INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LA PUENTE PARK MASTER PLAN LA PUENTE, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for:

CITY OF LA PUENTE 15900 East Main Street La Puente, CA 91744

Prepared by:



CHAMBERS GROUP, INC. 5 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 750 Santa Ana, California 92707 (949) 261-5414

October 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION1				
SECTION	2.0 – PF	ROJECT DESCRIPTION		
2.1	PROJE	T PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND		
2.2	PROJEC	CT LOCATION		
2.3	PROJEC	CT SETTING		
2.4	PROJEC	CT COMPONENTS		
2.5	SCHED	ULE9		
2.6	CONST	RUCTION		
2.7	OPERA	TION9		
2.8	REQUI	RED PERMITS AND APPROVALS9		
SECTION	3.0 – EN	IVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION11		
SECTION	4.0 - EN	IVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS12		
4.1	ORGAN	IIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS 12		
4.2	TERMI	NOLOGY USED IN THIS ANALYSIS		
4.3	EVALU	ATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS 12		
	4.3.1	Aesthetics14		
	4.3.2	Agriculture & Forestry Resources		
	4.3.3	Air Quality		
	4.3.4	Biological Resources		
	4.3.5	Cultural Resources		
	4.3.6	Energy		
	4.3.7	Geology and Soils		
	4.3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
	4.3.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
	4.3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality		
	4.3.11	Land Use Planning55		
	4.3.12	Mineral Resources		
	4.3.13	Noise		
	4.3.14	Population and Housing		
	4.3.15	Public Services		
	4.3.16	Recreation		
	4.3.17	Transportation		
	4.3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources		
	4.3.19	Utilities and Service Systems73		
	4.3.20	Wildfire		
	4.3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A LIGHTING DESIGN PLANS
- APPENDIX B AIR QUALITY CALEEMOD
- APPENDIX C ENERGY CALCULATIONS
- APPENDIX D PRELIMINARY LIMITED GEOTECHNICAL DESIGN REPORT
- APPENDIX E GREENHOUSE GAS MODEL
- APPENDIX F NOISE MEASUREMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Park Master Plan Improvements4
Table 2: Designations/Classifications for the Project Area 21
Table 3: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Summary 22
Table 4: Regional Thresholds of Significance 25
Table 5: Local Thresholds of Significance
Table 6: Construction-Related Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions 27
Table 7: Construction-Related Local Criteria Pollutant Emissions 28
Table 8: Operations-Related Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions 29
Table 9: Operations-Related Local Criteria Pollutant Emissions
Table 10: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Project 45
Table 11: Existing Noise Level Measurements
Table 12: Construction Equipment Emissions and Usage Factors 59
Table 13: Proposed Project Construction Noise Levels at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Prior to Mitigation
Table 14: Mitigated Proposed Project Construction Noise Levels at Nearby Sensitive Receptors
Table 15: Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Emissions63

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Project Location Map	6
Figure 2: Project Area Map	7
Figure 3: Park Master Plan Improvements	8

SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), codified in the Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), was established to require public agencies to consider and disclose the environmental implications of their actions (projects). CEQA was enacted in 1970 by the California Legislature to disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of a proposed project and identify possible ways to avoid or minimize significant environmental effects of a project by requiring implementation of mitigation measures or recommending feasible alternatives. CEQA applies to all California governmental agencies at all levels, including local, regional, and State, as well as boards, commissions, and special districts.

As provided by PRC Section 21067, the public agency with the principal responsibility for approving a project that may have a significant effect upon the environment is considered the Lead Agency. The City of La Puente ("City"), as Lead Agency for the implementation of the City's approved Park Master Plan ("Proposed Project"), is responsible for preparing environmental documentation in accordance with CEQA as amended to determine if approval of the discretionary actions requested and subsequent implementation of the Proposed Project could have a significant impact on the environment. As defined by Section 10563 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study ("IS") is prepared primarily to provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"), Negative Declaration ("ND"), Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND"), or Notice of Exemption ("NOE") would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for the Proposed Project.

City of La Puente Initial Study and Environmental Evaluation

1.	Project Title:	Implementation of the Park Master Plan
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of La Puente 15900 East Main Street La Puente, CA 91744
3.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	City of La Puente 15900 East Main Street La Puente, CA 91744
4.	City Contact Person and Phone Number:	John Di Mario Development Services Director 626-855-1517
5.	Project Location:	501 Glendora Avenue La Puente, CA, 91744
6.	General Plan Designation:	Open Space
7.	Zoning Designation:	Open Space
8.	Description of Project:	The Proposed Project analyzes the changes for implementation of the City of La Puente's approved Park Master Plan to improve La Puente City Park which includes addition of new elements and expansion and relocation of existing facilities.
9.	Surrounding Land Uses:	The land uses surrounding the Proposed Project consist of Low Density Residential (R1) to the west, north, and east; Public Facility (PI) to the south; and General Commercial (C2) to the northeast.
10.	Reviewing Agencies :	
		Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Los Angeles County Fire Department Native American Heritage Commission Hacienda – La Puente Unified School District
11.	California Native American Consultation:	Tribal consultation has begun with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification letters sent to the following Native American tribes: the San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe.

SECTION 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The City of La Puente (City) prepared its Park Master Plan (PMP) in 2018 that included a site analysis and inventory of facilities and services for the following areas in the City:

- La Puente City Hall
- La Puente Senior Center
- La Puente Community Center
- La Puente City Park
- Puente Creek Nature Education Center

The PMP lays out the future additions, reconfigurations, and other site enhancements to the City's facilities. The PMP was the outcome of a multi-year process that included community input and participation at various stages of the PMP's development. These included Steering Committee presentations, community workshops, community outreach events, surveys, and concept plan reviews. Questions and surveys were asked of the public regarding which areas they want to see improved, what type of facilities and events they want to see, and the preference of concept plans for each of the facilities. Since the drafting of the PMP, the City has evaluated and focused on the needs of the residents for La Puente City Park (Park) improvements.

