

## 2. Introduction

---

### 2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they will carry out. This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The environmental impact report (EIR) is the public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts and to identify alternatives or mitigation measures to lessen or avoid the significant impacts of a project. The EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

The lead agency means “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment” (CEQA § 21067). The Hacienda La Puente Unified School District (HLPUSD or District) has the principal responsibility for carrying out of the Wedgeworth K-8 School and Residential Development Project. For this reason, HLPUSD is the CEQA lead agency for this project.

The intent of the DEIR is to provide sufficient information on the potential environmental impacts of the Wedgeworth K-8 School and Residential Development Project to allow HLPUSD to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the District are described in Section 3.4, *Intended Uses of the EIR*.

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with requirements of the:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, §§ 21000 et seq.)
- State Guidelines for the Implementation of the CEQA of 1970 (CEQA Guidelines), as amended (California Code of Regulations, §§ 15000 et seq.)

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public about the environmental impacts of the development and operation of the Wedgeworth K-8 School and Residential Development Project. This DEIR addresses impacts that may be significant and adverse, evaluates alternatives to the project, and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts.

## 2. Introduction

### 2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The HLPUSD determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study on July 29, 2019 (see Appendix A). Comments received during the initial study's public review period, from July 29 to August 27, 2019, are in Appendix B.

Table 2-1 compiles the comment letters received from government agencies during the NOP/Initial Study public review period. The table identifies the section(s) of the DEIR where the issues are addressed. Appendix B includes copies of the comments received on the NOP/Initial Study during public review period.

