately 122,544 gpd and an increase in recycled water demand of 68,449 gpd over existing conditions (Fuscoe 2023c). Because of the elimination of golf course irrigation on the Project Site, the Project would result in a net reduction on groundwater well usage of 176,340 gpd (Fuscoe, 2023c). As stated in a Will-Serve Letter and Service Map provided by the WWWD dated May 25, 2023, the WWWD has the ability to serve the Project Site because the WWWD has the ability to purchase additional water supply from the Three Valley Municipal Water District to meet any new demand. The proposed increase in recycled water demand from the represents approximately 4 percent of the projected demand from 2025 to 2045 in the UWMP (Fuscoe 2023c). New fire hydrants will need to be included in the water infrastructure design to meet fire department requirements. A fire flow test was performed at 5 hydrants near the Project Site to determine if there is adequate capacity within the existing 12-inch and 8-inch water mains to serve the Project. Flow test results indicate adequate fire flow availability and infrastructure capacity for the Project. Based on the adequate water supply capacity of WWWD, WWWD's Will-Serve Letter, and the satisfactory results of the fire flow test, the Project would result in less than significant operational impacts regarding water infrastructure.

During construction, the Project would not generate wastewater that would contribute directly to the County's wastewater system. Installation of wastewater infrastructure would be limited to relocating and adding on-site wastewater distribution and minor off-site work associated with connections to the public main. No upgrades to the public main are anticipated. Any work that affects services to the existing sewer lines would be coordinated with the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD). The Project would comply with NPDES Municipal Permits and local MS4 permit development standards, LID practices, and all applicable BMPs (e.g., bioretention, rainfall storage, and/or biofiltration) pertaining to water quality standards during construction to reduce or eliminate pollutants from entering the local drainage system. Furthermore, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure TR-3 to ensure safe pedestrian access as well as emergency vehicle access and safe vehicle travel during off site construction to connect to LACSD facilities. Therefore, construction impacts associated with wastewater generation would be less than significant with mitigation.

During operation, the Project Site would generate a net increase of approximately 78,801 gpd of wastewater compared to baseline conditions. Because the existing on-site structure (i.e., the maintenance facility building) has no separate plumbing, existing wastewater generation is assumed to be zero. The Project Site will be served primarily by both existing and relocated sewer lines. The LADPW would require a sewer connection permit with LACSD and associated connection fees to cover any infrastructure improvements required as a result of the Project. All existing sewer mains are anticipated to have adequate capacity, and additional sewer main improvements would not need to be upgraded or relocated outside of the Project Site. Project Site flows are ultimately conveyed to the San Jose Creek WRP. The Project's estimated wastewater generation comprises less than 0.25 percent of the remaining available capacity of the WRP. In addition, a Will-Serve Letter dated November 21, 2022, was provided by LACSD for the Project, which states that LACSD can serve the Project Site. Therefore, operational impacts on wastewater infrastructure would be less than significant.

All existing infrastructure connected to the Project Site would be surveyed prior to demolition. Coordination would occur with the service provider to arrange relocation and cut over circuits so that continuous service would be maintained to these locations. No cables, fiber, or copper would be cut prior to full investigation and confirmed cut over. Provisions for telecommunications would be installed by the contractor, and final configuration and connection locations would be confirmed by the service provider during design. Dedicated conduits and manholes for systems would be routed throughout the Project Site for the new buildings. The contractor would coordinate with the service provider to ensure easy connectivity of their services within the buildings during the final stages of the Project. Therefore, with coordination between the contractor and the service provider, impacts to telecommunications would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3

L. Wildfire

1. Emergency Response/Evacuation Plan

Impact WDF-1: Would the proposed Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Applicable emergency response and evacuation plans for the Project Site are the Safety Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Los Angeles County Operational Area Emergency Response Plan. The General Plan designates Fairview Drive/Brea Cutoff Road as an evacuation route. No lane closures would be required along Fairview Drive/Brea Cutoff Road or along other designated evacuation routes in the area. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure TR-3 would be implemented to further ensure that temporary construction activities would not result in impacts to emergency response or evacuation plans. In addition, the Project is not located along any roadway facilities within the State Highway System (maintained by Caltrans) or any nearby public emergency services such as hospitals or police/fire stations which would require frequent use of unobstructed roadways. Therefore, the Project's temporary construction impacts would not prevent or interfere with the County's evacuation plan such that an evacuation could not occur, and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

During operation, vehicular circulation within the Project Site would be accommodated by private roadways, which would be constructed consistent with applicable LACDPW design standards for local roads and would adequately accommodate emergency vehicles as required by the LACFD. Streets constructed within the project would provide a new vehicular connection between Colima Road and East Walnut Drive South. Further, the Project would include off-site improvements to streets and intersections to promote mobility and safety which would result in improved traffic circulation. Therefore, the Project would not restrict or interfere with the flow of emergency vehicles or evacuation once constructed. While additional traffic volumes could be expected with the construction of more housing, the County would be required to periodically update its emergency response and evacuation plan(s) as required under AB 747 and the County's General Plan. This periodic reevaluation would address these changed conditions and would adjust the evacuation plans accordingly, if necessary. Therefore, the Project's operational impact to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3

2. Cumulative Impacts- Wildfire

Finding: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Significant cumulative impacts related to wildfire could occur if the incremental impacts of the Project combined with the incremental impacts of one or more cumulative projects would substantially increase the risk that people or the environment would be exposed to wildfire hazards, or substantially disrupt traffic on roadways used for emergency response and evacuation. Events could only be cumulative if two or more wildfire events occurred at the same time and overlapped in close proximity to one another. While it is possible that the Project and cumulative projects could result in increased wildfire risk at the same time in overlapping locations, the responsible party associated with each project would be required to control the safety of their own site conditions to the same established regulatory standards. The Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure TR-3 as discussed above, which would further mitigate cumulative impacts related to wildfire risk.