The Proposed Project is to implement the amended PMP by completing improvements to the 27-acre La Puente City Park. Enhancements to the La Puente City Park consist of the following key elements:

- splash pad area
- themed playground
- skate park area
- basketball courts
- fitness pathway
- fitness area
- amphitheater

- fitness building
- restroom enhancements
- sewer improvements
- football/softball field(s)
- soccer fields
- event pavilions

The City of La Puente proposes to utilize grants received from the Natural Resources Agency to implement the PMP in order to provide improvements to La Puente City Park. The preparation of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to analyze the changes for the implementation of the City's recently approved Park Master Plan for the 27-acre La Puente City Park.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project is located in the City of La Puente at 501 Glendora Avenue in Los Angeles County (County) (Figure 1). The streets that border La Puente City Park (Park) are North Hacienda Boulevard, located west of the Park; East Temple Avenue, located to the north; and Glendora Avenue, located to the east (Figure 2).

The Proposed Project site is zoned as Open Space. The land uses surrounding the Proposed Project consist of Low Density Residential (R1) to the west, north, and east; Public Facility (PI) to the south; and General Commercial (C2) to the northeast.

2.3 PROJECT SETTING

La Puente City Park features open grass areas, picnic shelters, a playground, basketball courts, handball courts, athletic fields, restroom facilities, and parking lots. The Park is also used by the La Puente National Little League, La Puente Girls Softball, and Jr. All American Warriors Football and Cheer.

La Puente High School and the La Puente Community Center/Youth Learning Activity Center border the southern and eastern ends of the Park, respectively. Saint Joseph Elementary School is located at the northeastern corner of the Park at East Temple Avenue and Glendora Avenue. Single-family homes are located east, north, and west of the Park. Mixed commercial businesses are located north of East Temple Avenue across from Saint Joseph School. First United Methodist Church and Saint Joseph Catholic Church are located along Glendora Avenue across the street from the Park.

2.4 PROJECT COMPONENTS

The City of La Puente proposes the following changes/improvements to the approved PMP. These changes include new additions, expansion, and relocation of existing facilities. Each number corresponds to the location in Figure 3 which identifies the PMP improvements. A majority of the facilities at the Park that comprise the PMP are currently existing. The table below includes facilities that will be relocated or are new additions, and includes park features that would remain unchanged.

Map ID	Park Feature	Existing Conditions	Proposed Actions		
1.	Park entrance	Existing	No proposed changes		
2.	Improved parking lots	Existing parking lots	Additional parking to be added, resurfacing and restriping and landscaping improvements		
3.	Parking lot connection	N/A	New feature to connect existing parking lots		
4.	Improved restrooms	Existing	Upgraded		
5.	Baseball fields	Existing	Turf replacement, new lighting, and fencing		
6.	Softball fields	Existing	Relocate as shown on PMP Map; turf replacement, lighting, new fencing		
7.	Snack bar/enhanced kiosk	Existing	Upgraded		
8.	Batting cages	N/A	New feature		
9.	Cheer practice area	Existing in open space area	Designated area		
10.	Football field and lighting	Existing with no lighting	Reposition as shown on PMP, add lighting to support use of the football field		
11.	Sculptural plaza	Open space	New feature		
12.	Enhanced basketball courts	Located west of handball courts	Relocate as shown on the PMP map		
13.	Two enclosed U10 soccer fields	Trees, open space, and walkways	New feature		
14.	Fitness building	Open space, turf	New feature		
15.	Fitness lawn	Open space, turf	Designated area		

Table 1: Park Master Plan Improvements

Map ID	Park Feature	Existing Conditions	Proposed Actions
16.	Event lawn	Open space, turf	Turf replacement
17.	Amphitheater	Open space, turf; existing events use	New feature to allow for
		temporary structures and equipment	permanent use
18.	Stage	Open space, turf	New feature
19.	Skate park	Existing basketball courts	New feature ¹
20.	Event pavilions	Open space, pavilions, picnic area	Relocate as shown on the
			PMP map
21.	Existing bathroom	Restroom use	No change
22.	Food truck promenade	Open space, picnic area	New feature
23.	Picnic pavilions	Picnic pavilions	No change
24.	Fitness pathway	Open space	New feature
25.	Fitness area	Trees, seating areas	New feature
26.	Themed playground	Existing	Improvements
27.	Themed splash area	Open space	New feature
28.	Large pavilions	Open space	New feature
31.	Enhanced maintenance yard	Maintenance yard	Expansion to the east
32.	Electrical park sign	Parking lot, landscaping	New feature ²
33.	Softball batting cages	Open space	New feature
34.	T-ball fields	Access road, open space, parking lot	New feature

Table 1: Park Master Plan Improvements

¹ Construction and use of the skate park have been previously analyzed and approved as a separate and distinct action. Since construction of this feature has the potential to overlap with other park improvements discussed herein, it is included as a cumulative project.

² Construction and use of the electrical park sign have been previously analyzed and approved as a separate and distinct action. Since construction of this feature has the potential to overlap with other park improvements discussed herein, it is included as a cumulative project.