**Table 2-1 Government Agency NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
<b>Agencies</b>			
California Department of Transportation	8/27/2019	States that the nearest state facilities to the project site are State Route 60 (SR-60) and SR-39 (South Azusa Avenue) and acknowledges that the Initial Study identified potentially significant impacts in areas of transportation. Caltrans looks forward to receiving the DEIR for review and to provide further comments, if warranted, in the areas identified in the Initial Study. Caltrans asserts that the following state highways may need to be included in the traffic analysis :	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR-60 on ramps and South Azusa Avenue</li> <li>• SR-60 off-ramps and South Azusa Avenue</li> <li>• Colima Road and South Azusa Avenue</li> <li>• Gale Avenue and South Azusa Avenue.</li> </ul>	
		Caltrans also recommended that the Highway Capacity (HCM) 6th edition method be used for conducting operational and conflict analyses on state highway facilities.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
		Caltrans requests that if construction traffic is expected to cause delays on any state facilities, a construction traffic management be submitted for review.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
Count of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation	8/26/2019	Requests that the DEIR provides an analysis of the proposed project's potential impacts to Pepperbrook Park (1701 S. Countrywood Avenue), Countrywood Park (16817 E. Cooper Hill Road), and Peter F. Schabarum Regional County Park (17250 E. Colima Road). The department wants the DEIR to provide information on whether the proposed school has any plans to use these county parks for physical education or sports programming.	See Section 5.7, Recreation.
		Provides information on park in-lieu fee in accordance with the provisions of County Code Section 21.28.140 (Quimby Code), and requirement for providing local park space for residential subdivisions.	See Section 5.7, Recreation.
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning	8/26/2019	Recommends that all applicable measures be included in the project, including incorporating solar and other renewable energy, incorporating ride-sharing programs, implementing idling requirements during construction, and using sustainable pavements per the County's adopted Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) to reduce GHG.	See Section 5.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1 Government Agency NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
		Provides land use density standards for an H5 (Residential 5) category and an R-A (Residential-Agriculture), and indicates that the proposal of up to 160 units would be significantly higher than the currently permitted density of 50 units.	See Initial Study Section 3.11(b) Land Use and Planning.
		Indicates that the proposed project will be subject to the currently proposed draft Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and shall fulfill the requirements in place at the time as applicable.	Comment is noted but no further response is required.
		The board of supervisors adopted the Our County Sustainability Plan, which limits siting of new sensitive uses such as playground, daycare centers, schools, residences, or medical facilities to at least 500 feet from freeways.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		The project site is within the ancestral area of the Kizh Nation (Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians), and they must be consulted during the course of any county subdivision process.	See Section 5.9, Tribal Cultural Resources.
Native American Heritage Commission	8/9/2019	Provides requirements pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) and Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) that require notification and consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the proposed geographic area.	See Section 5.9, Tribal Cultural Resources.
Los Angeles County Public Health	8/27/2019	Indicates that the proposed project shall adhere to the requirements in Title 12 Chapter 12.08 of the Los Angeles County Noise Control Ordinance.	See Section 5.6, Noise.
		States that the potential noise impact from vehicular traffic due to the California 60 freeway and other sources should be evaluated, and the noise impacts from the proposed school to the residential units as well as noise impacts from construction of new residential units should be evaluated.	See Section 5.6, Noise.
		States that a buffer of at least 500 feet should be maintained between the development and freeways, and this minimum buffer zone should be extended on site-specific conditions, given the fact that unhealthy traffic emissions are often present at greater distances. Exceptions to this recommended practice should be made only upon a finding by the decision-making body that the benefits of such development outweigh the public health risk.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Comments that new schools, housing, or other sensitive land uses built within 1,500 feet of a freeway should adhere to current best-practice mitigation measures to reduce exposure to air pollution.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Comments that the health risk assessment prepared for the proposed project evaluates only adult school staff and students, and the EIR should evaluate other sensitive receptors that may be potentially impacted by the project, such as visitors and off-site residential receptors.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Comments that the project is in a high-pollution-burdened area (88%) according to CalEnviroScreen 3.0, and development of a sensitive land use in this area contributes to cumulative exposure and localized health impacts.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Comments that although not regulated as particulate emissions from diesel-fueled engines, ultrafine particles are a constituent of diesel vehicle exhaust that can travel to the lungs and into the bloodstream. Requests that the EIR consider emissions from	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1 Government Agency NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
		vehicles idling and traveling to and from the school and evaluate potential impacts.	
		Concerned that dust emissions during grading and or excavations may expose workers and the public to soil fungal spores, which can cause Valley Fever. Requests that the EIR includes impacts associated with fugitive dust emissions and include a discussion on Valley Fever.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Requests that the EIR identify the presence of active and abandoned oil wells and oil facilities within 500 feet of the project and evaluate potential impacts.	Although an “oil well” was identified at the corner of Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road, which is within 300 feet of the project site, it was actually an exploratory well, where no oil or gas was ever found or associated with. It was plugged over 600 feet below the ground surface, and no methane mitigation was ever required. Significant environmental impacts have not been identified. There are existing residential units as close as approximately 70 feet from the intersection of Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road. No further discussion in the EIR is necessary.
Los Angeles County Public Works Department	8/27/2019	Comments that the existing hazardous waste management infrastructure in Los Angeles County is inadequate to handle the hazardous waste currently being generated, and that the household hazardous waste from Phase 2 development could adversely impact existing infrastructure.	Comments are noted. The Phase 2 residential development would be required to comply with the requirements of County Public Works at the time of development and provide educational materials on the proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste as part of standard condition of approval. This issue is not addressed in the EIR.
		The District is encouraged to take advantage of special county programs to encourage waste diversion by visiting <a href="http://www.CleanLA.com">www.CleanLA.com</a> online.	Comments are noted. No further response is necessary.
		Comments that the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 requires each development project to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials.	The proposed K-8 School provides a site plan showing the trash enclosure, and this area would also provide as storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. The residential development would also be required comply with the