With respect to impairment of an emergency response or evacuation plan, other cumulative projects would be subject to LACFD and LACDPW standards, which require all emergency access to be maintained during construction and operations. Of the identified cumulative projects, only three are in proximity to contribute traffic on nearby study roadways. Due to the proximity of the Project Site to the three nearest cumulative projects (i.e., within one mile), and implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3, it is not anticipated that emergency access near or between these sites would be limited or be deemed inadequate. As such, compliance with LACFD and LACDPW standards would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact regarding inadequate emergency access.

With respect to wildfire risk associated with physical characteristics such as slope, prevailing winds, and other factors; wildfire-related infrastructure impacts; and post-fire effects, only one of the identified cumulative projects is located within a VHFHSZ. This Project would be required to comply with all relevant regulations for development within a FHSZ, which would minimize the Project's effects related to wildfire. Further, that Project is sufficiently removed from the nearest cumulative project (nearly two miles to the southeast, with intervening residential developments, roadways, and a freeway in-between) so as to preclude a combination of wildfire effects between that cumulative project and the Project. Any project located within a VHFHSZ would also likely require some level of fuel modification zones around its perimeter to protect that project from encroachment from wildfire. The nearest cumulative project has already undergone environmental review and has been approved, with its associated environmental effects evaluated and mitigated to the extent feasible. That project would be required to comply with all applicable requirements, particularly those related to vegetation modification zones and building standards. None of the other listed cumulative projects are located within a FHSZ or an SRA, which indicates that none are subject to heightened severity as related to wildfire impacts. Furthermore, none of the cumulative projects are sufficiently close to the Project to result in a cumulatively considerable combination of impacts. The Project would not cumulatively contribute with other relevant projects to expose people or structures,

either directly or indirectly, to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No significant cumulative impact related to wildfire would occur with implementation of Mitigation Measures TR-3.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3.

6. FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the Project, the County has determined that either (1) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the County has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." This is referred to herein as "Finding 3".

A. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

1. GHG Emissions

Impact GHG-1: The proposed Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: Impact would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Maximum annual GHG emissions resulting from motor vehicles, energy (i.e., electricity), water conveyance and wastewater treatment, and solid waste were calculated for the expected opening year (2028). Due to the potential persistence of GHGs in the environment, impacts are based on annual emissions and, in accordance with draft SCAQMD methodology, construction-period impacts are not assessed for significance independent of operational-period impacts. Rather, construction GHG emissions were amortized over a 30-year period and are included in the Project's annualized operational GHG emissions. Net annual GHG emissions generated from the Project would be 1,554 MT CO₂e per year which is greater than the Los Angeles County's net zero threshold of significance. The majority of the emissions would occur from vehicles traveling over regional roadways and the Project would implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Mitigation Measures TR-1 and TR-2 which would reduce VMT and associated GHG emissions from mobile sources. Use of electric vehicles and solar PV will be encouraged as residents of the Project Site will already have the electrical infrastructure in place making it easier compared to older homes that do not have these built-in benefits. In addition, the Project includes PDF GHG-2 which would avoid natural gas emissions, and electricity would be supplied to the Project by the Clean Power Alliance which would further reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, operational-related GHG emissions would decline in future years as emissions reductions from the State's Cap-and-Trade Program are fully realized and as older vehicles are replaced with newer vehicles that comply with more stringent combustion emissions standards pursuant to the California Air Resources Board's (CARBs) Advanced Clean Cars Program and Mobile Source Strategy. Even with regulatory compliance and implementation of the aforementioned Mitigation Measures, the Project would generate 1,465 MT CO₂e per year which exceeds the applicable net zero threshold of significance. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TR 1: Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program. In order to encourage use of the Metrolink commuter rail system and reduce commute-related VMT in the region, the homeowner's association (HOA) shall provide a reimbursement subsidy of up to 50 percent of the cost of one Metrolink monthly pass per residential dwelling unit for five (5) years (the subdivider shall administer and fund the reimbursement subsidy program for the first three [3] years, at which point the HOA shall take over administration and funding). Consistent with the guidance provided in the 2021 Handbook which states that projects may be located up to two (2) miles from high-quality transit service when access is supported by bicycle, the subdivider will also provide an electric bicycle with the purchase of each dwelling unit in order to support the effectiveness of this measure (discussed in further detail below).

It should be noted that monthly passes for the Metrolink system are sold based on the specific origin and destination stations both for cost and ticketing purposes (e.g., a monthly pass from Industry Station to L.A. Union Station costs approximately \$238.00, while a monthly pass from Industry Station to Riverside – Downtown Station costs approximately \$259.00). As the destination stations for future residents cannot be determined in advance, it is not feasible for the subdivider to pre-purchase and distribute passes along with the purchase of each dwelling unit. Instead, the subdivider/HOA will advertise the subsidy program to future residents at the time of purchase, and once a year for the remaining years of the subsidy program. As the total cost of the transit passes cannot be determined in advance, the total yearly homeowner transit subsidy reimbursement cost for Metrolink passes shall not exceed \$20,250.00 to the subdivider/HOA.

The Project Site is also served by public bus transit. As described in Section 3.2, public bus transit service in the vicinity is provided by Foothill Transit. Public bus stops are provided at the intersections of Fairway Drive-Brea Canyon Cutoff Road/Colima Road and Lake Canyon Drive/Colima Road, with service approximately every 20-30 minutes during the peak commute hours. Therefore, in addition to the Metrolink subsidies, the subdivider/HOA shall also provide a reimbursement subsidy of up to 50 percent of the cost of one Foothill Transit monthly bus pass per residential dwelling unit for five (5) years (the subdivider shall administer and fund the reimbursement subsidy program for the first three [3] years, at which point the HOA shall take over administration and funding) in order to encourage the use of bus transit and reduce residential VMT in the region. A 31-day Foothill Transit bus pass costs approximately \$60.00. The subdivider/HOA shall advertise the subsidy program to future residents at the time of purchase, and once a year for the remaining years of the subsidy program. As the total cost of the transit passes cannot be determined in advance, the total yearly homeowner transit subsidy reimbursement for Foothill Transit bus passes shall not exceed \$24,750.00 to the subdivider/HOA.