The Proposed Project will also include upgrading of the sewer line on North Hacienda Boulevard that comes into the Park adjacent to the existing parking lots. As part of the new addition and improvements, new lighting is proposed. Lighting designs have been prepared for the athletic ballfields, which include the football field, softball fields, T-ball fields, soccer fields, basketball courts, and skate park areas in the Park. Light poles will be designed to avoid trees and will be placed in open areas to avoid interference with utilities such as gas and sewer lines and approximately 10 feet or more from the court/field sideline areas for safety purposes. Lighting designs are provided in Appendix A.

2.5 SCHEDULE

The first set of improvements (Phase 1) to the western portion of the Park along North Hacienda Boulevard will begin in December 2019 and will be completed by the summer of 2020. These improvements include the field and athletic areas of the Park, including the skate park and relocation of the basketball courts, as well as all undergrounding work. The eastern portion of the Park will remain open for public use. All other improvements, including Phase 2 (as identified in the diagram above) will be implemented over the next three to five years based on available funding. The PMP estimates approximately three phases for the completion of the rest of Park.

2.6 CONSTRUCTION

Construction activities include site demolition, grading, planting, irrigation, finish work, and development of new structures. Construction equipment and vehicles to be used include; but are not limited to, semitrucks, employee vehicles, forklifts, backhoes, graders, and cranes. The existing parking lot along Temple Avenue will be used as a staging area for construction of the Proposed Project.

2.7 OPERATION

The PMP will improve the user experience of the Park by providing new site amenities, improving existing facilities, and improving natural features. The PMP will meet the projected demand of park users. Recommendations include permanent park features to accommodate existing park events such as various recreational and youth sports activities, movies, concerts and City special events.

2.8 REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS

As required by the CEQA Guidelines Article 9, Section 15124 (d)(1), this section provides, to the extent the information is known to the City of La Puente, a list of permits and approvals to implement the Proposed Project and list of agencies that will review this IS/MND and use it in their decision-making process. The following lists of City entitlements and permits may be required for the Proposed Project prior to construction and operation:

- Building
- Grading
- Demolition
- Electrical, Mechanical, and Plumbing
- Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning

The Final IS/MND will be considered for adoption by the La Puente City Council in conjunction with the approval and implementation of the amended Park Master Plan. Reviewing agencies include those

agencies that do not have discretional approval over the Proposed Project but may review the IS/MND for accuracy. Potential reviewing agencies include the following:

- Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Hacienda La Puente Unified School District

SECTION 3.0 - ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

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

Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Energy
Geology / Soils Hydrology / Water Quality	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Land Use / Planning	Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mineral Resources
Noise	Population / Housing	Public Services
Recreation Utilities / Service Systems	Transportation Wildfire	Tribal Cultural Resources Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 1. I find that the project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- 2. I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- 3. I find the proposed Project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- 4. I find that the proposed Project may have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- 5. 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

Date

Development Services Director

John DiMario

 \boxtimes

SECTION 4.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

4.1 ORGANIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Sections 4.3.1 through 4.3.21 provide a discussion of the potential environmental impacts of the Project. The evaluation of environmental impacts follows the questions provided in the Checklist provided in the CEQA Guidelines.

4.2 TERMINOLOGY USED IN THIS ANALYSIS

For each question listed in the IS checklist, a determination of the level of significance of the impact is provided. Impacts are categorized in the following categories:

- **No Impact.** A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- Less Than Significant. A less than significant impact would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation. A potentially significant (but mitigable) impact would have a substantial adverse impact on the environment but could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of mitigation measure(s).
- Potentially Significant. A significant and unavoidable impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

4.3 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 the project (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).

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.

Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant.

"Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

"Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact."

Mitigation measures are identified and explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures may be cross-referenced).

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the 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:

- a) Earlier analyses used where they are available for review
- b) Which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis
- c) The mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project for effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated

References and citations have been incorporated into the checklist references to identify information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

Source listings and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.

The explanation of each issue identifies:

- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question
- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

4.3.1 <u>Aesthetics</u>

a)	Except as provided in Public Resources	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	Code Section 21099 would the project	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	have a substantial adverse effect on a	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	scenic vista?		Incorporated		
				\bowtie	

a) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is located in an urbanized area adjacent to schools, religious facilities, and residential and commercial properties. Users of the Park currently have partial views of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and Hacienda Hills to the south. Viewpoints are partially obstructed by the existing tree lines and buildings surrounding the Proposed Project. For customers of existing businesses, pedestrians, residents, and other persons outside the Proposed Project area, their primary views are of the existing Park and other structures and trees surrounding the area. These persons also have partial viewpoints of Hacienda Hills and the San Gabriel Mountains. From most other directions, the visual horizon is limited by existing man-made features.

Overall views from the surroundings areas would not be impacted because the Proposed Project does not include development of facilities that would extend far beyond the heights of any existing structures and accessory structures within the Park. The tallest existing building in the Park is approximately 15 feet in height. The new proposed buildings would be 15 feet in height, and the amphitheater would be approximately 18 feet in height.

No designated scenic resources are identified within the Proposed Project site, and the Proposed Project site is not part of a State, county, or municipally designated scenic vista (General Plan 2004). While the Proposed Project would alter the existing facilities within the Park, these changes are consistent with existing uses and would not introduce new facilities or structures that are not typically found in public parks. Furthermore, new additions and improvements within the Park would result in a positive impact by upgrading and maintaining the Park as requested from the comments and surveys received from the public. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Except as provided in Public Resources	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	Code Section 21099 would the project	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	substantially damage scenic resources,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	including, but not limited to, trees, rock		Incorporated		
	outcroppings, and historic buildings			\bowtie	
	within a state scenic highway?				