2. Introduction

**Table 2-1 Government Agency NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
			California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act and provide appropriate
		The Los Angeles County Building Code, Section 110.4, requires that buildings adjacent to or within 300 feet of active, abandoned, or idle oil or gas well(s) be provided with methane gas protection systems.	Although an "oil well" was identified at the corner of Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road, which is within 300 feet of the project site, it was actually an exploratory well, where no oil or gas was ever found or associated with. It was plugged over 600 feet below the ground surface, and no methane mitigation was ever required. Significant environmental impacts have not been identified. There are existing residential units as close as approximately 70 feet from the intersection of Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road. No further discussion in the EIR is necessary.
		Comments that since the project site was part of land used for agricultural purposes prior to the construction of the existing school, if any excavated soil is contaminated by or classified as hazardous waste by an appropriate agency, the soil must be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.	Comments are noted. As stated in the Initial Study Section 3.9(b) Hazards and Hazardous Materials, a Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) was prepared in May 2019 for the project site due to the possibility of residual pesticides present in the soil from the historical agricultural use of the site from approximately 1928 to around 1964. The PEA determined that the onsite soils are not contaminated and that studied soil constituents concentration do not exceed the residential screening threshold levels. Any imported soils will be managed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. No significant impact is anticipated and no further response is necessary.
		States that if any operation for the project includes the construction, installation, modification or removal of stormwater treatment facilities, the Environmental Programs Division (EPD) should be contacted for the required operating permits.	Comments are noted. As stated in the comment, the EPD would be contacted about permits in the event of construction, installation, modification, or

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1 Government Agency NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
			removal of stormwater treatment facilities.
		Comments that property owner representatives contracting with the trash hauling and landscaping services are required to include in the service agreements that organic waste, including green waste, hauled from the properties, whether mixed with trash or source separated, is to be diverted from landfills, which may start as soon as service is implemented and no later than January 1, 2022, per SB 1383.	Comments are noted. Valley Vista will be notified as required. No significant environmental impact is anticipated and no further response is necessary.
South Coast Air Quality Management District	8/20/2019	Requests that all appendices related to the air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files be submitted to SCAQMD for review, including emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling input and output files.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		SCAQMD recommends that the EIR use its adopted California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook and the CalEEMod land use emissions software as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		SCAQMD requests that the EIR quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds to determine air quality impacts.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		SCAQMD recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Comments that the EIR should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the proposed project and all air pollutant sources related to the proposed project.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
		Recommends that if the proposed project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, a mobile source health risk assessment be performed in accordance with the "Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis."	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	8/27/2019	Provides information regarding wastewater flow, generation, treatment, and required connection fee.	See Section 5.10, Utilities and Service Systems.
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation	8/19/2019	Requests a consultation because the project site is within its ancestral tribal territory.	See Section 5.9, Tribal Cultural Resources.

Table 2-2 summarizes the concerns regarding the proposed project's environmental impacts that were raised by the general public and where they are addressed in the DEIR. Note that comments voicing general opposition to the proposed project but not related to specific physical environmental concerns or impacts are not under the purview of this EIR; therefore, they are noted as such, and no further response was provided. Each topical analysis in the DEIR evaluates whether the proposed project may have a "significant effect on the

2. Introduction

environment” according to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Section 15131(a) states that the focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.”