Total annual transit reimbursement subsidies (Metrolink and Foothill Transit) paid by the subdivider/HOA will not exceed \$45,000 per year for the five (5)-year period. The subdivider/HOA will provide a report to Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works and Planning six (6) months prior to the end of the fifth year, detailing the use of the transit subsidy program. The County will determine within 90 days if the use of the transit subsidy program should continue for an additional five (5) years. In no event shall the transit subsidy program last more than a total of 10 years.

To ensure the transfer of the transit subsidy program, the subdivider shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the continuous maintenance, administration, and operation of the fund for the period specified, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

Mitigation Measure TR-2: Electric Bicycles. The subdivider shall provide an electric bicycle along with the purchase of each dwelling unit at the close of escrow. The provision of electric bicycles is expected to support implementation of the transit subsidy program by providing an alternative last-mile connection to the nearby Metrolink Industry Station.

2. GHG Reduction Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Impact GHG-2: The proposed Project would conflict with any applicable plan, policy, regulation, or recommendation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Finding: Impact would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would be consistent with many of the key Project attributes included in the 2022 Scoping Plan and would implement project design features and incorporate additional characteristics to reduce energy, conserve water, reduce waste generation, and reduce vehicle travel, consistent with statewide strategies and regulations, which would reduce GHG emissions. The Project would also be inconsistent with some of the key project attributes under the VMT Reduction priority area. Specifically, the Project would not consist of the specific transit-supportive densities identified, would not restrict parking, and while the Project would comply with the County's affordable housing requirements through inclusion of over 20 percent below market units, the Project would not include units restricted to the lower-income level. Because the Project would not be consistent with certain VMT reduction key project attributes, it is conservatively concluded that the Project is inconsistent with the CARB 2022 Scoping Plan.

Both the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and 2020–2045 RTP/SCS describe how the region can attain the GHG emission-reduction targets set by CARB by achieving an 8 percent reduction in per capita transportation GHG emissions by 2020 and a 19 percent reduction in per capita transportation emissions by 2035 compared to the 2005 level on a per capita basis (SCAG 2020). Compliance with and implementation of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and 2020–2045 RTP/SCS policies and strategies would have co-benefits of reducing vehicle gasoline and diesel fuel consumption associated with reduced per capita VMT. The Project Site's urban location in an already developed area would help increase residential density near public transit, consistent with SB 743. The Project Site is served by existing bus transit service and the increased density by the Project would encourage transit ridership and decrease vehicle trips, VMT, and associated GHG emissions. The Project would provide recreational multi-use trails within the Project Site which are expected to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and other non-motorized modes of travel. Therefore, the Project is well-located and designed to attain expanded VMT and associated GHG emissions reductions in the future if and when the planned bicycle facilities are installed. Garages would be capable of supporting future electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE), consistent with the CALGreen Code. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the goals of the SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and 2020–2045 RTP/SCS and would not preclude attainment of its primary objectives.

The goals and policies in the Los Angeles County General Plan Air Quality Element address both air quality impact and GHG emissions reductions. The Project would meet the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency standards and CALGreen Code. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with the mobility goals of the General Plan including Goal M-4 and subsequent policies. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the County's applicable policies for GHG emissions reduction. Furthermore, the Project would pre-wire or install conduit and panel capacity for EVSE and pre-wire for solar panels, as well as have electricity supplied by the CPA 100 percent green rate, consistent with the Rowland Heights Community Plan.

The Los Angeles Countywide Sustainability Plan (OurCounty Plan) is a regional sustainability plan for Los Angeles that outlines what local governments and stakeholders can do to enhance the well-being of every community in the County while reducing damage to the natural environment and adapting to the changing climate, particularly focusing on those communities that have been disproportionately burdened by environmental pollution (County of Los Angeles 2019). The Project would be consistent with the relevant sustainability goals included in the OurCounty Plan.

Furthermore, the Project would comply with, and in some instances would go beyond, the requirements of the CALGreen Code and the County Green Building Ordinance, along with the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency standards.

The Project would be consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, the Los Angeles County General Plan, and the OurCounty Plan, and with many goals and key project attributes from the 2022 Scoping Plan. However, the Project would be inconsistent with some of the VMT related key project attributes under the 2022 Scoping Plan. Thus, while the Project is generally consistent with these plans, because the Project is inconsistent with some VMT related strategies of the 2022 Scoping Plan, impacts are conservatively concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures TR-1 and TR-2.

3. Cumulative Impacts- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Finding: Impact would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The emissions of a single project will not cause or exacerbate global climate change. Climate change is a global phenomenon and the significance of a project's GHG emissions is inherently cumulative in nature. As described in OPR's Discussion Draft: CEQA and Climate Change, "The CEQA Guidelines generally address greenhouse gas emissions as a cumulative impact due to the global nature of climate change. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21083, subd. (b)(2).) As the California Supreme Court explained, "because of the global scale of climate change, any one project's contribution is unlikely to be significant by itself." (Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497, 512.)" CEQA requires that lead agencies consider evaluating the cumulative impacts of GHGs from even relatively small increases in GHG emissions. Small contributions to this cumulative impact (from which significant effects are occurring and are expected to worsen over time)

may be potentially considerable and therefore significant. The Project would generate emissions that exceed the threshold of zero (0) MTCO_{2e} per year and Impact GHG-1 would be significant and unavoidable. Because GHG emissions are considered cumulative in nature, the Project would also result in GHG emissions that are cumulatively considerable due to Impact GHG-1. TDM strategies and Mitigation Measure TR-1 and TR-2 would further reduce impacts from GHG emissions from mobile sources, but not to a less than significant level. The Project would be consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, the Los Angeles County General Plan, and the OurCounty Plan, and with many goals and key project attributes from the 2022 Scoping Plan. However, the Project would be inconsistent with some of the VMT related key project attributes under the 2022 Scoping Plan. Thus, while the Project is generally consistent with these plans, because the Project is inconsistent with some VMT related strategies of the 2022 Scoping Plan, Impact GHG-2 is considered significant and unavoidable, and the Project's contribution to significant global climate change impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-1 and TR-2.

B. Construction Noise

Impact NOI-1: Construction of the proposed Project would generate a substantial temporary 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 during on-site construction activities or during Project operations.