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The nearest eligible local State highway is State Route (SR) 57 between SR 60 and SR 90, approximately 6 miles east from the Proposed Project site (Caltrans 2017). The Proposed Project is not located within a State scenic highway nor would it alter an existing highway. The Proposed Project would not include the removal of any scenic resources along the existing roadways. Additionally, no historic buildings would be removed, as no buildings of historic significance are located within the Park. Trees on site would be relocated within the Park boundaries. Impacts would be less than significant.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Implementation of the La Puente Park Master Plan La Puente, California

c)	Except as provided in Public Resources	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	Code Section 21099 would the project	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	substantially degrade the existing visual	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	character or quality of public views of		Incorporated		
	the site and its surroundings? (Public			\bowtie	
	views are those that are experienced				
	from publicly accessible vantage point).				
	If the project is in an urbanized area,				
	would the project conflict with				
	applicable zoning and other regulations				
	governing scenic quality?				

c) Less than Significant Impact. The visual character of the Proposed Project and surrounding area is an urban corridor developed with a mix of commercial, residential, a park, and public facilities. Implementation of the Proposed Project would involve park improvements, including new construction of park facilities that would modify the existing character. While the Proposed Project would alter the existing facilities within the Park, the changes are consistent with existing uses and would not introduce new facilities or structures that are not typically found in public parks. The Proposed Project would improve the Park conditions and would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views. As discussed in Section 4.3.1 (a), residents and visitors of the Park and surrounding areas have partial views of the San Gabriel Mountains and Hacienda Hills. The viewpoints are limited by existing man-made features and tree lines. The Proposed Project would not conflict with applicable zoning because it would not require rezoning or changes in land uses of the area. Operational activities would be consistent with existing conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

d)	Except as provided in Public Resources	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	Code Section 21099 would the project	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	create a new source of substantial light	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	or glare which would adversely affect		Incorporated		
	day or nighttime views in the area?			\boxtimes	

d) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is in an urbanized area and includes existing light sources. Sources of illumination near the Proposed Project include Park lighting, street lighting, field lighting from the Park and existing schools, parking lots, and security lighting. Other light sources include the neighboring businesses, residents, public facilities, and commuters along Glendora Avenue, East Temple Avenue, and North Hacienda Boulevard.

During construction, the Proposed Project would provide additional sources of illumination with the presence of construction vehicles and equipment. Once operational, the Proposed Project would include additional field lighting during nighttime events. Lighting designs for the Park are included in Appendix A. However, existing light sources and nighttime activities already occur within the Park. Existing lighting will be replaced with modern and energy-efficient systems.

Foot-candles (fc) is a unit of measurement to calculate light intensity (illuminance). The levels vary based on the source of the light. Horizontal illuminance is the amount of light that would land on

a horizontal surface, and vertical illuminance is the amount of light that would land on a vertical surface. Typical illumination levels for common areas are 10 fc to 20 fc for ATMs, 10 fc to 40 fc for retail, and an overcast day averages at 100 fc (Lighting Design Lab 2013). Section 10.38.080 of the zoning code for outdoor light and glare states the following:

10.38.080 Outdoor Light and Glare

All lighting shall be arranged so as to keep light from directed on site, whether the illumination is direct or indirect light from the source, No operation, activity, sign or lighting fixture shall create illumination which exceeds 0.5 foot-candles minimum maintained on any adjacent property. No direct or sky-reflected glare, whether from floodlights or from high temperature processes such as combustion or welding or otherwise, visible at the property lot line of the source, shall be permitted.

According to the lighting designs in Appendix A, the locations that would experience the highest illuminance levels would be the properties located north of Temple Avenue at 15633 and 15547 Temple Avenue. The property at 15547 Temple Avenue is zoned for residential uses and the property at 15633 Temple Avenue is zoned for commercial uses. The maximum horizontal and vertical fc levels at 15547 Temple Avenue are 0.36 fc and 0.70 fc respectively. The maximum horizontal and vertical foot-candles for the 15633 property are 0.15 fc and 0.71 fc respectively.

The horizontal illuminance levels for both properties are below the zoning code requirements and would result in less than significant impact. The vertical illuminance levels for both properties are above the zoning code requirements. However, these areas have previously been exposed to the existing field lighting. The new lighting would not face the residential and commercial properties north of Temple Avenue. The maximum vertical illuminance levels are approximately 14 times lower than the lowest illuminance levels for ATMs. In addition, the Proposed Project would continue to comply with the City's Park User Guide for use of the lighted athletic fields (City 2010). The Proposed Project would also introduce glare from the windshields of the vehicles in the parking lots. However, the presence of vehicles in the parking lot would not be a new addition to the Park. Furthermore, the parking lot closest to the lighted fields are surrounded by trees which would minimize light scatter to the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Proposed Project would not introduce new lighting that would result in substantial glare during operations. The Proposed Project has historically provided nighttime lighting for evening events. New lighting systems would not be considered new uses for the Park. Impacts associated with substantial light or glare would be less than significant.

4.3.2 Agriculture & Forestry Resources

- a) In determining whether impacts to Potentially Less than Less than No agricultural resources are significant Significant Significant Significant Impact environmental effects, lead agencies With Mitigation Impact Impact may refer to the California Agricultural Incorporated \square 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 and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?
 - a) No Impact. The Proposed Project is in an urbanized area adjacent to commercial, residential, and public facilities. The land use designation of the Proposed Project is Open Space and does not include any land identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (CDC 2016). The Proposed Project area is not zoned for agricultural uses. No impact would occur.

b)	Would the project conflict wit	h Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	existing zoning for agricultural use, or	a Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	Williamson Act contract?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
					\square

b) No Impact. The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area adjacent to commercial, residential, and public facilities. As discussed in Section 4.3.2 (a), the Proposed Project is

developed and is not zoned for agricultural uses. Additionally, the Proposed Project does not include lands under a Williamson Act contract (CDC 2017). No impact would occur.