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
<b>Agencies</b>		
Reina Roel	Comments are related to the District’s decision on the proposed project and why Wedgeworth students are entitled to a new school facility when other District schools are not.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Asks why the District is spending money to build new school when there are other available schools in the area that have low enrollment and/or are closed.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
Geri Renswick	Concerned about residential development and where they would park, since it was not shown in the site plan.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
	Concerned about traffic and how the County and/or Caltrans will facilitate traffic flow, specifically, at Azusa and Pepperbrook, Wedgeworth and Ridge Park, Manor Gate and Wedgeworth, Manor Gate and Pepperbrook, Countrywood and Wedgeworth, and Countrywood and Pepperbrook. They are currently heavily used with gridlocks during school start/finish times, and used as alternate routes to Colima. Concerned that an additional 400 to 600 cars from the proposed project will result in severe traffic congestion, and residents will be unable to ever exit the neighborhood.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
Anthony Nunez	Comments are related to closing other District schools and students having to drive farther out to attend schools.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Concerned about an empty lot on Wedgeworth Avenue owned by the District with no plans for development, and loss of AYSO soccer and softball leagues’ fields at the Cedarlane and La Subida campuses, in addition to the proposed displacement of the Highlander Baseball Field.	The cumulative impact of displacement of the Highlander Baseball Field is addressed in Section 5.7, Recreation.
	Opposes the inclusion of up to 160 residences, mainly due to traffic concerns. Asserts that Wedgeworth Drive is already a busy street crossing different streets that are congested to gain access to the neighborhood.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Parking for Countrywood II condos off Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road is already extremely difficult.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
	Wedgeworth Drive and Eagle Park Road corner is long overdue for a 4-way stop or a traffic signal, and is very dangerous.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	The stretch between Ridge Park Drive and Forest Glen Drive is prime for speeding and dangerous.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Pepperbrook Way traffic is very congested and overflows onto Wedgeworth Drive.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
	Wedgeworth Drive is traffic hazard during school drop-off/pick-up hours, and drivers do not follow the directions given by school staff.	Comments are noted. See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concern over possible increase in crime, noise, and pollution due to additional residents.	Comments stating that the proposed project will increase crime is speculation only, and crime is not significant environmental impact. See Initial Study Section 3.15, Public Services, stating that the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in police protection services to result in physical environmental impact. See Section 5.6, Noise, for noise impact and Section 5.1 for air quality impact.
	Wants to see the Highlander Baseball Field included with the new school.	See Chapter 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, for discussion on environmental impacts of including two baseball fields with the proposed project.
	Concerned about having two K-8 campuses within a one-mile radius and low attendance at Bixby Elementary School, which may cause closing of Bixby ES.	Closing of Bixby ES is speculative, and this issue is not under the purview of the CEQA analysis.
Gabriela Navar	Concerned that there was a lack of community outreach.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration. However, adequate CEQA notification was provided in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Section 21092.
	Concerned the project will increase traffic.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Commenter states that the project will likely increase the number of cars parked in the surrounding project area.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
	Project will increase trash.	See Initial Study Section 3.19 stating that the proposed project would increase solid waste demands; however, adequate hauling service and landfill capacities are available. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified.
	Project will lead to an increase energy usage.	See Section 5.2, Energy.
	Project will lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	See Section 5.4, GHG Emissions.
	Worried that the project will increase pollutants in the air.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.



2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
	The project will eliminate a recreational area used for little league baseball and softball games.	See Section 5.7, Recreation.
	The proposed project is not needed due to California's declining birth rates and declining enrollment in schools.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Commenter asks if the development of an underground stormwater collection will cause issues to the foundation.	See Section 5.3, Geology and Soils, and Section 5.5, Hydrology and Water Quality.
	Commenter asks why LA County has eliminated the use of current storm drain runoff to new construction.	The County of Los Angeles Los Impact Development Standards Manual requires that there be no increase in stormwater runoff from a project site. The proposed project is required to comply with the county standards and would retain all stormwater on-site.
	Concerned about the drinking fountain water quality and asks if it is up to standard to be consumed.	The water quality of drinking fountains are regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water (DDW) and Los Angeles County Public Health Department and will be required to provide safe drinking water that meets the standards. CA Education Code Section 38086 also requires school districts to provide access to free, fresh drinking water during meal times in school service areas. The proposed school would continue to adhere to applicable regulations.
	Respondent asks if there are currently issues with water quality in the area.	See Section 5.5, Hydrology and Water Quality.
	Concerned about fugitive dust during construction and asks what's being done to ensure residents aren't exposed to pollutants.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
	Concerned the project will cause safety issues for the community and children, and asks what safety measures will be implemented.	Comments do not specify what type of safety issues are anticipated. Traffic safety issues are addressed in Section 5.8, Transportation, and safety from crime is not under the purview of this EIR.
	Commenter asks if there will be an increase in police presence for the school.	The District provides its own police protection services, and appropriate police presence would be provided as

