**DRAFT Initial Study**This document comprises the Initial Study as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

City of Alhambra

**The Villages at The Alhambra**

Case Number: RP-17-1, CU-17-9, V-17-10, V-17-11, & TT-74194

**Location:** 1001 South Fremont Avenue; 920 South Fremont Avenue; 2215 West Mission Road; 629, 635, 701, 825 and 1003 South Date Avenue; Alhambra, CA 91803

**Project Description:** The proposed Project covers portions of a 38.37-acre site bounded by Fremont Avenue (west), Mission Road (south), Date Avenue (east), and Orange Street (north) in the City of Alhambra. The Project would retain 902,001 square-feet of existing office space and would repurpose 10,145 square-feet as Residential Amenity space for the newly proposed South Plan Area, discussed in detail below. Also, the Project would retain a 50,000 square-foot LA Fitness health club, but would replace existing surface parking areas, warehouse/storage/maintenance buildings, and a vacant office building with 516 new, for-sale, dwelling units in stacked flat and townhome configurations; 545 new rental apartments in five-story stacked flat configurations; and 4,347 total parking spaces to accommodate all new uses.

The proposed Project divides the site into five plan areas consisting of the following specific components:

Office Plan Area

* Retention of an existing 902,001 square-feet of office space and 1,800 parking spaces, including the existing five-level parking structure.
* 10,145 square-feet of existing office space will be repurposed as Residential Amenity space for the South Plan Area.
* No new development will occur within the Office Plan Area, although vehicle and pedestrian circulation areas along its edges will be modified to provide consistent linkages with the adjacent plan areas.

North Plan Area

* Demolition of all existing structures (A12, B14, B15, and B16), totaling 20,876 sf and surface parking lots.
* Construction of 516 for-sale residential units (stacked flats and townhomes) (731,698 square feet) in five-story buildings (Bldgs. N1, N2, N3, & N4) with accompanying residential amenities.
* Provision of 1,135 parking spaces for residents and guests in 2.25-level below grade parking garages for stacked flat units, individual garages for townhomes, and on-street parking within Plan area.

East Plan Area

* Demolition of existing warehouse/storage buildings (B12 & B13) totaling 21,700 square-feet and surface parking lots.
* Construction of a five-story, 490-stall parking garage (Bldg. E1) to serve the existing office uses in the Office Plan Area as well as the proposed residences in the other plan areas.

South Plan Area

* Demolition of all existing structures and surface parking lots, except Building A0 (10,145 sf) will be retained.
* Construction of 392 rental apartment units (stacked flats) (449,816 square feet) in two five-story buildings (Bldgs. S1 & S2) with accompanying residential amenities.
* Provision of 663 parking spaces for residents and guests.

Corner Plan Area

* Demolition of existing office and maintenance buildings and surface parking lots.
* Construction of 153 rental apartment units (176,116 square feet) in a five-story building (stacked flats) with accompanying residential amenities (Bldg. C1).
* Provision of 259 parking spaces for residents and guests.

**Discretionary Actions:**

1. Pursuant to Alhambra Municipal Code (AMC) Chapter 23.62, Residential Planned Development Permit;
2. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.66, Conditional Use Permit;
3. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 22.48, Vesting Tentative Tract Map;
4. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.68, Variance to permit shared parking; and
5. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.64, Design Review; and,
6. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.71, Development Agreement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| APPLICANT: | PREPARED BY: |  ON BEHALF OF: |
| Elite-TRC Alhambra Community LLC 1000 S. Fremont Ave, Unit 1 Los Angeles, CA 91803 | CAJA Environmental Services11990 San Vicente BoulevardLos Angeles, CA 90049 | City of AlhambraDevelopment Services Department111 South First StreetAlhambra, CA 91801 |
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1. Project Description

The subject of this Initial Study (IS) is the proposed The Villages at The Alhambra Project (referred to herein as the “Project” or the “Proposed Project”). The City of Alhambra’s Development Services Department is the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Mitigated Negative Declaration must be prepared or to identify the significant environmental effects to be analyzed in an EIR.

**Project Information**

Project Title: The Villages at The Alhambra

Project Location: 1001 South Fremont Avenue; 2215 West Mission Road; 629, 635, 701, 825 and 1003 South Date Avenue; Alhambra, CA 91803

Project Applicant: Elite-TRC Alhambra Community LLC

1000 S. Fremont Avenue, Unit 1

Alhambra, CA 91803

Lead Agency: City of Alhambra
Development Services Department
111 South First Street, Alhambra, California 91801
Attn: Paul Lam

**Regulatory Framework**

According to CEQA Guidelines, Article 5. Preliminary Review of Projects and Conduct of Initial Study:

*15063. INITIAL STUDY*

*(a) Following preliminary review, the Lead Agency shall conduct an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the Lead Agency can determine that an EIR will clearly be required for the project, an Initial Study is not required but may still be desirable.*

*(1) All phases of project planning, implementation, and operation must be considered in the Initial Study of the project.*

*(2) To meet the requirements of this section, the lead agency may use an environmental assessment, or a similar analysis prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.*

*(3) An initial study may rely upon expert opinion supported by facts, technical studies or other substantial evidence to document its findings. However, an initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.*

*(b) Results.*

*(1) If the agency determines that there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the Lead Agency shall do one of the following:*

*(A) Prepare an EIR, or*

*(B) Use a previously prepared EIR which the Lead Agency determines would adequately analyze the project at hand, or*

*(C) Determine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project’s effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Another appropriate process may include, for example, a master EIR, a master environmental assessment, approval of housing and neighborhood commercial facilities in urban areas, approval of residential projects pursuant to a specific plan described in section 15182, approval of residential projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning as described in section 15183, or an environmental document prepared under a State certified regulatory program. The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration.*

*(2) The Lead Agency shall prepare a Negative Declaration if there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment.*

*(c) Purposes. The purposes of an Initial Study are to:*

*(1) Provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or a Negative Declaration.*

*(2) Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration.*

*(3) Assist in the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:*

*(A) Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant,*

*(B) Identifying the effects determined not to be significant,*

*(C) Explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant, and*

*(D) Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project’s environmental effects.*

*(4) Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;*

*(5) Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;*

*(6) Eliminate unnecessary EIRs;*

*(7) Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.*

*(d) Contents. An Initial Study shall contain in brief form:*

*(1) A description of the project including the location of the project;*

*(2) An identification of the environmental setting;*

*(3) An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries. The brief explanation may be either through a narrative or a reference to another information source such as an attached map, photographs, or an earlier EIR or negative declaration. A reference to another document should include, where appropriate, a citation to the page or pages where the information is found.*

*(4) A discussion of the ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;*

*(5) An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls;*

*(6) The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.*

**Regional Setting**

The Project Site is located at 1001 South Fremont Avenue; 2215 West Mission Road; and 629, 635, 701, 825 and 1003 South Date Avenue, in the City of Alhambra (City), approximately one mile southwest of the Alhambra Civic Center. The Site is approximately 0.7 miles east of the City of Los Angeles boundary at Lowell Avenue. See Figure 1, Regional and Local Vicinity Map, for the location within the context of the City. See Figure 2, Aerial Map, for the Project Site and surrounding areas.

***Regional and Local Access***

Regional access is provided by the Long Beach Freeway (Interstate 710) located approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the Site and the San Bernardino Freeway (Interstate 10) located approximately 0.8 mile south of the Site. Local access is provided by Mission Road, Fremont Avenue, Date Avenue, and Orange Street.

***Public Transit***

The Alhambra Community Transit (ACT) shuttle bus provides bus service to the Project Site. Fremont Avenue carries both the Green and Blue Lines, providing service to most portions of the City, including the downtown area and Civic Center.