Finding: Construction noise impacts would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation. Impacts to operational noise would be less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction noise levels would exceed the significance threshold of 75 dBA at all sensitive receptor locations without mitigation. Highest on-site noise levels would be observed at R5 (existing residences near the middle of the Project Site, along Walnut Leaf Drive and south of Colima Road and sensitive receptors in proximity thereto), which could experience noise levels at 86.5 dBA during the overlapping construction phases. Therefore, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, which include installation of noise barriers and equipping construction equipment with muffler exhaust systems, respectively, would be implemented. With implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, on-site construction activity would result in increases of ambient noise levels greater than 10 dBA at sensitive receptor locations R1 through R5. As such, environmental impacts related to the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during temporary construction of the Project would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of all mitigation measures.

Construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for the Project would incrementally increase noise levels on roads leading to the site. Although there would be a relatively high single-event noise-exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance (passing trucks at 50 feet would generate up to a maximum of 87

dB(A) Lmax), the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be small. Further, when construction traffic is added to the existing traffic volumes on street segments in the Project vicinity, no traffic noise level increases would exceed the 3 dBA threshold considered to be significant. Therefore, short-term construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the Project Site would be less than significant.

Offsite construction including street widening would not result in noise levels exceeding the County's 75 dBA noise standard for mobile source construction equipment noise at single-family residences. Nor would street widening construction activity result in increases of ambient noise levels greater than 10 dBA at sensitive receptor locations R1, which is the closest sensitive receptor to the off-site construction work. Nevertheless, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, which would reduce noise levels by 3 dBA, would ensure that construction noise would not exceed County threshold at the nearest sensitive receptor. As such, environmental impacts related to the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during street widening would be less than significant with mitigation. Noise levels from the crane used during traffic signal installation would result in noise levels exceeding the County's 75 dBA noise standard for mobile source construction equipment noise at single-family residences and impacts would be potentially significant; therefore, the Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would be implemented and would reduce noise levels from traffic signal installation from 83 dBA Leq to 71 dBA Leq which would be below the County's threshold of 75 dBA. However, even with all feasible mitigation, traffic signal construction activity would result in increases of ambient noise levels greater than 10 dBA at sensitive receptor location R2, which is the closest sensitive receptor to the off-site construction work. As such, environmental impacts related to the temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels during installation of the traffic signal would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Operational noise would be less than significant. The operation of mechanical equipment that would be installed for the Project, such as air conditioners, fans, generators, and related equipment, would generate noise levels in proximity to the equipment. Mechanical equipment would typically be located on rooftops or within buildings, shielded from nearby land uses to attenuate noise and avoid conflicts with adjacent uses. All outdoor mounted mechanical and electrical equipment would be designed to meet the requirements of County Code, Section 12.08.390. A conservative exterior noise level reference for air condenser units, the primary source of noise from fixed mechanical equipment, is 66 dBA Leq measured at a distance of 3 feet based on the Noise Navigator Sound Level Database (Berger, Neitzel & Kladden 2016). The closest sensitive receptors are located at approximately 100 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors when accounting for the buffer zones provided by open space between existing residential receptors and the Project. At 100 feet, the noise level would attenuate to 35.5 dBA Leq (not including attenuation from intervening structures, walls, or roofs). This would not exceed the allowable mechanical equipment noise level at a neighboring property line of 55 dBA, which is the LACC threshold for significant operational stationary equipment noise (see Table 3.10-8). Therefore, environmental impacts related to the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards during long-term operation of the proposed Project's stationary mechanical equipment would be less than significant.

Adding the Project traffic to the existing and future conditions would not result in changes in the traffic noise levels compared to the corresponding baseline traffic noise levels that would exceed the applicable standard for a significant impact. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impact under the existing plus Project scenario would occur from the operation of the Project.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Temporary Construction Noise Barriers. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, temporary construction noise barriers shall be erected along the Project boundary that separates on-site active construction area and off-site sensitive receivers within 200 feet of the Project boundary. Such noise barriers shall have a minimum height of 10 feet above ground to block the direct line-of-sight between onsite active construction areas. Temporary barriers shall include acoustical blankets with a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 25 and noise reduction coefficient (NRC) of 0.75. Temporary noise barriers shall achieve a minimum of 12 dBA reduction in construction noise.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Construction Equipment Noise Control. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the County/Project subdivider shall incorporate the following measures as a note on the grading plan cover sheet:

- Construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards and capable of reducing equipment noise levels by a minimum of 3 dBA.
- Construction staging areas shall be located at the greatest distance feasible from off-site sensitive uses during Project construction.
- The Project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project Site, whenever feasible.

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Mobile Noise Barriers. For off-site improvements related to the traffic signal installation, the contractor shall install temporary noise barriers, prior to issuance of grading and building permits, between the active construction area and the off-site noise-sensitive receptors. The mobile noise barriers shall achieve sound level reductions of a minimum of 10 dBA between the Project construction sites and the sensitive receptor location. These temporary noise barriers shall be used to block the line-of-sight between the engine of the crane and similarly elevated ground-level noise-sensitive receptors. The barriers should allow for repositioning in order to block the noise at the sensitive receptor as construction activities move along the Project boundary. A noise barrier is not required if it would pose a safety risk or unreasonably prevent access to the construction area as deemed by the on-site construction manager such as in areas that have limited equipment maneuvering space or access. Any barrier capable of a reduction greater than 12 dBA would require greater height and heavier noise insulation which would make mobility of the barrier infeasible and cause safety concerns related to barrier stability. Further, noise barriers would only be effective if they block the line-of-sight to sensitive receptors. The contractor shall provide documentation verifying compliance with this measure.

C. Transportation (VMT)

1. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3

Impact TR-2: The Project would conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b).