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
		determined by the District. Increased police presence at the school would not result in new or expanded police facilities to result in significant environmental impact.
	Concerned about traffic safety; the commenter asks if there will be traffic-calming measures to safeguard children and others in the community.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Asks if the Office of Emergency Management for LA County and the Governor's office of Emergency Service reviewed how the project will handle emergency response.	The Los Angeles County Fire Department and the California Division of State Architect would review and approve an on-site emergency access plan.
	Asks what precautions, if any, are planned if a mandatory evacuation occurs.	Schools are required to follow approved evacuation plans, as is the case under existing conditions.
	Concerned about three potentially significant air quality impacts discussed in the initial study. They want to know how these impacts will be addressed to bring the impacts below a significant threshold.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
	Concerned that the South Coast Basin is in non-attainment and that the project only worsens this issue.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
	Concerned about noise levels and asks what measures will be implemented to ensure noise levels do not exceed thresholds in the general plan or noise ordinance.	See Section 5.6, Noise.
	Comment requests alternatives to the project be suggested due to the significant impacts associated with the project.	See Chapter 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
	Requests that the EIR incorporate SCAQMD's "Air Quality Issues in school site selection guidance document" publication, which they attached to their letter.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
George Otanez	States that they are against the project because the area is already congested, and the project will only add more traffic.	Comment noted. See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned that the project is taking away the baseball field.	See Section 5.7, Recreation.
	Concerned about the traffic and parking worsening because their neighborhood already has traffic and lack of parking due to Wilson HS.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
Anna Trabert	States that they're opposed to the project because the kids who currently attend or will attend the proposed school do not live in the immediate vicinity of the school, which is mostly elderly people.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the school board for consideration.
	Commenter states they also oppose the project due to potential traffic impacts that directly impact them; they often cannot leave their residence due to cars blocking their driveway.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned that Manor Gate Road will see increased traffic congestion because the site plan shows Manor Gate leading into the driveway for the residences.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned about the potential lack of parking due to the project.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.

2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
Erich Trabert	States that they're opposed to the project because the kids who currently attend or will attend the proposed school do not live in the immediate vicinity of the school, which is mostly elderly people.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Commenter states they also oppose the project due to potential traffic impacts that directly impact them; they often cannot leave their residence due to cars blocking their driveway.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned that Manor Gate Road will see increased traffic congestion because the site plan shows Manor Gate leading into the driveway for the residences.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned about the potential lack of parking due to the project.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
Fernando Cubillas	Concerned about traffic in the neighborhood.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Asks how many kids going to the Wedgeworth do not live in the area.	Approximately 100 students.
	Asks how many kids going to Wedgeworth live in the neighborhood.	Approximately 500 students.
	Commenter states that when they attended a local school they walked to school.	Comment is noted.
	Numbers at Bixby Elementary are low.	Comment is noted.
	States that when they went to Wilson HS the attendance was 2,200.	Comment is noted.
	States that total attendance at Cedarlane Elementary School is only 600.	Comment is noted.
	Cedarlane Middle School is only 355, which they state is very low.	Comment is noted.
	Asks how much Glenelder Elementary School was sold for.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. No further response is necessary.
	Commenter asks where kids will play little league baseball if the fields are removed.	See Section 5.7, Recreation.
Commenter states neighborhood homeowners would like a meeting with the school district to discuss the project and that they are now consulting with their lawyer regarding all legal options.	Comment is noted.	
Ramiro and Marcie Pentes	Concerned with how busy Wedgeworth Drive gets due to traffic.	Comment is noted.
	Commenter states many students come from outside the area, and these outside students increase traffic and noise.	Comment is noted. Approximately 17 percent of the students are from outside the area.
	Commenter states that congestion on the street makes it tough to drive and unsafe for pedestrians.	Comment is noted.
	Commenter requests the proposed project not occur because of impacts to traffic, noise and air pollution.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality, Section 5.6, Noise, and Section 5.8, Transportation.
Sue Kovall	Asks why the project for a school includes being able to build residential units.	The proposed project includes two phases on the project site because the District owns the 20-acre site, and the proposed school would be developed on