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) provides bus service to the Project Site. Fremont Avenue carries Metro Express bus line 485, connecting Union Station in downtown Los Angeles with Altadena, and Metro Limited bus line 258, connecting downtown Alhambra with Monterey Park, East Los Angeles, Commerce, Bell Gardens, South Gate, and Paramount. Both Metro lines stop at Fremont/Mission and Fremont/Orange, adjacent to the Project Site.

The Project Site is located approximately 1.8 miles northeast of the Southern California Regional Rail Authority’s Cal State L.A. Metrolink commuter rail station on its San Bernardino Line, connecting downtown Los Angeles to San Bernardino. Separate shuttle services also provide transportation from the Project Site to both Cal State L.A. and the University of Southern California.

**Site Characteristics**

The Site consists of the entire block bounded by Fremont Avenue on the west, Mission Road on the south, Date Avenue on the east, and Orange Street on the north. The Project Site’s assessor parcel number (APN), zoning, land use designation, and lot size is listed on Table 1. The total area that composes the Project site is approximately 1,675,498 square feet (or 38.46 acres[[1]](#footnote-2)). The Site is zoned PO (Professional Office) and is designated for Office Professional uses in the City’s General Plan.

**Table 1**

**Project Site**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Address** | **APN** | **Zone** | **General Plan Land Use** | **Size (sf) 1** |
| 825 S. Date Avenue | 5342-001-009 | PO | Office Professional | 19,984 |
| 1003 S. Date Avenue | 5342-001-010 | 19,984 |
| 2215 W. Mission Road | 5342-001-019 | 48,183 |
| 629 S. Date Avenue, Lot 8 | 5342-001-006 | 10,016 |
| 635 S. Date Avenue, Lot 9 | 5342-001-007 | 10.016 |
| 701 S. Date Avenue, Lot 10 & 11 | 5342-001-008 | 20,031 |
| 1000 S. Fremont Avenue | 5342-001-021 | 1,043,571 |
| Orange/Date #22, Lot 1-7 | 5342-001-022 | 119,378 |
| Date Avenue Lot 12, 13, 14, alley, 1 & ½ of Lot 2 | 5342-001-023 | 67,601 |
| Date Avenue ½ of Lot 2 & Lot 3-6 | 5342-001-024 | 49,180 |
| Orange Street #25 between Lot 8 & 9 | 5342-001-025 | 27,750 |
| Orange Street #26 between Lot 8, 9 & 10 | 5342-001-026 | 120,970 |
| Orange Street #27 by Lot 10 & east of Lot 9 | 5342-001-027 | 15,038 |
| **Total** | **1,675,498** |
| *Source: The Ratkovich Company; Los Angeles County Assessor Records***1** The proposed acreage is measured from Vesting Tentative Tract Map 74194 prepared for the Project. |

**Existing Uses**

The Project Site is fully developed with office, warehouse, storage, utility substation, and surface parking lot uses. For purposes of the proposed Project, the Project Site is being divided into five plan areas: Office, North, East, South, and Corner. With respect to each of these plan areas, existing land uses on the Project Site are as follows:

Office Plan Area (17.76 acres)

* 902,001 total square-feet of office space in 9 buildings ranging from one to six stories in height (Bldgs. A1-A11, A13, B1, B6)
* 50,558 square foot LA Fitness gym
* A 746 space, three-story parking garage (Bldg. B2)
* a 1,032 space, five-story parking garage (Bldg. B7)
* a utility area
* a guard gate

North Plan Area (10.88 acres)

* a two-story, 11,144 square-foot vacant office/warehouse building (Bldg. A12)
* 20,876 total square-feet of warehouse/workshop/storage space in three one-story buildings, including two metal structures and one concrete block building. (Buildings Bldgs. B14, B15, & B16)
* a 2,370 square-foot, one-story cooling tower
* asphalt surface parking lots
* a guard gate

East Plan Area (1.75 acres)

* 21,700 square-feet of warehouse/shipping and receiving space in two one-story buildings, one metal and one concrete block. (Bldgs. B12 & B13)
* Southern California Edison utility substation
* asphalt surface parking lots

South Plan Area (5.86 acres)

* A 10,145 square-foot one-story office building (Bldg. A0)
* 8,300 square-feet of maintenance space in a one-story metal and brick building (Bldg. B-11)
* asphalt surface parking lots

Corner Plan Area (2.13 acres)

* 42,222 square-feet of vacant office space in a two-story concrete building (Corner Building)
* asphalt surface parking lots

**Surrounding Uses**

* To the west across Fremont Avenue, from north to south, are (i) a two-story business park/office building and surface parking; (ii) a one-story towing service building and attached parking lot; (iii) a vacant parcel; (iv) a one-story retail/commercial complex featuring fast-food restaurants and a café (with a pedestrian bridge over Fremont Avenue connecting to the Project Site); and (v) a Kohl’s department store with associated surface parking lot. The first four uses are on properties zoned IPD (Industrial Planned Development), while the Kohl’s store is on a property zoned CPD (Commercial Planned Development).
* To the east across Date Avenue, from north to south, are (i) a one-story warehouse/shipping and receiving center with associated surface parking; (ii) a one-story Carpet King warehouse/office with associated surface parking; (iii) a one-story office/warehouse building; (iv) a one-story office complex with carport; (v) a two-story printing/copying center with associated surface parking (on the north side of Chestnut Street); (vi) a two-story office building (on the south side of Chestnut Street); (vii) a one-story concrete office/warehouse complex with associated surface parking; (viii) a two-story stucco office building with associated surface parking; and (ix) a three-story concrete office development with associated surface parking. All of these properties are zoned IPD (Industrial Planned Development).
* To the north across Orange Street, from west to east, are (i) asphalt surface parking lots and (ii) the approximately 25-story Los Angeles County Public Works office building and associated surface parking lots. These properties are zoned PO (Professional Office).
* To the south across Mission Road are (i) the below-grade, dual Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and (ii) a one-story storage and moving supplies business, located between Mission Road and the railroad corridor across from the Project Site’s southeastern frontage. The rail corridor is zoned OS (Open Space), while the other property is zoned IPD (Industrial Planned Development).

The nearest existing residential uses to the Project Site are the single-family homes to the south along Front Street, across the railroad tracks from Mission Road, each approximately 200-feet away from the edge of the Site.

**Proposed Project**

The Proposed Project is intended to develop an urban neighborhood across the Project Site, including a network of landscape and communal spaces that fuse office and residential uses into a single community with a unique identity and sense of place. Active uses will be featured along street frontages in order to avoid blank walls and visible parking areas. Most of the existing office buildings on the Site would be retained as part of the Project.

As discussed previously, the Project Site consists of the entire block bounded by Fremont Avenue on the west, Mission Road on the south, Date Avenue on the east, and Orange Street on the north. The Proposed Project, as noted previously, divides the site into five plan areas: Office, North, East, South, and Corner. The development proposal for each of these plan areas is described below.

Office Plan Area

* Retention of an existing 902,001 square-feet of office space and 1,800 parking spaces, including the existing five-level parking structure.
* 10,145 square-feet of existing office space will be repurposed as Residential Amenity space for the South Plan Area.
* No new development will occur within the Office Plan Area, although vehicle and pedestrian circulation areas along its edges will be modified to provide consistent linkages with the adjacent plan areas.

North Plan Area

* Demolition of all existing structures (A12, B14, B15, and B16), totaling 20,876 sf and surface parking lots.
* Construction of 516 for-sale residential units (stacked flats and townhomes) (731,698 square feet) in five-story buildings (Bldgs. N1, N2, N3, & N4) with accompanying residential amenities.
* Provision of 1,135 parking spaces for residents and guests in 2.25-level below grade parking garages for stacked flat units, individual garages for townhomes, and on-street parking within Plan area.

East Plan Area

* Demolition of existing warehouse/storage buildings (B12 & B13) totaling 21,700 square-feet and surface parking lots.
* Construction of a five-story, 490-stall parking garage (Bldg. E1) to serve the existing office uses in the Office Plan Area as well as the proposed residences in the other plan areas.