Finding: Impact would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: A significant transportation impact would result if the Project VMT exceeds 10.0 VMT per capita. The daily residential VMT per capita for the Project was determined by using the County's VMT Tool. The VMT Tool was developed to analyze projects that are located within a single Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ). However, the parcels that comprise the Project are located into two separate TAZs; therefore, the VMT analysis was conducted in two parts. It was determined that Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3 are forecast to generate 18.8 residential VMT per capita (TAZ-1), and Planning Area 5 is forecast to generate 21.6 residential VMT per capita (TAZ-2). The effect of telework is not reflected in the baseline VMT forecasts reported by the VMT Tool (LLG 2023). While the degree of teleworking in the SCAG region is expected to remain higher than pre-pandemic levels in coming years, any prediction of the future levels of telecommuting would be speculative in nature. An adjustment to the baseline VMT forecast to reflect the documented share of telework prior to the pandemic would therefore be speculative and is not considered mitigation, and the baseline VMT forecast has not been adjusted to reflect telework. The VMT analysis quantified one measure from the CAPCOA Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity (2021 Handbook) which provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for assessing and quantifying reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. It has been determined that one quantifiable measure is applicable as a Project Design Feature, PDF T-1: Increase Residential Density. PDF T-1 results in a quantifiable VMT reduction of 13.04 percent for Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, and a quantifiable VMT reduction of 2.39 percent for Planning Area 5. With implementation of PDF T-1, Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3 are forecast to generate 16.3 residential VMT per capita and Planning Area 5 is forecast to generate 21.1 residential VMT per capita. VMT in these planning areas would still exceed the South County residential VMT threshold of 10.0 residential VMT per capita. In addition, the Project would implement PDF T-2: Locate Project Near Bike Path/Bike Lane, which would reduce VMT associated with the Project; however, the VMT reductions from implementation of this measure are not quantified. As the Project would generate VMT above the County's thresholds, the Project proposes to implement Mitigation Measures TR-1 and Mitigation Measure TR-2 to reduce VMT by providing reimbursement subsidies for Metrolink and Foothill Transit Passes and by providing electric bicycles along with the purchase of each dwelling unit. With Mitigation Measure TR-1 and TR-2 the Project is expected to result in a quantifiable VMT reduction of 0.45 percent and Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3 (TAZ-1) are forecast to generate 16.2 residential VMT per capita and Planning Area 5 (TAZ-2) is forecast to generate 21.0 residential VMT per capita. As a result, the Project's VMT would continue to exceed the threshold of 10.0 residential VMT per capita after mitigation. No further feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, the Project-level VMT impacts would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TR 1: Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program. In order to encourage use of the Metrolink commuter rail system and reduce commute-related VMT in the region, the homeowner's association (HOA) shall provide a reimbursement subsidy of up to 50 percent of the cost of one Metrolink monthly pass per residential dwelling unit for five (5) years (the subdivider shall administer and fund the reimbursement subsidy program for the first three [3] years, at which point the HOA shall take over administration and funding). Consistent with the guidance provided in the 2021 Handbook which states that projects may be located up to two (2) miles from high-quality transit service when access is supported by bicycle, the subdivider will also provide an electric bicycle with the purchase of each dwelling unit in order to support the effectiveness of this measure (discussed in further detail below).

It should be noted that monthly passes for the Metrolink system are sold based on the specific origin and destination stations both for cost and ticketing purposes (e.g., a monthly pass from Industry Station to L.A. Union Station costs approximately \$238.00, while a monthly pass from Industry Station to Riverside – Downtown Station costs approximately \$259.00). As the destination stations for future residents cannot be determined in advance, it is not feasible for the subdivider to pre-purchase and distribute passes along with the purchase of each dwelling unit. Instead, the subdivider/HOA will advertise the subsidy program to future residents at the time of purchase, and once a year for the remaining years of the subsidy program. As the total cost of the transit passes cannot be determined in advance, the total yearly homeowner transit subsidy reimbursement cost for Metrolink passes shall not exceed \$20,250.00 to the subdivider/HOA.

The Project Site is also served by public bus transit. As described in Section 3.2, public bus transit service in the vicinity is provided by Foothill Transit. Public bus stops are provided at the intersections of Fairway Drive-Brea Canyon Cutoff Road/Colima Road and Lake Canyon Drive/Colima Road, with service approximately every 20-30 minutes during the peak commute hours. Therefore, in addition to the Metrolink subsidies, the subdivider/HOA shall also provide a reimbursement subsidy of up to 50 percent of the cost of one Foothill Transit monthly bus pass per residential dwelling unit for five (5) years (the subdivider shall administer and fund the reimbursement subsidy program for the first three [3] years, at which point the HOA shall take over administration and funding) in order to encourage the use of bus transit and reduce residential VMT in the region. A 31-day Foothill Transit bus pass costs approximately \$60.00. The subdivider/HOA shall advertise the subsidy program to future residents at the time of purchase, and once a year for the remaining years of the subsidy program. As the total cost of the transit passes cannot be determined in advance, the total yearly homeowner transit subsidy reimbursement for Foothill Transit bus passes shall not exceed \$24,750.00 to the subdivider/HOA.

Total annual transit reimbursement subsidies (Metrolink and Foothill Transit) paid by the subdivider/HOA will not exceed \$45,000 per year for the five (5)-year period. The subdivider/HOA will provide a report to Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works and Planning six (6) months prior to the end of the fifth year, detailing the use of the transit subsidy program.

The County will determine within 90 days if the use of the transit subsidy program should continue for an additional five (5) years. In no event shall the transit subsidy program last more than a total of 10 years.

To ensure the transfer of the transit subsidy program, the subdivider shall provide in the CC&Rs a method for the continuous maintenance, administration, and operation of the fund for the period specified, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

Mitigation Measure TR-2: Electric Bicycles. The subdivider shall provide an electric bicycle along with the purchase of each dwelling unit at the close of escrow. The provision of electric bicycles is expected to support implementation of the transit subsidy program by providing an alternative last-mile connection to the nearby Metrolink Industry Station.