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
		only 10 acres. Development of Phase 2 would require separate discretionary action and approval by the County Board of Supervisors.
	Asks why the project is K-8.	The District proposes a K-8 school to accommodate the dual immersion program at the existing Wedgeworth ES.
	There will be multiple impacts to noise, population, and traffic as well as potential impacts to aesthetics, land use, population, and public services.	These issues have been addressed in appropriate sections of the Initial Study (Appendix A) and the DEIR. No specific comments have been provided, and no further response is necessary.
	Commenter states that townhomes are not allowed within the general plan nor are they compatible with surrounding homes.	Consistency analysis with the existing County General Plan is provided in the Initial Study Section 3.11 (Appendix A).
	Concerned with the removal of the baseball fields.	See Section 3.7, Recreation.
	Concerned that the superintendent and school board have not been transparent with the community.	Comment is noted.
	Concerned that the project is not within the community's best interest as it is removing the baseball fields.	Comment is noted.
	There is a risk from increased vehicle emission because of increased traffic from the project.	See Section 5.1, Air Quality.
	Commenter states that many of the persons coming to Wedgeworth are coming from outside the community and they ask that this be addressed.	Approximately 100 students (17 percent) are from outside the area. Traffic distribution is addressed in Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned that the addition of upper grades will lead to loitering, trash, noise, and other issues.	The District proposes a K-8 school. There is no evidence that expanding to a K-8 school from an elementary school would lead to loitering, trash, noise, and other environmental issues. Comments are speculative, and no further discussion in the EIR is necessary.
	Commenter states that the project will strain public services due to the increase in population and traffic.	See Initial Study Section 3.15. Increased demands in public services would not result in new or expanded public facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.
	Concerned emergency response to a disaster will be hindered due to traffic congestion.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.

2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
	Respondent requests a new school be built for grades K-5 and that the baseball fields should be retained	See Chapter 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Concerned about the loss of little league fields.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
Tony Telles	Concerned that the project will lead to an increase in population, noise, traffic, and crime.	These issues have been addressed in appropriate sections of the Initial Study (Appendix A) and the DEIR. No specific comments have been provided and no further response is necessary.
	The traffic has become considerably worse since they moved to the area in the 1980s.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	There is no parking during the day.	See Chapter 3, Project Description. Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Commenter states that the upper grades will bring additional problems.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Commenter is against the removal of the baseball fields.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
Macias Family	Concerned with an increase in traffic, which directly impacts them because sometimes it blocks their driveway.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned with the increase in students because people often park on their block so there's less parking.	See Chapter 3, Project Description.
	Traffic in the neighborhood is already bad and unsafe.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Kids need a place to play.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Commenter states there does not need to be more families in the area and that traffic will get worse because of the project.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
Anna and David Sievert	Concerned with the increase in traffic on various streets close to the school.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Statement describes how there are four schools within one mile of Wedgeworth Drive and they all contribute to the traffic issues.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Traffic on Manor Gate is also an issue as it prevents people from leaving their homes and causes safety issues.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
	Commenter dislikes the potential removal of the baseball fields.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
Christine Salazar	Concerned with the project as it will remove the baseball field.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Opposed to the project as Cedarlane Middle School is just down the block and enrollment is declining district wide.	Comments are noted and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration.
	Concerned with the traffic from the proposed 160 residential units.	See Section 5.8, Transportation.
Rosalie Soto	Comment requests that the 160 residential units are not built as it will make traffic and parking worse.	See Chapter 3, Project Description and Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Concerned with the noise from the project.	See Section 5.6, Noise.
Adriana Quiñones	Upset about the lack of information regarding the sale of the three schools in the area.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Requests project stops until all residents are notified of the project and have time to provide community feedback.	Comments are noted, and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration. However, adequate CEQA notification was provided in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 21092.
	Comment states they opposed the project when it was first proposed 20 years ago, and they do not like that the school board would bring it back without community input.	Comments are noted, and will be forwarded to the School Board for consideration. However, adequate CEQA notification was provided in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 21092.
	Comment states many oppose the project because of the close proximity of schools Bixby and Cedarlane schools.	Comments are noted.
	Commenter states many oppose the project because of the increase in traffic.	Comments are noted. Traffic impacts are evaluated in Section 5.8, Transportation.
	Commenter states many oppose the project because of the potential health impacts from construction.	Comments are noted. Construction impacts have been evaluated in appropriate sections of the EIR.
	Many students who attend schools in the area are not actually from the area.	Approximately 17 percent of the existing students are from outside the area.
	Comment states that the removal of the baseball fields is unacceptable.	Comments are noted.
	Baseball fields should stay, and a sports complex should be constructed and there should be improvements on Bixby.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-2 Residents NOP Written Comments Summary**