South Plan Area

* Demolition of all existing structures and surface parking lots, except Building A0 (10,145 sf) will be retained.
* Construction of 392 rental apartment units (stacked flats) (449,816 square feet) in two five-story buildings (Bldgs. S1 & S2) with accompanying residential amenities.
* Provision of 663 parking spaces for residents and guests.

Corner Plan Area

* Demolition of existing office and maintenance buildings and surface parking lots.
* Construction of 153 rental apartment units (176,116 square feet) in a five-story building (stacked flats) with accompanying residential amenities (Bldg. C1).
* Provision of 259 parking spaces for residents and guests.

Overall the Proposed Project would construct 1,061 residential units (516 for-sale; 545 rental), and associated open space, landscaping, and vehicle/pedestrian circulation areas to accompany the existing 902,001 square-feet of office space that would be retained within the Office Plan Area. Also, up to 4,347 parking spaces will be provided as part of the Proposed Project to serve both the residential and office uses at the Project Site. The Project is shown in Figure 3, Site Plan. The development is described in Table 2, Project Summary.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2Project Summary**  |
| **Type** | **Dwelling Units** | **Size (sf)** |
| ***Office Plan Area*** |
| **Existing Buildings to be Retained** |
| Office | - | **902,001** |
| ***North Plan Area*** |
| **Multi-Family Residential (For Sale)** |
| 2-Bedrooms | 330 | **731,698** |
| ***­***3-Bedrooms | 150 |
| Townhomes | 36 |
| **Total** | **516** |  |
| ***East Plan Area*** |
| **New Parking Structure** | - | 0 |
| ***South Plan Area*** |
| **Multi-Family Residential (Rental)** |
| Studio | 60 | **449,816** |
| ***­***1-Bedroom | 167 |
| ***­***2-Bedrooms | 148 |
| ***­***3-Bedrooms | 17 |
| **Total** | **392** |
| ***Corner Plan Area*** |
| **Multi-Family Residential (Rental)** |
| Studio | 20 | **176,116** |
| ***­***1-Bedroom | 70 |
| ***­***2-Bedrooms | 59 |
| ***­***3-Bedrooms | 4 |
| **Total** | **153** |
| ***Project Total***  | ***1,061*** | ***902,001 existing office******1,080,875 new residential*** |
| *Source: TCA Architects, Inc., April 2018* |

***Access***

Vehicular access to the Proposed Project would be achieved via multiple entrances. The existing entrance from Fremont Avenue would be retained and would lead to a two-way private drive providing access to the Office and Corner Plan Areas. Two of the three existing entrances from Orange Street would also be retained primarily for the Project, with the first leading to parking areas for the existing office buildings to remain in the Office Plan Area and the second leading to a modified two-way private drive providing access to the residential areas of the North Plan. The existing entrance from Date Avenue would be retained and would lead to a two-way private drive, connecting to each of the private drives from the Orange Street frontage, providing access to the North, Office, and East Plan Areas. A new entrance from Date Avenue would be constructed farther south that would lead to a proposed two-way private drive providing access to the Corner, South, East, and Office Plan Areas and which would connect to the Fremont Avenue entrance across the Site. Lastly, a new entrance is proposed from Mission Road to provide access to the South and Corner Plan Areas. This entrance would connect to a new two-way private drive that would link to the Fremont Avenue and new Date Avenue entrances. Pedestrian access would be on all sides of the Project Site.

***Parking***

Table 3, Vehicle Parking, provides the amount of required and provided parking for the Project. The Project is required to have 2,057 spaces for the proposed residential uses on-site and would provide 2,057 spaces. The Project is required to have 2,290 spaces for the existing office uses to be retained on-site and would provide 2,290 spaces.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3Vehicle Parking**  |
| **Use** | **Plan Area Served (number of spaces)** | **Total** |
| **Office** | **North** | **East** | **South** | **Corner** |
| Residential | 0 | 1,135 | 0 | 663 | 259 | 2,057 |
| Office | 1,800 | 0 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 2,290 |
| **Total** | **4,347** |
| *Source: TCA Architects, Inc., April 2018* |

***Height***

The existing seven-story, 91-foot tall office building in the center of the Project Site would remain, as would the existing five-story, 86-foot tall office building adjacent to it. All of the other buildings, including all of the proposed new construction, would be lower than the code allowed 75-feet in height. The new five-story residential buildings in the North Plan Area would be a maximum of 60-feet in height above street grade, while the new five-story residential buildings in the Corner Plan Area would be a maximum of 62-feet in height above street grade. The new six-story residential buildings in the South Plan Area would be a maximum of nearly 67-feet in height above street grade, while the new five-level parking structure in the East Plan Area would be approximately 40-feet in height above street grade.

***Open Space***

Table 4, Open Space, provides the amount of required and provided open space to be included in the Proposed Project. Each proposed residential unit is required to have 425 square-feet of open space, at least 30-percent of which must be located in the primary amenity area. The proposed residential units would require a total of 450,925 square-feet of open space. The Project would provide a total of 716,434 square-feet of open space.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 4Open Space**  |
| **Use** | **Open Space in Plan Area (square feet)** | **Total** |
| **Office** | **North** | **East** | **South** | **Corner** |
| Residential: Required | 0 | 219,300 | 0 | 166,600 | 65,025 | 450,925 |
| *Residential: Provided* | *276,040* | *236,485* | *31,063* | *132,069* | *40,777* | *716,434* |
| Office: Required | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Office: Provided* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Source: TCA Architects, Inc., April 2018* |

***Landscaping***

All of the existing trees within the Office Plan Area would be retained. The remaining portions of the Project Site contain 214 trees. All of these trees would be removed and replaced during Project construction. The Project proposes 864 new trees on the Site.

### Construction Information

The estimated construction schedule is shown in Table 5, Construction Schedule. The Project would be split into a North Phase and a South Phase, referring to the general portion of the Site where construction activities would be concentrated. These two phases are expected to occur simultaneously, with construction of the North Phase requiring approximately 28 months and construction of the South Phase approximately 26 months. Operation of the newly construction portions of the Project would be expected to begin in 2019. Approximately 413,003 cubic yards of earthen material is expected to be exported from the Project Site during construction work.[[2]](#footnote-3) Demolition of approximately 104,242 square-feet of existing structures on-site would also generate material requiring hauling from the Site. The proposed haul route for excavated/demolished materials within the City would consist of Date Avenue to Mission Road to Fremont Avenue, and then either Fremont Avenue south to Interstate 10 or Valley Boulevard west to Interstate 710.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 5Construction Schedule |
| Phase | Approximate Duration |
| Demolition/Site Preparation | 2 months |
| Grading (Soldier Beam/Mass Excavation) | 7 months |
| Construction (Below Grade Concrete Garage & Type V Buildings) | 20 months |
| Paving | 2 months |
| Architectural Coatings | 9 months |
| *Construction schedule, including start, end, and duration dates are estimates only. Some phases will overlap.* |

**Project Objectives**

The objectives of the Project are as follows:

* Retain the existing office buildings within the Office Plan Area portion of the Site.
* Capitalize on a smart growth opportunity by intensifying a currently underutilized site with a mix of residential uses near public transit lines, commercial, and office space.
* Contribute housing stock toward the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation.
* Contribute to the economic health of the City by developing residential uses that generate local tax revenues, provide new construction jobs, and generate residents who support local businesses.

**Discretionary Actions**

The City is the Lead Agency for the Project. In order to construct the Project, the Applicant is requesting approval of the following actions from the City:

1. Pursuant to Alhambra Municipal Code (AMC) Chapter 23.62, Residential Planned Development Permit;
2. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.66, Conditional Use Permit for Urban Residential development in the PO Zone;
3. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 22.48, Vesting Tentative Tract Map for a 10-lot subdivision for condominium purposes;
4. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.68, Variance to permit shared parking;
5. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.64, Design Review; and
6. Pursuant to AMC Chapter 23.71, Development Agreement with a term of 10 years.