2. Cumulative Impacts- Transportation (VMT)

Finding: Impact would be Significant and Unavoidable with imposition of all feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Of the 12 identified cumulative projects, only three could contribute traffic to study area roadways. The three proximate cumulative projects are estimated to generate approximately 54 trips in the AM peak hour and 58 trips in the PM peak hour. Similar to the Project, each cumulative project would be required to demonstrate consistency with the applicable plans, programs, ordinances and policies, and implement mitigation measures if conditions exceed thresholds set in the County Guidelines. Furthermore, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate consistency with applicable regulatory requirements, such as the Los Angeles General Plan and the Rowland Heights Community General Plan. As set forth above, the Project would not worsen transportation impacts or result in conflicts with program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and therefore its impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

The County's Guidelines state that short-term effects are evaluated in a detailed project-level VMT analysis, while long-term or cumulative effects are determined through consistency with SCAG's current 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. If a project does not demonstrate a significant impact in the project impact analysis, a less-than-significant impact in the cumulative impact analysis can also be determined, while land use projects that demonstrate a project-level impact and which are not found to be consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS could have a significant transportation impact. As discussed above in the Project Impact Analysis, the Project would result in a significant Project-level impact in comparison to the County's efficiency-based residential VMT impact thresholds. Therefore, the Project would potentially contribute toward a cumulative VMT impact, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

The Project would increase traffic in the vicinity; however, it would not substantially increase hazards based on the evaluation of traffic signal warrants and vehicle queues. While the Project would remove the golf cart path south of Colima Road, pedestrian crossings across Colima Road are planned to be accommodated at the Tierra Luna-Project Driveway/Colima Road intersection instead. The analysis considered all traffic analysis scenarios, including Future Plus

Project traffic conditions, which is the cumulative traffic scenario for the Project study area and therefore includes the vehicular volumes that would be added to roadways by the Project and cumulative Projects. As such, the Project in combination with cumulative projects would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative projects would be subject to LACFD and LACDPW standards, which require emergency access to be maintained during construction and operations. Of the 12 identified cumulative projects, only three could contribute traffic to nearby study roadways. Due to the proximity of the Project Site to the three nearest cumulative projects (i.e., within one mile), and implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3, it is not anticipated that emergency access near or between these sites would be limited or inadequate. As such, compliance with LACFD and LACDPW standards would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact regarding inadequate emergency access. The other seven cumulative projects are sufficiently distant from the Project Site to not contribute to the emergency access adequacy on nearby study area roadways.

Mitigation Measure

Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3.

7. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a Project is a fundamental aspect of the environmental review process under CEQA. Public Resources Code Section 21002 states, in part: “it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.” In addition, Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(a) states: “The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) emphasizes the selection of project alternatives should be based primarily on the ability to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts attributable to a proposed project, “even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly.” CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) further directs that the range of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason,” such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are addressed. In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives must be feasible.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires the analysis of a “no project” alternative and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires the evaluation of alternative location(s) for a proposed project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to designate an environmentally superior alternative. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The underlying purpose of the Project is to redevelop a portion of a golf course to provide market-rate and middle- and moderate-income housing opportunities as well as open space areas and recreational resources. As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the list of objectives that the Applicant seeks to achieve for the Project is provided below.

The objectives of the Project are:

- Provision of New Housing. Provide needed new housing within infill locations in unincorporated Los Angeles County.
- Provide a Diverse Variety of Housing Types and Affordability. Provide a diverse mix of for-sale housing product type, price, and home size to support physical, social, and economic diversity, including both market and below-market options for middle- and moderate-income households that are distributed throughout the development.
- Create a Healthy Community. Create a dynamic community with opportunities for outdoor passive and active recreational opportunities.

- Integrate Environmentally Responsible Practices. Conserve natural resources and open space for a sustainable community. Minimize impact and use of natural resources, emphasizing healthy, safe, and responsible environments to balance community development with environmental considerations.
- Create Connectivity. Encourage community participation and interaction by providing a trail system to existing recreational amenities and open spaces.

The consideration of alternatives is an integral component of the CEQA process. The selection and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives provides the public and decision-makers with information on ways to avoid or lessen environmental impacts created by a proposed project. When selecting alternatives for evaluation, CEQA requires alternatives that meet most of the basic objectives of the Project, while avoiding or substantially lessening the Project's significant effects.

Four alternatives to the Project were defined and analyzed:

A. Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

Finding: No new development or land uses would be introduced on the Project Site under Alternative 1, and the existing uses on the Project Site would continue to operate as they do currently. Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas, construction noise, and transportation (VMT) impacts. Alternative 1 would have no impact to the remaining environmental issue areas. While impacts would be reduced under Alternative 1, this Alternative would not provide market-rate and middle- and moderate-income housing opportunities as well as publicly accessible open space areas. Accordingly, Alternative 1 is hereby rejected by the County as it would not achieve any of the Project objectives.

Facts in Support of Finding: Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), the no project alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which a proposed project does not proceed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) states "in certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained." Accordingly, for purposes of this analysis, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development alternative, assumes the Project would not be approved, no new permanent development or land uses would be introduced within the Project Site, and the existing environment would be maintained. The Project Site generally comprises 13 holes and the driving range of the existing 27-hole Royal Vista Golf Club. Under Alternative 1, the potential Project-related impacts associated with development of the Project Site and described in the Draft EIR would not occur.

Alternative 1, No Project/No Development, would not result in the addition of any residential units or other development on the Project Site. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in no environmental effects compared to the Project's significant and unavoidable and less than significant impacts after the implementation of mitigation measures. Although no environmental effects would occur, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project Objectives.

B. Alternative 2: Mixed Use Alternative

Finding: Alternative 2, Mixed Use Alternative would not reduce the environmental impacts compared to those of the Project. Significant and unavoidable impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions, construction noise, and transportation (VMT) would remain significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative 2 consists of a total of 324 residential units, 36,000 square feet of commercial retail uses, and open space with a trail system. The 324 residential units would consist of 250 single family detached residential lots (Urban 2 on Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5) and 74 townhomes set aside for middle- and moderate-income households (Urban 4 on Planning Area 4). The 36,000 sf of commercial retail would be located in Planning Area 3, and Planning Area 6 would be open space. A trail system would meander through all of the Planning Areas. This Alternative would require a Zone Change from the current A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000 (Residential Planned Development) for the proposed single-family homes and the affordable housing component (townhomes) and the amendment to the Rowland Height Community Plan and Los Angeles County General Plan land use designation from the current Open Space (OS) land use designation to Urban (U-2, U-4) and Commercial (C). This Alternative's residential area would consist of a total of 48.29 acres (Planning Areas 1, 2, 4 and 5). The commercial retail area would be on 4.22-acres (Planning Area 3). This Alternative would include 23.14-acres of open space.