c)	Would the project conflict with existing	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	land (as defined in Public Resources	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as		Incorporated		
	defined by Public Resources Code				\boxtimes
	section 4526), or timberland zoned				
	Timberland Production (as defined by				
	Government Code section 51104(g))?				

c) No Impact. the Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area adjacent to commercial, residential, and public facilities. As discussed in Section 4.3.2 (a), the Proposed Project is developed and is not zoned for agricultural uses. While the Proposed Project is designated as Open Space, the Proposed Project does not house any timberland or forested land. The Proposed Project would not result in an alteration to the zoning or land use designation of the Proposed Project site. No impact would occur.

d)	Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
					\boxtimes

d) No Impact. The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area adjacent to commercial, residential, and public facilities. As discussed in Section 4.3.2 (c), the Proposed Project is developed and does not contain forested lands. No impact would occur.

e)	Would the project involve other	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	changes in the existing environment	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	which, due to their location or nature,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	could result in conversion of Farmland,		Incorporated		
	to nonagricultural use or the conversion				\boxtimes
	of forest land to non-forest use?				
	which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		With Mitigation Incorporated		

e) No Impact. As noted in Section 4.3.2 (a) through (d), the Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area adjacent to commercial, residential, and public facilities. The Proposed Project is not zoned for agriculture or forest use and neither are the adjacent properties. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use. Additionally, implementation of the Proposed Project would not preclude agricultural or forestry use on any property near the Proposed Project site. No impact would occur.

4.3.3 <u>Air Quality</u>

This section describes the existing air quality setting and potential effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area. Construction air quality modeling was performed through use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.2. The model output is provided in Appendix B.

Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project site is located in the City of La Puente in the County of Los Angeles. The Proposed Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Air Basin), and air quality regulation is administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD implements the programs and regulations required by the federal and State Clean Air Acts.

Atmospheric Setting

Air quality is a function of both the rate and location of pollutant emissions under the influence of meteorological conditions and topographical features. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with physical features of the landscape to determine their movement and dispersal, and consequently, their effect on air quality. The combination of topography and inversion layers generally prevents dispersion of air pollutants in the Air Basin.

The climate of the Air Basin lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific, which results in a mild climate, tempered by cool sea breezes. Although the Air Basin has a semiarid climate, the air near the surface is typically moist because of the presence of a shallow marine layer. Except for infrequent periods when dry air is brought into the basin by offshore winds, the ocean effect is dominant. Periods of heavy fog are frequent; and low stratus clouds, often referred to as "high fog," are a characteristic climate feature. Average temperatures for Montebello (WRCC 2011), which is the nearest monitoring station with historical data, range from an average low of 47 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in December to an average high of 90 °F in August. Rainfall averages approximately 15 inches a year, with almost all annual rainfall coming from the fringes of mid-latitude storms from late November to early April and summers being almost completely dry.

Winds are an important parameter in characterizing the air quality environment of a project site because they determine the regional pattern of air pollution transport and control the rate of dispersion near a source. Daytime winds in the Air Basin are usually light breezes from off the coast as air moves regionally onshore from the cool Pacific Ocean. These winds are usually the strongest in the dry summer months. Nighttime winds in the Air Basin result mainly from the drainage of cool air off the mountains to the east, and they occur more often during the winter months and are usually lighter than the daytime winds. Between the periods of dominant airflow, periods of air stagnation may occur, both in the morning and evening hours. Whether such a period of stagnation occurs is one of the critical determinants of air quality conditions on any given day.

During the winter and fall months, surface high-pressure systems north of the Air Basin, combined with other meteorological conditions, can result in very strong winds from the northeast called "Santa Ana Winds." These winds normally have durations of a few days before predominant meteorological conditions are reestablished. The highest wind speed typically occurs during the afternoon due to daytime thermal convection caused by surface heating. This convection brings about a downward transfer of

momentum from stronger winds aloft. It is not uncommon to have sustained winds of 60 miles per hour with higher gusts during a Santa Ana Wind.

Regulatory Setting

The Proposed Project site lies within the Air Basin, which is managed by the SCAQMD. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been established for the following criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), and lead. The CAAQS also set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility.

Areas are classified under the Federal Clean Air Act as either "attainment" or "nonattainment" areas for each criteria pollutant, based on whether the NAAQS have been achieved or not. Attainment relative to the State standards is determined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The Air Basin has been designated by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a nonattainment area for O₃ and PM_{2.5}. Currently, the Air Basin is in attainment with the NAAQS for CO, SO₂, NO₂, and PM₁₀. The Air Basin is designated as partial nonattainment for lead based on data from two source-specific monitors in Vernon and the City of Industry that are both near battery recycling facilities. The 2012 Lead State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Los Angeles County provides measures to meet attainment of lead by December 31, 2015. Current monitoring data show that lead is now below the standards at all monitoring stations; however, three years of meeting the standards is required before Los Angeles County can request to be redesignated by the EPA.

The EPA has designated the Air Basin as extreme nonattainment for the 8-hour average ozone standard. In 2015, the EPA strengthened its 8-hour "primary" and "secondary" ozone standards to 0.070 parts per million (ppm). The previous standard, set in 2008, was 0.075 parts per million (ppm). The SCAQMD, the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Air Basin, adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in March 2016 that provides measures to reduce 8-hour ozone levels to below the federal standard by 2037.