Commenting Person	Summary of Comments	Response/Issue Addressed In:
		and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Comment states that the board is elected to serve the community, and the bond to improve schools was not intended to be spent all on one school.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis. However, comments are noted and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
	Comment states the community was not made aware of how the construction will be paid for.	Comments are noted.
	Commenter requests various state and local public officials look into the sales for the project as there has been little oversight.	This issue is not under the purview of CEQA analysis.
	Requests that all construction stop until the community is involved.	The proposed project has not been approved, and construction has not started.

The NOP process helps determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process and the initial study for the project, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts. Issues considered Potentially Significant are addressed in this DEIR, but issues identified as Less Than Significant or No Impact are not. Refer to the initial study in Appendix A for discussion of how these initial determinations were made.

### 2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR

The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the District’s initial study and comments received in response to the NOP. A scoping meeting was not conducted pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21083.9, as the proposed project is not a project of statewide, regional, or areawide significance, and the Department of Transportation has not requested a meeting. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance.

The information in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, establishes the basis for analyzing future, project-related environmental impacts. However, further environmental review by the District may be required as more detailed information and plans are submitted on a project-by-project basis.

#### 2.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

During preparation of the Initial Study, the District determined that 10 environmental impact categories were not significantly affected by or did not affect the proposed project. These categories are not discussed in detail in this DEIR.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources

## 2. Introduction

- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Wildfire

### 2.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

The District determined that 10 environmental factors have potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented.

- Air Quality
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

### 2.3.3 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

This DEIR identifies two significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, as defined by CEQA, that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Unavoidable adverse impacts may be considered significant on a project-specific basis, cumulatively significant, and/or potentially significant. The District must prepare a “statement of overriding considerations” before it can approve the project, attesting that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits outweigh the adverse effects, and therefore the adverse effects are considered acceptable. The impacts that were found in the DEIR to be significant and unavoidable are:

- Recreation
- Transportation



## 2. Introduction

### 2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Some documents are incorporated by reference into this DEIR, consistent with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, and they are available for review at the Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Office at 15959 East Gale Avenue, City of Industry, CA 91716.

- Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report, PlaceWorks, May 2019.

### 2.5 FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for 45 days. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the District address shown on the title page of this document. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the District will review all written comments timely received and prepare written responses for each. A Final EIR (FEIR) will incorporate the timely received comments, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from comments. The FEIR will be presented to the Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Board of Education for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who comment on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the District.

The DEIR is available to the general public for review at various locations:

- Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Office at 15959 East Gale Avenue, City of Industry, CA 91716.
- Wedgeworth Elementary School Administration Office at 16949 Wedgeworth Dr, Hacienda Heights, CA 91745
- [www.hlpschools.org/wsp](http://www.hlpschools.org/wsp)

### 2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING

Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6, requires that agencies adopt a mitigation monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081. Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the proposed project will be completed as part of the Final EIR, prior to consideration of the project by the Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Board of Education.

## 2. Introduction

*This page intentionally left blank.*