**Figure 1, Vicinity Map**

**Figure 2, Aerial Map**

**Figure 3, Site Plan**

2. initial study checklist

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LEAD CITY AGENCY**Alhambra Development Services Department | **COUNCIL DISTRICT**N/A | **DATE**October 2017 |
| **RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES**Southern California Air Quality Management District; Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board; CalTrans |
| **PROJECT TITLE/NO.**The Villages At The Alhambra | **CASE NO.** RP-17-1, CU-17-9, V-17-10, V-17-11, Design Review, & TT-74194 |
| **PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.**N/A | ** DOES have significant changes from previous actions.**** DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.** |
| **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**See Section 1 (Project Description). |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**See Section 1 (Project Description). |
| **PROJECT LOCATION**1000 South Fremont Avenue; 2215 West Mission Road; 629, 635, 701, 825 and 1003 South Date Avenue; Alhambra, CA 91803 |
| **PLANNING DISTRICT**City of Alhambra |  **STATUS:** ** PRELIMINARY** ** PROPOSED**  **ADOPTED 04/12/2010** |
| **EXISTING ZONING**PO | **MAX. DENSITY ZONING**PO: 75 units/1 acre. |  **DOES CONFORM TO PLAN** |
| **PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE**OP and PO | **MAX. DENSITY PLAN**OP: 75 units/1 acre |  ** DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN** |
| **SURROUNDING LAND USES**Office, commercial, warehouse, shipping, storage, railroad  | **PROJECT DENSITY**Maximum 67.8 units/acre |  ** NO DISTRICT PLAN** |
| **DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency)** |
| **On the basis of this initial evaluation:** |
| **** I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |
| **** I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.  |
|  I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. |
| **** I find the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. |
| **** I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Title |

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to a project like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less that significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross referenced).
5. Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
	1. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
	2. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
	3. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
	1. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
	2. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

|  |
| --- |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** |

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Aesthetics |  Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Population/Housing |
| Agricultural and Forestry Resources | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Public Services |
| Air Quality |  Hydrology/Water Quality | Recreation |
| Biological Resources | Land Use/Planning | Transportation/TrafficTribal Cultural Resources |
|  Cultural Resources | Mineral Resources | Utilities/Service Systems |
| Geology/Soils | Noise | Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| **INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)** |
| **BACKGROUND** |
| **PROPONENT NAME**Elite-TRC Alhambra Community LLC | **PHONE NUMBER**626-300-5000 |
| **PROPONENT ADDRESS**1000 S. Fremont Avenue, Unit 1, Alhambra, CA 91803 |
| **AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST**City of Alhambra Development Services Department | **DATE SUBMITTED**October 2017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS** | (Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets) |
|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| **I. Aesthetics.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**Response a:** |  |  |  |  |

A significant impact would occur if a proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially blocks a scenic vista. Panoramic views or vistas provide visual access to a large geographic area, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance. Panoramic views are usually associated with vantage points looking out over a section of urban or natural area, which provide a geographical orientation not commonly available. Examples of panoramic views might include an urban skyline, valley, mountain range, the ocean, or other water bodies. The Project Site is in an urbanized portion of Alhambra, and topographically relatively flat. The Project would maintain the existing mid-rise office buildings on the Site currently and construct new residential buildings (up to approximately 67 feet in total height). The Project would increase the overall building heights on the Project Site from the existing surface parking lots and low-rise warehouse, storage, and office buildings, having a potential adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, this potential impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact would occur only where scenic resources would be damaged or removed by the project. The Project Site does not contain trees with scenic significance or rock outcroppings and is not located within a state scenic highway. The Project Site does not contain any recognized historic buildings, nor does it contain any recognized natural features. The Project Site is not adjacent to a City-designated scenic highway. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a potential impact with respect to this criterion and no further analysis is necessary.

**Response c:**

Asignificant impact may occur if a project introduces incompatible visual elements on the Project Site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the area. The Project would increase the building heights on the Site from existing uses and would introduce new architectural elements to the area that are consistent with what exists currently. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project introduces new sources of light or glare on the Project Site which would be incompatible with the areas surrounding the Site or which pose a safety hazard, such as to motorists utilizing adjacent streets.

*Artificial Light*

An adverse impact would occur if the project created a substantial new source of artificial light that would adversely affect the surrounding area. Artificial light may be generated from individual (i.e., point) sources as well as from indirect sources of reflected light. Uses such as residences, hospitals, and hotels are considered light sensitive since they are typically occupied by persons who are subject to disturbance by bright light sources during evening hours. The Project Site is located in a well-lit urban portion of Alhambra where there are high levels of ambient nighttime lighting including street lighting, architectural and security lighting, and indoor building illumination (light emanating from the interior of structures which passes through windows), all of which are common to more densely populated areas. Nevertheless, aesthetic impacts to nearby properties may result due to excessive illumination at the Project Site. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

*Glare*

An adverse impact would occur if the project created a substantial new source of glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Glare is a common phenomenon in the southern California area due mainly to the occurrence of a high number of days per year with direct sunlight and the highly urbanized nature of the region, which results in a large concentration of potentially reflective surfaces. Potential reflective surfaces in the Project vicinity include automobiles traveling and parked on streets in the vicinity of the Project, exterior building windows, and surfaces of brightly painted buildings in the Project vicinity. Excessive glare not only restricts visibility but increases the ambient heat reflectivity in a given area. The potential exists for glass or other shiny building materials to cause glare impacts. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

*Shade/Shadow*

The analysis of the Project’s potential shade/shadow impacts focuses on changes in shading conditions for those off-site uses and activities that are dependent on access to natural light. Off-site uses and activities that meet this criterion include routinely used outdoor spaces associated with residential, recreational, or institutional uses (pre-schools, schools, nursing homes); or commercial uses such as pedestrian-oriented outdoor spaces or restaurants with outdoor eating areas; and existing solar collectors. The Project would maintain the existing mid-rise office buildings on-site and would construct new residential buildings (up to approximately 67 feet in height). Because there are no land uses, which are considered to be shade-sensitive, adjacent to the Project Site, no adverse off-site impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of Project development. Thus, further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **II. Agricultural And Forestry Resources.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest Range and Assessment Project and Forest Legacy Assessment project and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined by Public Resources Code section 122220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  |

**Responses a-e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to result in the conversion of state-designated agricultural land from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use, the conversion of land zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Act contract from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use, results in the rezoning of forest land or timberland, or involves other changes in the existing environment which, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project Site is currently developed with multiple buildings and surface parking and is in a highly urbanized area. The Site does not contain any agricultural uses and is not delineated as such on any maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.[[3]](#footnote-4) The Site is zoned Professional Office (PO). No Williamson Act Contract applies to the Site. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **III. Air Quality.** The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in: |  |  |  |  |
| a.Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ❑ |  |  |  |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment(ozone, PM 2.5, & PM 10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is not consistent with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The Project Site is located within the 6,600 square-mile South Coast Air Basin (Basin). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is required, pursuant to the Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment (i.e., ozone [1-hour and 8-hour standards], PM10, and PM2.5). As such, the project would be subject to the SCAQMD’s AQMP. The AQMP contains a comprehensive list of pollution control strategies directed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. These strategies are developed, in part, based on regional population, housing, and employment projections prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

SCAG is the regional planning agency for Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino and Imperial Counties, and addresses regional issues relating to transportation, the economy, community development and the environment.[[4]](#footnote-5) With regard to air quality planning, SCAG has prepared the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), which includes Growth Management and Regional Mobility chapters that form the basis for the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP, and are utilized in the preparation of the air quality forecasts and consistency analysis included in the AQMP. Both the RCPG and AQMP are based, in part, on projections originating with the City’s General Plan.