Additionally, the EPA has designated the Air Basin as nonattainment for $PM_{2.5}$. In 1997, the EPA established standards for $PM_{2.5}$ (particles less than 2.5 micrometers), which were not implemented until March 2002. The 1997 $PM_{2.5}$ standard of 15 micrograms per cubic meter (μ g/m³) was attained on August 24, 2016. However, on December 14, 2012, the EPA revised the primary annual $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS from 15 μ g/m³ to 12 μ g/m³. The 2012 AQMP provides measures to reduce $PM_{2.5}$ emissions to within the federal standard by December 31, 2025. $PM_{2.5}$ is a subset of the PM_{10} emissions whose standards were developed to complement the PM_{10} standards that cover a full range of inhalable particle matter. For the PM_{10} health standards, the annual PM_{10} standard was revoked by the EPA on October 17, 2006; and the 24-hour average PM_{10} attainment status for the Air Basin was redesignated to attainment (maintenance) on July 26, 2013.

The Air Basin has been designated by CARB as a nonattainment area for ozone, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Currently, the Air Basin is in attainment with the State ambient air quality standards for CO, SO₂, and sulfates and is unclassified for visibility-reducing particles and hydrogen sulfide. The adopted AQMPs provide measures to meet the State standards for ozone, NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Table 2 presents the designations and classifications applicable to the Proposed Project area.

Pollutant	Averaging Time Standard	National Standards Attainment Date ¹	California Standards ²
1979	1-Hour	Nonattainment (Extreme)	
1-Hour Ozone (O₃) ³	(0.12 ppm)	2/6/2023	
1997	8-Hour	Nonattainment (Extreme)	
8-Hour Ozone (O₃) ⁴	(0.08 ppm)	6/15/2024	Nonattainmont
2008	8-Hour	Nonattainment (Extreme)	Nonattainment
8-Hour Ozone (O₃)	(0.075 ppm)	7/20/2032	
2015	8-Hour	Nonattainment (Extreme)	
8-Hour Ozone (O₃)	(0.070 ppm)	8/3/2038	
Carbon Manavida (CO)	1-Hour (35 ppm)	Attainment (Maintenance)	Maintananaa
Carbon Wonoxide (CO)	8-Hour (9 ppm)	6/11/2007 (attained)	Maintenance
	1-Hour	Unclassifiable/Attainment	
Nitragan Diavida (NO)5	(100 ppb)	Attained	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) ³	Annual	Attainment (Maintenance)	Attainment
	(0.053 ppm)	9/22/1998	
	1-Hour (75 ppb)	Designation Pending/ Pending	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂) ⁶	24-Hour (0.14 ppm)	Unclassifiable/Attainment	Attainment
	Annual (0.03 ppm)	3/19/1979 (attained)	
Particulato Matter (DM.)	24-Hour	Attainment (Maintenance)	Nonattainmont
	(150 μg/m³)	7/26/2013	Nonattainment
	24-Hour	Nonattainment (Serious)	
	(35 μg/m³)	12/31/2019	
Dartiquiata Mattar (DM	1997 Annual	Attainment	Nonattainmant
Particulate Matter (PMI2.5)	(15.0 μg/m³)	8/24/2016	Nonattainment
	Annual	Nonattainment	
	(12.0 μg/m³)	12/31/2025	
Load (Ph)	3-Months Rolling	Nonattainment (Partial) ⁷	Nonattainmont
Leau (PD)	(0.15 µg/m³)	12/31/2015	nonattainment

Table 2: Designations/Classifications for the Project Area

¹ Obtained from http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/naaqs-caaqs-feb2016.pdf?sfvrsn=14

² Obtained from http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

³ 1-hour O₃ standard (0.12 ppm) was revoked, effective June 15, 2005; however, the Air Basin has not attained this standard based on 2008-2010 data has some continuing obligations under the former standard.

⁴ 1997 8-hour O₃ standard (0.08 ppm) was reduced (0.075 ppm) in 2008; the 1997 O₃ standard and most related implementation rules remain in place until the 1997 standard is revoked by U.S. EPA.

⁵ New NO₂ 1-hour standard, effective August 2, 2010; attainment designations January 20, 2012; annual NO₂ standard retained.

⁶ The 1971 annual and 24-hour SO₂ standards were revoked, effective August 23, 2010; however, these 1971 standards will remain in effect until one year after U.S. EPA promulgates area designations for the 2010 SO₂ 1-hour standard. Area designations are expected in 2012, with Basin designated Unclassifiable/Attainment.

⁷ Partial Nonattainment designation – Los Angeles County portion of Basin only. Expect redesignation to attainment based on current monitoring data.

Monitored Air Quality

The air quality at any site is dependent on the regional air quality and local pollutant sources. Regional air quality is determined by the release of pollutants throughout the air basin. Estimates of the existing emissions in the Air Basin provided in the Final 2016 AQMP, March 2017, indicate that, collectively, mobile sources account for 33 percent of the volatile organic compounds (VOC), 88 percent of emissions from nitrogen oxides (NOx), and 35 percent of directly emitted PM_{2.5}, with another 10 percent of PM_{2.5} from road dust. However, the mobile source regulations currently in place are anticipated to reduce the share of emissions currently produced by mobile sources; and by 2031 mobile source emissions are anticipated to create 14 percent of VOC emissions, 30 percent of NOx emissions, and 23 percent of PM_{2.5} emissions with another 14 percent of PM_{2.5} from road dust.

The SCAQMD has divided the Air Basin into 38 air monitoring areas with a designated ambient air monitoring station representative of each area. The Proposed Project site is located in Air Monitoring Area 11, which covers south San Gabriel Valley. Since not all air monitoring stations measure all of the tracked pollutants, the data from the following two monitoring stations, listed in the order of proximity to the Proposed Project site, have been used: Pico Rivera Monitoring Station (Pico Rivera Station) and Azusa Monitoring Station (Azusa Station).