Under Alternative 2, similar environmental impacts would occur to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, biological resources, GHG, land use, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources and wildfire. As compared to the Project, Alternative 2 would have increased impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise and would reduce impacts to public services and utilities and services. This Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts for GHG, construction noise, or transportation (VMT) to less than significant. Overall, more environmental impacts would occur with this Alternative compared to the Project. Alternative 2 would meet all of the Project objectives except for Objective "Provide a Diverse Variety of Housing Types and Affordability." This Alternative would not provide affordable housing evenly distributed throughout the site. The proposed affordable housing would only be located in Planning Area 4.

C. Alternative 3: Existing Zoning Alternative

Finding: Alternative 3, Existing Zoning Alternative, would reduce the environmental impacts compared to those of the Project. This Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impact for transportation (VMT) but would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts for GHG or construction noise.

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative 3 would develop the entire site (all Planning Areas 1-6) with a total of 97 residential units, consisting of 71 single family residential units and 26 townhomes, consistent with existing zoning, with all 26 townhome units reserved for middle- and moderate-income households. Planning Areas 2 and 3 are zoned A-1-10,000 and would include 16 single-family lots in Planning Area 2 and 4 single-family lots and 26 townhomes on Planning Area

3. Planning Areas 1, 4, 5 and 6 are zoned A-1-1 and would include 51 single-family lots. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would require an amendment to the Rowland Heights Community Plan and Los Angeles County General Plan land use designation from the current Open Space (OS) land use designation to Urban (U-1 and U-3) for Planning Areas 2 and 3 and Non-Urban 2 (N2) for Planning Areas 1, 4, 5 and 6. This alternative does not include open space or a trail system. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts as those of the Project as follows: aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; energy; geology, soils, and seismicity; GHG emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; mineral resources; noise; population and housing; public services; recreation; transportation; tribal cultural resources; utilities, service systems, and energy; and wildfire. Alternative 3 would not reduce significant environmental impacts and would have similar impacts to the Project.

Under Alternative 3, reduced impacts to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, energy, GHG, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities impacts would occur compared to the Project. The same impacts to agriculture and forestry resources, biological resources, mineral resources, population and housing, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire would occur with this Alternative as with the Project. This Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impact for transportation (VMT) but would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts for GHG or construction noise. Overall, this Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts compared to the Project. However, this Alternative would not meet all of the Project Objectives since the Alternative would not include open space or a trail system to encourage outside recreation or provide affordable housing evenly distributed throughout the site plan. The proposed affordable housing would be entirely located in Planning Area 3. The Alternative would be consistent with the remaining Project Objectives, but as compared to the Project it would provide less housing overall and less diversity of housing types to encourage a range of affordable housing options.

D. Alternative 4: 322 Residential Units Alternative

Finding: Alternative 4, 322 Residential Units Alternative, would not reduce the environmental impacts compared to those of the Project. Significant and unavoidable impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions, construction noise, and transportation (VMT) would remain significant and unavoidable.

Facts in Support of Finding: Alternative 4 would include the development of a total of 322 residential units, consisting of redevelopment of Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 with 250 detached single family residential units and Planning Area 3 with 72 townhome units. All 72 townhome units would be reserved for middle- and moderate-income households. The two remaining planning areas (Planning Areas 4 and 6) would be open space areas with a connected trail system. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would require a Zone Change from the current A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000 (Residential Planned Development) for the proposed single-family homes and the affordable housing component (townhomes) and amendment to the Rowland Heights Community Plan and Los Angeles County General

Plan land use designation from the current Open Space (OS) land use designation to Urban (U). The 250 single family lots would be located in Planning Areas 1, 2 and 5, and the 72 affordable townhouse units would be located within 14 structures in Planning Area 3. Planning Area 4 would not be developed but remain as open space, and Planning Area 6 would be 1.59-acre open space. The residential component (322 units) would comprise a total of 47.63 net acres (Planning Areas 1, 2, 3 and 5). These areas would also include an additional 28.02 acres of onsite retained open space within the four residential planning areas. This alternative does not include open space or a trail system.

Under Alternative 4, reduced impacts to aesthetics, air quality, energy, hydrology and water quality noise, public services, and utilities would occur under this Alternative compared to the Project. The same impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, GHG, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, mineral resources, population and housing, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire would occur with this Alternative as with the Project. This Alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts for GHG, construction noise, or transportation (VMT). Overall, this Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts compared to the Project. Alternative 4 would meet all of the Project Objectives, but to a lesser degree than the Project with the exception that Alternative 4 would not provide affordable housing evenly distributed throughout the site. The proposed affordable housing would be located entirely within Planning Area 3.

E. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Finding: Alternative 3 is considered the environmentally superior alternative; however, Alternative 3 would not meet all of the Project Objectives since the Alternative would not include open space or a trail system to encourage outside recreation or provide affordable housing evenly distributed throughout the site. The proposed affordable housing would be entirely located in Planning Area 3. In addition, Alternative 3 would not fully eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG and temporary construction noise impacts.

Facts in Support of Finding: The No Project Alternative would avoid all construction and operational impacts but would not meet the primary Project Objectives. As required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, because the Environmental Superior Alternative is the No Project Alternative (No Project/No Development), an Environmentally Superior Alternative must be selected from the remaining alternatives. Due to the avoidance of the significant and unavoidable transportation (VMT) impact, Alternative 3, Existing Zoning, is considered the environmentally superior alternative. Overall, Alternative 3 would reduce the significant and unavoidable transportation (VMT) impact but would continue to have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with GHG and temporary construction noise. Alternative 3 would not meet all of the Project Objectives since the Alternative would not include open space or a trail system to encourage outside recreation or provide affordable housing evenly distributed throughout the site.