A significant impact may occur if the Project is inconsistent with the growth assumptions upon which the AQMP was based. As a result, Project development could have an adverse effect on the SCAQMD’s implementation of the AQMP. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A project would result in a significant air quality impact if project-related emissions exceed federal, state or regional standards or thresholds, or if project-related emissions would substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Construction and operation of the Project will result in an increase in uses which has the potential to generate emissions which could exceed federal, state, or regional standards or thresholds or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a federal or state non-attainment pollutant. With regard to determining the significance of the Project’s contribution to regional emissions, the SCAQMD recommends that a project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project-specific impacts. Therefore, according to the SCAQMD, an individual project that generates construction or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment. The Project has the potential to add a cumulatively considerable contribution to a federal or state non-attainment pollutant. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Land uses that are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others include hospitals, schools, residences, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, and retirement homes.[[5]](#footnote-6) Sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity include residential areas to the south across Mission Road, the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, and Front Street. The Project could expose these sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction and operation. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response e:**

A significant impact would only occur if the project would generate substantial odors. The SCAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* identifies those land uses that are associated with odor complaints, which typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project does not include any of the uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Compliance with industry standard odor control practices, SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance), and SCAQMD Best Available Control Technology Guidelines would limit potential objectionable odor impacts during the Project’s long-term operations phase and no significant impacts would be anticipated.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents as well as asphalt paving. SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1113 limit the amount of volatile organic compounds from cutback asphalt and architectural coatings and solvents, respectively. Via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, no construction activities or materials are proposed which would create a significant level of objectionable odors and potential objectionable odor impacts during the Project’s short-term construction phase would thus be limited to a less than significant level. Therefore, further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IV.** **Biological Resources.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?  |  |  |  |  |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?  |  |  |  |  |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance(e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)? |  |  |  |  |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact would occur if a project would remove or modify habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited above. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of Alhambra and is currently developed with multiple buildings, paving, and landscaping. The Site does not contain any natural open spaces, act as a wildlife corridor, nor possess any areas of significant biological resource value. No hydrological features are present on the Site and there are no sensitive habitats present. Due to the lack of biotic resources, no candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified in local plans, policies, regulations, by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would be expected to occur on the Site. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required. Further evaluation of this issue is not required, as impacts would be less than significant.

**Response b:**

A significant impact would occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community identified locally, regionally, or by the state and federal regulatory agencies cited would be adversely modified by a project. There are no riparian areas located on or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response c:**

A significant impact would occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, would be modified or removed by a project. Review of the National Wetlands Inventory identified no wetlands or water features on the Project Site.[[6]](#footnote-7) Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response d:**

A significant impact would occur if a project would interfere or remove access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The Project Site is developed with existing buildings and surface parking and is not within a notable corridor for the movement of any native resident or migratory birds. The Site is located within an urban area that is highly disturbed. The Project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could interfere with the movement of migratory birds or other wildlife species. In addition, no bodies of water exist on the Site to provide habitat for fish. As such, Project implementation would neither interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response e:**

A significant adverse impact would occur if a project were inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The Project would be confined to a previously developed site and would not involve substantial changes in the existing environment. No local ordinances protecting biological resources are applicable to the Project Site.The Project would remove existing trees on the Site and would provide replacement trees per applicable requirements of the City. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response f:**

A significant impact would occur if a project would be inconsistent with policies in any draft or adopted conservation plan. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of Alhambra and is currently developed with buildings, paving, and minimal landscaping. The Site is not located in or adjacent to an existing or proposed Significant Ecological Area.[[7]](#footnote-8) Additionally, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that applies to the Project Site. The Project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans. Therefore, no impact would occur, and further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **V. Cultural Resources:** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined inState CEQA Section 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines an historical resources as: 1) a resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; 2) a resource listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting certain state guidelines; or 3) an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided that the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. A project-related significant adverse effect would occur if the proposed project were to adversely affect a historical resource meeting one of the above definitions.

The State Office of Historic Preservation recommends that properties over 45 years of age be evaluated for their potential as historic resources. Several of the buildings on the Project Site are over 45 years old. Accordingly, further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

**Response b:**

Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources which met the criteria for historical resources, as discussed above, or resources which constitute unique archaeological resources. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the Project was to affect archaeological resources which fall under either of these categories. The excavation of the subterranean parking garages has the potential to affect unknown archaeological resources. Project impacts with respect to archaeological resources are therefore potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project would disturb paleontological resources or geologic features which presently exist within the Project Site. The excavation of the subterranean parking garages has the potential to affect unknown paleontological resources. Project impacts with respect to paleontological resources are therefore potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project would disturb previously interred human remains. The Project Site is located in a heavily urbanized area and developed with existing buildings and surface parking. The likelihood of encountering human remains on the Project Site is minimal. However, during the construction phase and excavation of the subterranean parking garages, there is a possibility that human remains could be encountered. Project impacts with respect to human remains are therefore potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VI. Geology and Soils.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Exposure of people or structures to 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? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a.i:**

Fault rupture is defined as the surface displacement that occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. Based on criteria established by the California Geological Survey (CGS), faults can be classified as active, potentially active, or inactive. Active faults may be designated as Earthquake Fault Zones under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, which includes standards regulating development adjacent to active faults.

There are several principal active faults in the metropolitan region. The greatest of these is the San Andreas Fault, approximately 30 miles (55 kilometers) northwest of Alhambra, on the other side of the San Gabriel Mountains. Several other important active faults lie closer to and even within the populated area of greater Los Angeles. These include the Sierra Madre fault zone, which runs through parts of Altadena and other foothills communities, the Raymond Fault in San Marino, and the Hollywood and Santa Monica Faults along the southern edge of the Hollywood Hills and Santa Monica Mountains.

The Site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The Project would comply with the CGS *Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (1997), which provides guidance for evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with seismic safety requirements in the UBC and the AMC. Nonetheless, as the Site is located in a seismically active region, potential impacts associated with fault rupture will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response a.ii:**

A significant impact may occur if a project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the southern California region. Southern California is active seismic region (UBC Seismic Zone IV). Although the Project Site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Zone, the Site is susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. The main seismic hazard affecting the Site is moderate to strong ground shaking. The Project would conform to all applicable provisions of the City Building Code and the UBC with respect to new construction. Adherence to current building codes and engineering practices would ensure that the Project would not expose people, property or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the southern California region. Nonetheless, as the Site is located in a seismically active region, this potential impact from ground shaking will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response a.iii:**

Liquefaction is a form of earthquake-induced ground failure that occurs primarily in relatively shallow, loose, granular, water-saturated soils. Liquefaction can occur when these types of soils lose their inherent shear strength due to excess water pressure that builds up during repeated movement from seismic activity. Low groundwater table and the presence of loose to medium dense sand and silty sand are factors that could contribute to the potential for liquefaction. The City of Alhambra is not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction because the groundwater table is greater than 50 feet below ground surface.[[8]](#footnote-9) The Project would be required to comply with building regulations set forth by the State Geologist, which require site analysis prior to development. Furthermore, the Project would comply with the CGS *Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (1997), which provides guidance for evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards including liquefaction. Nonetheless, potential impacts associated with liquefaction will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response a.iv:**