The Pico Rivera Station is located approximately 6.7 miles west of the Proposed Project site at 4144 San Gabriel River Parkway, Pico Rivera, and the Azusa Station is located approximately 7.6 miles north of the Proposed Project site at 803 North Loren Avenue, Azusa. Since historical concentrations of carbon monoxide were found to be well below State and federal limits throughout the Air Basin, SCAQMD discontinued monitoring carbon monoxide levels on March 31, 2013. It should be noted that due to the air monitoring stations distances from the Proposed Project site, recorded air pollution levels at the air monitoring stations reflect with varying degrees of accuracy local air quality conditions at the Proposed Project site. Table 3 presents the composite of gaseous pollutants monitored from 2016 through 2018.

Air Pollutant	2016	2017	2018				
Ozone (O₃) ¹							
Max 1 Hour (ppm)	0.111	0.118	0.115				
Days > CAAQS (0.09 ppm)	9	7	3				
Max 8 Hour (ppm)	0.081	0.086	0.082				
Days > NAAQS (0.070 ppm)	6	9	5				
Days > CAAQS (0.070 ppm)	6	9	5				
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) ¹							
Max 1 Hour (ppb)	63.2	75.0	76.8				
Days > NAAQS (100 ppb)	0	0	0				
Days > CAAQS (180 ppb)	0	0	0				
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) ²							
Max Daily California Measurement	74.6	83.9	78.3				
Days > NAAQS (150 μg/m³)	0	0	0				
Days > CAAQS (50 μg/m³)	12	7	10				
National Average (20 μg/m ³)	33.7	31.7	32.7				

Table 3: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Summary

Air Pollutant		2016	2017	2018		
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5}) ¹						
Max Daily National Measurement		46.5	49.5	56.3		
Days > NAAQS (35 μg/m³)		2	1	2		
National Average (12 μg/m ³)		11.7	12.2	12.9		
State Average (12 µg/m ³)		11.7	12.1	ND		
Abbreviations:						
> = exceed ppm = parts per million	ppb = parts per billion	μg/m ³	³ = micrograms per cubic m	neter		
CAAQS = California Ambient Air Quality Standard	NAAQS = National Ambi	ent Air Quality				
ND = Insufficient or No Data	Bold = exceedance					
¹ Measurement taken from Pico Rivera Station						
² Measurement taken from Azusa Station						
Source: http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/						

Table 3: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Summary

- a) Where available, the significance Potentially Less than Less than No Significant criteria established by the applicable air Significant Significant Impact quality management district or air Impact With Mitigation Impact pollution control district may be relied Incorporated \boxtimes upon make following to the determinations would the project conflict with obstruct or implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
 - a) Less than Significant Impact. CEQA requires a discussion of any inconsistencies between a Proposed Project and applicable general plans (GP) and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125). The regional plan that applies to the Proposed Project includes the SCAQMD AQMP. Therefore, this section discusses any potential inconsistencies of the Proposed Project with the AQMP.

The purpose of this discussion is to set forth the issues regarding consistency with the assumptions and objectives of the AQMP and discuss whether the Proposed Project would interfere with the region's ability to comply with federal and State air quality standards. If the decision-makers determine that the Proposed Project is inconsistent, the lead agency may consider project modifications or inclusion of mitigation to eliminate the inconsistency.

The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook states that "New or amended GP Elements (including land use zoning and density amendments), Specific Plans, and significant projects must be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP." Strict consistency with all aspects of the plan is usually not required. A Proposed Project should be considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook identifies two key indicators of consistency:

- (1) Whether the project will result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.
- (2) Whether the project will exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2010 or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

Both of these criteria are evaluated in the following sections.

Criterion 1 – Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations?

Based on the air quality modeling analysis contained in this Air Analysis, it was determined that short-term construction impacts and long-term operations impacts would not result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD regional, local, and toxic air contaminant thresholds of significance.

Therefore, the Proposed Project is not expected to contribute to the exceedance of any air pollutant concentration standards and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the first criterion.

Criterion 2 – Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP?

Consistency with the AQMP assumptions is determined by performing an analysis of the Proposed Project with the assumptions in the AQMP. The emphasis of this criterion is to ensure that the analyses conducted for the Proposed Project are based on the same forecasts as the AQMP. The Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide consist of three sections: Core Chapters, Ancillary Chapters, and Bridge Chapters. The Growth Management, Regional Mobility, Air Quality, Water Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management chapters constitute the Core Chapters of the document. These chapters currently respond directly to federal and State requirements placed on the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Local governments are required to use these as the basis of their plans for purposes of consistency with applicable regional plans under CEQA. For this project, the City of La Puente General Plan defines the assumptions that are represented in the AQMP.

The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The Proposed Project site is designated as Open Space-Public (OS-Pu) in the General Plan and is zoned Open Space (OS). The Proposed Project is consistent with the current land use designations and would not require a General Plan Amendment or zone change. In addition, project construction would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules and Regulations, including Rules 402 and 403 that control the emissions of air contaminants, odors, and fugitive dust. Therefore, based on the above, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to exceed the AQMP assumptions for the Proposed Project site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the second criterion.

Based on the discussion above, the Proposed Project will not result in an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b)	Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
	quality management district or air	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	pollution control district may be relied		Incorporated		
	upon to make the following			\boxtimes	
	determinations would the project result				
	in a cumulatively considerable net				
	increase of any criteria pollutant for				
	which the project region is non-				
	attainment under an applicable federal				
	or state ambient air quality standard?				

b) Less than Significant Impact. As shown above in Table 3, the Proposed Project area is designated as a federal and/or State nonattainment area for ozone and PM_{2.5}. To estimate if the Proposed Project may adversely affect the air quality in the region, the SCAQMD has prepared CEQA Air Quality Handbook (SCAQMD 1993) to provide guidance to those who analyze the air quality impacts of proposed projects. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook states that any project in the Air Basin with daily emissions that exceed any of the identified significance thresholds should be considered as having an individually and cumulatively significant air quality impact. For the purposes of this air quality impact analysis, a regional air quality impact would be considered significant if emissions exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds identified in Table 4.