F. Alternatives That Were Considered but Rejected

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines(c), the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR: (i) the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; (ii) the alternative's infeasibility; or (iii) the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

Alternative Site: Under an Alternative Site Alternative, the Project would be constructed on a site other than the Project Site. Montebello Municipal Golf Course was potentially being planned for redevelopment at the time EIR preparation commenced. The site includes an 18-hole golf course on 120 acres adjacent to SR-60 and is approximately 7.5 miles from downtown Los Angeles. Because this alternative location is close to the employment destination of downtown Los Angeles, VMT would be reduced when compared to the Project, although a specific calculation was not determined. A consideration of the feasibility of an alternative site may include assessing whether the Applicant could reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to an alternative site. As the Montebello Municipal golf Course site is not in the County land use jurisdiction and is not owned or controlled by the Project Applicant, the Project Applicant does not own or have access to the site. Therefore, Montebello Municipal Golf Course was rejected as an alternative site for the purposes of the alternative analysis in this Draft EIR. The remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club, which is not part of the Project Site, was also considered and rejected as an alternative site because the Project Applicant does not own the properties that comprise the remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club, and because development of the Project on these properties would not reduce any of the Project's potentially significant impacts. Like the Project, the properties that comprise the remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club are proximate to existing residential uses with comparable construction noise limitations and the VMT significant impact would not be reduced. The Applicant does not own or otherwise have access or control of another comparably sized or otherwise suitable location. Because no feasible alternative sites were identified, no other alternative sites were considered.

Maximum Density Alternative: The Maximum Density Alternative would include the redevelopment of the Project Site (Planning Areas 1, 2, 3, and 5) with a total of 403 residential units, consisting of 213 single family residential units, 93 duplexes and triplexes, and 97 townhouse units (including 81 affordable units). Planning Areas 4 and 6 would include open space and a trail system. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would require a Zone Change from the current A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural) to RPD-5000 (Residential Planned Development) for the proposed single-family homes and the affordable housing component (81 townhomes) and an amendment to the Rowland Height Community Plan and Los Angeles County General Plan land use designation from the current Open Space (OS) land use designation to Urban (U). This alternative would meet all five Project Objectives. The Maximum Density Alternative has been considered but rejected since the Alternative would increase impacts due to the increased construction impacts associated with building out Planning Areas 1, 2, 3 and 5 with the maximum allowed development consisting of a total of 403 residential units, which is 43 additional units as compared to the Project's proposed 360 units. Further, operational impacts

would also be increased as compared to the Project since this Alternative would increase the number of residential units (population) requiring public and utility services.

8. FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

Impact: An increase in population or employment, or the construction of new housing would occur as a direct or indirect result of the proposed Project and the proposed Project could result in direct growth-inducement within the region

Finding: The Project would not result in substantial growth-inducement.

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the proposed Project would result in an increase in population within the unincorporated County. The proposed Project would include the development of 360 residential units and would retain some open space areas and would result in approximately 1,260 people. The Project's estimated residential population was calculated based on the SCAG projections, which is largely based on demographics data from the United States Census, and which identifies an average household size of 3.5.¹ As the Project would not provide any commercial uses, the Project would not generate any potential employment opportunities.

The Project's 1,260 residents would comprise approximately 5.7 percent of the unincorporated County's estimated growth at buildout in 2027. The Project's residents would comprise only 0.7 percent of SCAG's longer-term projected population increase for the unincorporated County in the SCAG 2045 Horizon Year. The Project's 360 units would comprise approximately 2.81 percent of the unincorporated County's estimated growth at buildout in 2027 and only 0.4 percent of SCAG's longer-term projected housing increase for the unincorporated County in the SCAG 2045 Horizon Year. The Project's increases in population and housing would be within SCAG's projections for the unincorporated County for both the near-term buildout year (2027) and for SCAG's projection horizon year (2045). Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would not result in substantial direct growth-inducement.

The remaining properties of the Royal Vista Golf Club are not part of the Project and are expected to retain the existing 14 holes and the clubhouse on 8 separate parcels, both north and south of Colima Road, and comprising about 80 acres. Like the proposed Project, these properties are designated as Open Space for land use and zoned A-1-1, and A-1-10,000, with the clubhouse property zoned as C-R-DP, Commercial Recreation, Planned Development. The C-R zoning limits the permitted uses primarily to amusement parks, campgrounds, tennis courts, and golf courses. Golf course uses could continue operation with the 14 holes, or this property could be redesigned as an executive 9-hole golf course. These properties are not owned or controlled by the Project Applicant, and it would be speculative to attempt to predict the future use of these properties beyond their current use. Development of these properties would require a General Plan amendment or a zone change, or both, depending on the proposed use. Such application would require a legislative decision by the Board of Supervisors, providing the County with discretion for any land use change to residential or commercial uses. Any change of use of the C-R-DP zoned clubhouse property would also need a discretionary conditional use permit approval. Given the current zoning of the Property, the absence of any pending discretionary entitlement

¹ SCAG, Profile of Unincorporated Los Angeles County, May 2019 <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/unincarealosangelescounty.pdf?1604708602> Accessed March 10, 2023.

application for a project on this property, and the continuing operation of the golf course at the time of the release of the NOP and the DEIR, assumption of any uses other than the golf course use would be speculative. Consequently, there is no known growth inducing action for the remaining golf course parcels that would result from the approval of the proposed Project, as such determination would be speculative, and development of the Project would not materially increase the likelihood or capacity of potential redevelopment of the remainder of the Royal Vista Golf Club.

Population growth can result in secondary environmental effects that could be significant. The environmental impact analysis conducted for cumulative development within the Project vicinity identified that there would be no significant environmental impacts associated with known project growth (i.e., the identified cumulative projects). Secondary effects of growth typically found to be significant and unavoidable include air quality degradation, hydrology and water quality modification and degradation, traffic congestion, transportation demand increase, increased noise, and increased demand on utilities.

The proposed Project would include new infrastructure such as water distribution lines and sewer lines, serving just the Project Site. These facilities would support the demand of the proposed Project and would not create additional capacity available to the region or area. As such, the proposed Project would not increase the County's infrastructure beyond that which is necessary to serve the proposed Project, and the proposed Project would not induce unplanned growth.