A significant adverse effect may occur if a project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding. Landslides can occur on slopes under normal gravitational forces and during earthquakes when strong ground motion can cause failure. Landslides tend to occur in loosely consolidated, wet soil, and/or rock on unstable sloping terrain. The Project Site is relatively flat and no significant slopes or hillsides are present on-site or immediately surrounding the Site. Additionally, the Site is not classified as a landslide hazard zone on the California Geologic Survey Seismic Hazards Map.[[9]](#footnote-10) Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur and further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project exposes large areas to the erosional effects of wind or water for a protracted period of time. The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of Alhambra and is currently fully developed with existing buildings and surface parking. Any topsoil that may exist on the Site was previously blended with other on-site soils during previous site preparation/grading activities. As such, development of the Project would not result in substantial loss of topsoil. Construction activities such as grading and excavation could create a potential for soil erosion. The potential for soil erosion on the Project Site is low due to the generally level topography of the Project Site and the presence of off-site drainage facilities. Project construction would require the removal of existing pavement and grading earth and excavation. Conformance with the City Building Code, which includes construction requirements for grading, excavation, and use of fill, would reduce the potential for wind or waterborne erosion. Therefore, Project impacts related to soil erosion during construction, with the inclusion of the proposed design features, are anticipated to be minimal. The potential for soil erosion during Project operation would be relatively low due to the urbanized nature of the Project site and area and the generally level topography of the Site. In addition, the Project Site will be improved with new buildings, hardscape and landscape. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. The Project Site is located in an urbanized portion of Alhambra and is currently developed with existing buildings and surface parking. Subsidence is a localized mass movement that involves the gradual downward settling or sinking of the ground, resulting from the extraction of mineral resources, subsurface oil, groundwater, or other subsurface liquids, such as natural gas. Since the Project may require dewatering for construction of the subterranean parking, the potential for subsidence may occur. Therefore, this issue and soil suitability will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils are clay-based soils that tend to expand (increase in volume) as they absorb water and shrink as water is drawn away. If soils below the development consist of expansive clays within a zone where the water content can fluctuate, foundation movement and/or damage can occur. Although the Project must comply with building regulations set forth by the California Building Code, the potential for an impact still exists. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area not served by an existing sewer system. The Project Site is located in a developed area of the City of Alhambra, which is served by a wastewater collection, conveyance and treatment system operated by the City. No septic tanks or alternative disposal systems are necessary, nor are they proposed. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact upon the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |  |  |  |  |

**Responses a and b:**

Construction and operation of the Project has the potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions because it will result in new construction and uses, which may directly or indirectly have a significant impact on the environment. In addition, the Project will need to be fully evaluated for consistency with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, the Project’s generation of greenhouse gas emissions and consistency with relevant plans will be analyzed in the EIR.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials |  |  |  |  |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |  |  |  |  |
| d. 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  |  |  |  |  |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area? |  |  |  |  |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  |  |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project involves use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions that could adversely affect sensitive receptors. The construction activities for the Proposed Project are anticipated to use typical, although potentially hazardous, construction materials, including vehicle fuels, paints, mastics, solvents, and other acidic and alkaline solutions that would require special handling, transport, and disposal. During operation, residential and office uses would store and use maintenance products, such as cleaning materials. Since the Project would require the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the potential for an impact exists. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project could potentially pose a hazard to nearby sensitive receptors by releasing hazardous materials into the environment through accident or upset conditions. As some of the existing buildings occupying the Project Site were constructed prior to 1980, they are likely to contain asbestos-containing-materials (ACMs) as well as lead-based-paint (LBP). Polychlorinated biphenyls and/or hazardous petroleum products (PCBs) could also be present on-site. Therefore, construction activities may have the potential to expose construction workers and sensitive receptors in the Project area to hazards associated with accidental exposure to ACMs, LBP, PCBs, and/or petroleum products. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant adverse effect may occur if a Project Site is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and is projected to release toxic emissions which pose a health hazard beyond regulatory thresholds. The Project Site is located within 0.25 mile of the following schools:

* California American University, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* Pinnacle College, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* Platt College, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* Keck School of Medicine of USC, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* American College of Commerce & Technology, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* Alliant International University, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue #5, located on the Project Site (within the Office Plan Area);
* Emery Park Elementary School, 2821 W. Commonwealth Avenue, approximately 0.25 mile northwest of the Project Site; and
* Little Sunshine Pre-School, 2401 W. Valley Boulevard, approximately 1,000 feet south of the Project Site.

The Project would use, at most, minimal amounts of hazardous materials for routine cleaning and maintenance. However, since construction of the Project would require the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the potential for an impact exists. Therefore, further analysis of this issue in the EIR is required.

**Response d:**

California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires various state agencies to compile lists of hazardous waste disposal facilities, unauthorized releases from underground storage tanks, contaminated drinking water wells and solid waste facilities where there is known migration of hazardous waste and submit such information to the Secretary for Environmental Protection on at least an annual basis. A significant impact may occur if a Project Site is included on any of the above lists and poses an environmental hazard to surrounding sensitive uses. Typically, the types of land uses on the Project Site (residential and commercial) are not anticipated to represent a hazard to the public or environment. Soil and soil vapor monitoring is currently occurring on the Project Site as a result of past industrial/manufacturing uses of the property that pre-date its current uses.[[10]](#footnote-11) Additionally, previous regulatory actions concerning other previous legacy pollutants have been undertaken on portions of the Project Site. Thus, the potential exists for the Project Site and/or any number of hazardous materials sites near the Project Site, including sites up-gradient, to be listed according to Government Code Section 65962.5 which could create a significant hazard to the public. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Responses e and f:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located within two miles of a public airport, and subject to a safety hazard or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response g:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or would generate traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such a plan. The construction and operation activities have the potential to impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way as well as interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response h:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire. The Project Site is not located in proximity to wildland areas, nor is it located within a City-designated fire hazard area. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IX. Hydrology And Water Quality**. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  |  |  |  |  |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site? |  |  |  |  |
| e. 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? |  |  |  |  |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  |  |  |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |  |  |  |  |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  |  |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, inquiry or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |  |  |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project discharges water that does not meet the quality standards of agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. Significant impacts would also occur if a project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regard to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include compliance with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements to reduce potential water quality impacts. The Project involves the development of residential and commercial uses on land that is currently developed. The Project has the potential to alter the existing surface water runoff drainage pattern and rainfall absorption, causing a net increase of rates of stormwater discharge which may exceed water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, this potential impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Response b:

A significant impact may occur if a project includes deep excavations which have the potential to interfere with groundwater movement, or includes withdrawal of groundwater or paving of existing permeable surfaces that are important to groundwater recharge. The Project does not propose any permanent groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the Site would be derived from the City’s existing water supply and infrastructure. However, it is possible that there would be an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces located on the Project Site upon completion of project construction. In addition, the construction would include excavation and could possibly require dewatering at the Site which might have a potentially significant impact on groundwater. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess this potential impact.

Response c:

A significant impact may occur if a project would substantially alter drainage patterns resulting in a significant increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of a project. There are no natural watercourses on the Site. The Project Site is currently developed and has ornamental trees and landscaping. As part of the Project, grading and construction activities may temporarily alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site. If not properly designed, the Project could result in erosion and siltation during construction and operation that is potentially significant. Therefore, the EIR will provide analysis to assess this potential.

Response d:

A significant impact may occur if a project results in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the project would result in flooding conditions affecting the Project Site or nearby properties. Grading and construction activities on the Project Site may temporarily alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site and off-site flows, thereby having a potential impact. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the potential to result in impacts in drainage patterns.

Response e:

A significant impact may occur if a project would increase the volume of stormwater runoff to a level which exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system serving the Project Site, or if the proposed project would introduce substantial new sources of polluted runoff. Construction of the project could contribute to the degradation of existing surface water quality conditions primarily due to: 1) potential erosion and sedimentation during the grading phase; 2) particulate matter from dirt and dust generated on the Site; and 3) construction activities and equipment. The EIR will provide analysis to assess the potential of the Project to result in these impacts.

**Response f:**

As previously discussed, the Project could involve the use of contaminants that could potentially degrade water quality if not properly handled and stored. Therefore, the EIR will provide additional analysis to assess this potential impact.

**Response g-h:**

The Project Site is not located within an area identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as being potentially subject to 100-year floods.[[11]](#footnote-12) As the Site is located in an area of minimal flooding, the Project would not introduce people or structures to an area of high flood risk. Therefore, the Project would not contain any significant risks of flooding and would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows. No impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**Response i:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were located in an area where flooding, including flooding associated with dam or levee failure, would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death. The Project Site is not located downslope from any reservoirs or other surface water storage facilities that could result in a potentially significant impact at the Site due to dam failure. As such, no impact would occur and no further analysis of this issue is required.

Response j:

A significant impact may occur if a project is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to be potentially at risk of the effects of seismically-induced tidal phenomena (i.e., seiche and tsunami) or if the site is located adjacent to a hillside area with soil characteristics that would indicate potential susceptibility to mudslides or mudflows. The Project Site is not located in an area that has been identified as being susceptible to tsunamis, and is located approximately 20 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not near any major water bodies. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with seiches or tsunamis at the Site. In addition, the Site is in an urbanized portion of the City of Alhambra and is relatively flat, thereby limiting the potential for inundation by mudflow. No further analysis of this issue is required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **X.** **Land Use And Planning**. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Physically divide an established community? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?  |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community (a typical example would be a project which involved a continuous right-of-way such as a roadway which would divide a community and impede access between parts of the community). The Project Site does not currently contain any residences and the proposed development would retain the existing office building campus in the northwestern quadrant of the Site. Therefore, no impact would occur with respect to dividing an established community and no further analysis of this issue is required.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the General Plan or zoning designations currently applicable to the Project Site and would cause adverse environmental effects, which the General Plan and zoning ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate. The Project would require several discretionary actions by the City which could conflict with land use plans, policies or regulations. The EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the potential impact from the project’s consistency with applicable General Plan policies, zoning code restrictions, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) policies, any other applicable City or regional plans and policies (such as the SCAQMD and Metro Congestion Management Plan).

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with policies in any draft or adopted conservation plan. The Project Site is fully developed and is located in an urbanized area. As discussed under Checklist Question IV(f), there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that applies to the Site. Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XI. Mineral Resources**. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally-important mineral resource, and if the project converted an existing or potential future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for regionally-important mineral resource extraction. The Project Site is not located within a designated oil field or oil drilling area, and no active or historic oil wells are located either on or in the vicinity of the Site.[[12]](#footnote-13) Additionally, the Project Site is located within an identified Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as designated by the State Mining and Geology Board.[[13]](#footnote-14) Areas designated MRZ-3 are considered to contain mineral deposits for which the significance cannot be determined from available data. The nearest oil production areas to the Project Site are the Boyle Heights Oil Field to the southwest (approximately four miles from the Site) and the Montebello Oil field to the southeast (approximately 3.5 miles from the Site). Therefore, the Project would have no impact with respect to loss of availability of a known regionally-important mineral resource and further evaluation is not required.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource extraction, and if the project converted an existing or potential future locally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the project affected access to a site used or potentially available for locally-important mineral resource extraction. Much of the area on and around the Project Site has been developed with structures and is inaccessible for mining extraction. Furthermore, the Project Site is developed and located in an urbanized area. Development of the Project would therefore not result in impacts associated with the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, no impact would occur and further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XII. Noise.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |  |  |  |  |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  |  |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  |  |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if the Project would generate excess noise that would cause the ambient noise environment at the Project Site to exceed noise level standards set forth in the City of Alhambra Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance) and other related policies. Construction would require the use of construction equipment during grading, excavation, hauling, establishing building foundations, and other construction activities. The concurrent use of construction equipment and machinery has the potential to increase noise levels above the applicable standards of the City’s Noise Ordinance. Existing on-site noise sources include the existing office and warehouse/storage uses. The Project would increase the activities that would occur on the Site and noise levels from on-site sources also have the potential to increase during Project operation. In addition, the traffic attributable to the Project has the potential to cause noise levels to exceed City Noise Ordinance standards. Therefore, the potential impact from these noise increases will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact would occur if the Project were to generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Construction of the Project would require the use of heavy construction equipment during grading, excavation, hauling, establishing building foundations, and other construction activities. The use of earthmoving equipment and machinery has the potential to cause groundborne vibration and noise which could have a potentially significant impact. During operation, ground-borne vibration may also occur from increased road traffic or other on-site activities. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if the operation would introduce substantial new sources of noise or would substantially add to existing sources of noise within the vicinity of the Site. Traffic and human activity associated with the Project, as described above, have the potential to increase ambient noise levels above existing levels which could have a potentially significant impact. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the Project Site during construction of the proposed project or on a periodic basis during the operation of the proposed project. As discussed above, construction activity has the potential to temporarily or periodically increase ambient noise levels above existing levels. In addition, the increase in on-site uses may also result in periodic increases in noise levels which could have a potentially significant impact. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project is located within an airport land use plan and would introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the Project Site during construction of the proposed project. As discussed under Checklist Question VIII(e), the Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The Project would therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from an airport use. Therefore, no impact would occur and further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response f:**

This question would apply to a project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. As discussed under Checklist Question VIII(f), there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Site. Therefore, no impact would occur and further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIII.** **Population And Housing**. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Induce substantial 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)?  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would locate new development such as homes, businesses, or infrastructure, with the effect of substantially inducing population growth that would otherwise not have occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude. The Project would result in the generation of jobs (both for construction and operation) and would also result in an increased residential population which could induce potentially significant population growth. Therefore, this issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would result in displacement of a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project would not displace any housing since there is no housing on the Site. Further, the Project would develop residential units. Therefore, no impact would occur and further evaluation is not required.

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would result in displacement of existing residents, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project would not displace a substantial number of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is no housing on the Site. Therefore, no impact would occur and further evaluation is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIV. Public Services.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Fire protection? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Police protection? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Schools? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Parks? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Other governmental services (including roads)? |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if the Alhambra Fire Department (AFD) could not adequately serve the Project based upon response time, access, or fire hydrant/water availability, necessitating the construction of a new or physically altered facility. The Project is served by:

* Fire Station No. 74, located at 2505 W. Norwood Place, approximately 1,300 feet from the Site.
* Fire Station No. 73, located at 2200 W. Main Street, approximately 0.6 mile from the Site.

The Project would increase the intensity of development at the Project Site, which may require the provision of new facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios. This potential impact of the Project on fire protection services will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if the Alhambra Police Department (APD) could not adequately serve the Project, necessitating a new or physically altered station. If existing service capacities are exceeded, new facilities, equipment and/or personnel may be required to maintain acceptable response times and service levels. The Project would increase the intensity of development at the Project Site, resulting in a potentially significant impact on police protection services. This will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the Alhambra Unified School District (AUSD). The Project would directly impact local schools by providing new housing to families with school-age children, and indirectly impact schools by providing jobs that may cause employees with families to relocate to an area, thus necessitating new school facilities. The potential impact of the Project on school facilities will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact would occur if the available City of Alhambra Parks and Recreation Department (APRD) recreation and park services could not accommodate the number of users created by a project, necessitating new or physically altered facilities and the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The Project includes the development of residential uses that would increase the permanent residential population of the area. Residential developments typically have the greatest potential to result in impacts to parks since they generate a permanent increase in residential population. Therefore, there could be a potentially significant impact from new parks or recreation facilities. The EIR will evaluate the Project’s impacts on park facilities.

**Response e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth that could exceed the capacity of public facilities (such as libraries), necessitating a new or physically altered library, the construction of which would have significant physical impacts on the environment. The Project is served by the Alhambra Civic Center Library, located at 101 S. First Street, approximately one mile northeast of the Site. Residential developments typically have the greatest potential to result in impacts to libraries since they generate a permanent increase in residential population. Therefore, the EIR will evaluate the Project’s potential impacts upon library facilities. The Project’s potential impacts on roads is addressed under Part XVI, Transportation/Circulation. No other governmental services are anticipated to be potentially impacted by the Project.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XV. Recreation.**  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact may occur if the Project would include substantial employment or population growth that could generate an increased demand for public park facilities which exceeds the capacities of existing parks and/or cause premature deterioration of the park facilities. The Project involves the construction of new residential uses that could increase the demand for neighborhood and regional parks and recreational facilities in the area (see XIV, Parks). While on-site open space and recreational amenities would be included, the Project has the potential to increase demands upon several public park facilities located within the vicinity. The EIR will evaluate the potential of the Project to cause an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur.

**Response b:**

As discussed above, the Project has the potential to increase demands upon recreational facilities that may in turn require the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The construction of these facilities may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, the potential of such facilities to have an adverse effect on the environment will be analyzed in the EIR.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVI. Transportation/Circulation**. Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? |  |  |  |  |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact would occur if the project generated traffic at each study intersection would exceed City of Alhambra Public Works Department (APWD) standards. The Project may result in potentially significant traffic impacts during operation and construction. The potential impacts of the Project will be evaluated in a traffic study in accordance with the assumptions, methodology, and procedures approved by APWD and the complete analysis will be included in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if adopted California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) thresholds are exceeded. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was adopted to regulate and monitor regional traffic growth and transportation improvement programs. The CMP designates a transportation network which includes all state highways and some arterials within the County of Los Angeles. If the level of service standard deteriorates on the CMP network, then local jurisdictions must prepare a deficiency plan that is in conformance with the Los Angeles County CMP. The intent of the CMP is to provide information to decision makers to assist in the allocation of transportation funds through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process. A CMP traffic impact analysis is required if a project would add 150 or more trips to the freeway, in either direction during either the AM or PM weekday peak hour. An analysis is also required at all CMP monitoring intersections where a project would add 50 or more peak hour trips. The local CMP requires that all CMP monitoring intersections be analyzed where a project would likely add 50 or more trips during the peak hours. It is unknown at this time whether the Project may result in a potentially significant traffic impact at any CMP monitoring locations. However, there could be an impact if levels of service standards are exceeded. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant impact would occur if a proposed project included an aviation-related use and would result in safety risks associated with such use. The Project does not include any aviation-related uses. Furthermore, as discussed under Checklist Question VIII(e), the Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or private use airport. Safety risks associated with a change in air traffic patterns would not occur. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project includes new roadway design or introduces a new land use or project features into an area with specific transportation requirements, characteristics, or project access or other features designed in such a way as to create hazardous conditions. It is unknown at this time whether the Project may increase hazards due to a design feature. In addition, there could be a potentially significant impact if the driveway width and queuing length result in inadequate space to accommodate the vehicles for the Project. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

**Response e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project design does not provide emergency access meeting the requirements of the AFD or in any other way threatens the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the Project Site or adjacent uses. The increased traffic during construction and operation could obstruct emergency vehicle access to the Project Site and adjacent uses in the Project vicinity. Therefore, the EIR will provide additional analysis to assess the potential for the Project to result in impacts on emergency access.

**Response f:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification to existing alternative transportation facilities located on- or off-site. There are transit stops nearby on Fremont Avenue that could be impacted by the Project. The potential of the Project to decrease the performance of these facilities or conflict with adopted policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation will be analyzed in the EIR.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources.** Would the project:Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? |  |  |  |  |
| b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

Although no cultural resources eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources, are known to exist at the Project Site, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if the Project was to affect tribal cultural resources which fall under these criteria. The excavation of the subterranean parking garages has the potential to affect unknown cultural resources. Project impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources are therefore potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVIII. Utilities.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  |  |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  |  |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? |  |  |  |  |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?  |  |  |  |  |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? |  |  |  |  |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

A significant impact would occur if a project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City of Alhambra Public Works Department, Utilities Division, provides wastewater collection services for the Project Site. Wastewater discharges are conveyed via the City’s sewer system to the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County’s trunk sewers for transport to the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant (WNWRP), which is a public facility and is therefore subject to the state’s wastewater treatment requirements which, in the Project area, are enforced by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). The WNWRP has a current capacity of 15 million gallons of wastewater per day (mgd). The Project’s introduction of new residential uses in combination with the retention of existing commercial uses could result in the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the LARWQCB. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response b:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that new facilities would be needed, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. The Project is expected to increase water usage and wastewater generated as compared to the existing uses on the Project Site. The potentially significant impact with respect to the capacity of the water and wastewater treatment plants and the existing water and sewer lines that serve the Site will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response c:**

A significant impact may occur if the volume of stormwater runoff were to increase to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the Project Site, to the extent that existing facilities would need to be expanded and the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. The addition of new uses to the Project Site may require new or expanded stormwater facilities which could have a potentially significant impact. The potential of the Project to result in the construction of these new or expanded stormwater facilities will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response d:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase water consumption to such a degree that new water sources would need to be identified, or that existing resources would be consumed at a pace greater than planned for by purveyors, distributors, and service providers. The Project is estimated to consume more water than the existing uses on the Site, resulting in a potentially significant impact if new or expanded entitlements are needed. Given the Project’s size, a Water Supply Assessment by the Alhambra Public Works Department would be conducted to evaluate the availability of water to serve the Project. Any potential impacts with respect to water supply will be analyzed within the EIR.

**Response e:**

A significant impact may occur if a project would increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the Project Site would be exceeded. As discussed under Checklist Question XVII(b), the Project is estimated to generate an increase in wastewater as compared to the existing development on the Site. Therefore, this potential impact related to wastewater treatment plant capacity and availability will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response f:**

A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree such that the existing and projected landfill capacity would be insufficient to accommodate the additional solid waste. Since the Project will result in an increase in residents and users, there could be a potentially significant impact if those solid waste disposal needs are not accommodated by a landfill. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with the ability of the local landfills to serve the Project will be analyzed in the EIR.

**Response g:**

Solid waste management is guided by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, which emphasizes resource conservation through reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste. The Act requires that localities conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study (SWGS) and develop a Source Reduction Recycling Element (SRRE). Solid waste generated on-site by the Project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and policies related to solid waste. The Project would provide clearly marked, durable, source sorted recycling bins throughout the Project Site to facilitate recycling in accordance with City requirements. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. Further evaluation of this issue is not required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVIII. Mandatory Findings Of Significance.** |  |  |  |  |
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |  |  |  |  |
| b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). |  |  |  |  |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |  |  |  |  |

**Response a:**

Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, the project has the potential to result in significant impacts with regard to the issues addressed herein. Therefore, the Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment. An EIR will be prepared to analyze and document these potentially significant impacts. All feasible mitigation measures will be identified to reduce the identified significant impacts.

**Response b:**

The potential for cumulative impacts occurs when the independent impacts of the project are combined with the impacts of other projects in proximity to the Project Site such that impacts occur that are greater than the impacts of the project alone. Located within the vicinity of the Project Site are other past, current, and/or reasonably foreseeable projects whose development, in conjunction with that of the Project, may contribute to potential cumulative impacts. Impacts of the Project on both an individual and cumulative basis will be addressed in the EIR. Therefore, the potential for cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems resulting from the project in conjunction with the identified cumulative development projects in the surrounding area will be analyzed and documented in the EIR. The potential for significant cumulative impacts from the other environmental issues that are not to be evaluated and documented in the EIR can be assessed at this time. Cumulative impacts are concluded to be less than significant for those issues for which it has been determined that the Project’s incremental contribution would be less than significant, including agriculture/forestry resources, biological resources, and mineral resources. Therefore, only those aspects of the Project to be analyzed and documented in the EIR are concluded to have the potential to combine with other development proposals in the surrounding area to generate significant cumulative impacts.

**Response c:**

As discussed above, construction and operation of the Project could result in environmental effects that could have substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As a result, these potential effects will be analyzed further in the EIR.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (Attach additional sheets if necessary)****As noted above, the lead agency has determined that the proposed project may result in a significant effect on the environment, and an environmental impact report is required.** |
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