Table 4: Regional Thresholds of Significance

	Pollutant Emissions (Pounds/Day)						
	VOC	NOx	СО	SOx	PM10	PM2.5	Lead
Construction	75	100	550	150	150	55	3
Operation	55	55	550	150	150	55	3

Source: SCAQMD, http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2

Air emissions related to construction of the Proposed Project may have the potential to exceed the State and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the Air Basin. In order to assess local air quality impacts, the SCAQMD has developed Localized Significant Thresholds (LSTs) to assess the project-related air emissions in the project vicinity. SCAQMD has also provided *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (LST Methodology), July 2008, which details the methodology to analyze local air emission impacts. The LST Methodology found that the primary emissions of concern are NO₂, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

The LST Methodology provides look-up tables with different thresholds based on the location and size of the project site and distance to the nearest sensitive receptors. The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 9.3 acres of the approximately 22-acre park site. Since the look-up tables provide 1-acre, 2-acre, and 5-acre project sizes, the 5-acre project site was utilized, since the Proposed Project would be completed in three phases and it is unlikely that more than 5 acres would be disturbed in any day. As detailed above, the Proposed Project site is located in Air

Monitoring Area 11, which covers south San Gabriel Valley. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project site are students and staff at La Puente High School, whose nearest outdoor use area is as near as 30 feet (9 meters) from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. In addition, homes are located as near as 90 feet (27 meters) to the northeast and 110 feet (34 meters) to the northwest of the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project. According to LST Methodology, any receptor located closer than 25 meters (82 feet) shall be based on the 25-meter thresholds. Table 5 below shows the LSTs for NOx, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} for both construction and operational activities.

Table 5: Local Thresholds of Significance

0 shi dhu	Allowable Emissions (pounds/Day) ¹							
Activity	NOx	СО	PM10	PM2.5				
Construction	183	1,814	12	9				
Operation	183	1,814	4	2				

¹ The nearest sensitive receptors are students and staff at La Puente High School, whose nearest outdoor use area is as near as 30 feet (9 meters) from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. According to SCAQMD methodology, all receptors closer than 25 meters are based on the 25-meter threshold.

Source: SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-Up Tables for five acres in Air Monitoring Area 11 found at: <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/appendix-c-mass-rate-lst-look-up-tables.pdf?sfvrsn=2</u>

Construction Emissions

Construction of the Proposed Project would create air emissions primarily from equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. The air emissions from the Proposed Project were analyzed through use of the CalEEMod model (see Appendix B). Construction activities for the Proposed Project are anticipated to be completed in three phases, with the first phase beginning in early 2020 and completed by the end of summer 2020. The remaining phases would occur over the next three to five years depending on available funding. In order to provide a conservative analysis, the CalEEMod model analyzed all proposed improvements to be completed in 10 months, starting in January 2020.

The construction activities would include: (1) demolition of approximately an acre of paved area that includes the existing handball courts, picnic and lunch shelters, and sidewalks; (2) grading of all areas to be improved as well as for the new sewer pipeline, which is anticipated to disturb approximately 9.3 acres of the 22-acre Park site; (3) construction of all proposed park features, which includes approximately 6,000 square feet of new building space; (4) application of architectural coatings on the new structures and features that is anticipated to occur concurrently with building construction; and (5) paving approximately 3.2 acres of reconfigured parking lot area and approximately 0.8 acre of new basketball courts, amphitheater stage, batting cages, splash area, and new sidewalks.

Table 6 shows the estimated worst-case summer or winter daily emissions that would be predicted from each construction activity for the Proposed Project, based on the default construction equipment assumptions provided by the CalEEMod model.

A set i star	Pollutant Emissions in pounds/day							
Activity	ROG	NOx	СО	SO ₂	PM 10	PM2.5		
Demolition	3.46	35.41	22.91	0.05	2.48	1.71		
Grading	2.53	27.08	16.89	0.03	4.43	2.75		
Combined Park Feature Construction and Architectural Coatings	8.85	28.63	29.45	0.07	3.98	1.93		
Paving	1.72	14.12	15.31	0.02	0.75	0.69		
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions	8.85	35.41	29.45	0.07	4.43	2.75		
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55		
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No		
Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2.								

Table 6: Construction-Related Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions

As shown in Table 6, maximum daily construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional criteria pollutant thresholds. In addition, construction emissions would be short-term, limited only to the period when construction activity is taking place. As such, construction-related regional emissions would be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project's construction-related air emissions from fugitive dust and onsite diesel emissions may have the potential to exceed the State and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the South Coast Air Basin. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project site are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet and La Puente High School, whose nearest outdoor use area is as near as 30 feet from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. In addition, homes are located as near as 90 feet to the northeast and 110 feet to the northwest of the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project.

The local air quality emissions from construction were analyzed using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate LST look-up tables and the methodology described in LST Methodology, prepared by SCAQMD, revised July 2008. In order to determine if any of the analyzed pollutants require a detailed analysis of the local air quality impacts, each phase of construction was screened using the LST look-up tables. Table 7 shows the onsite emissions from the CalEEMod model for the different construction phases and the calculated emissions thresholds.

A saturday	Onsite Pollutant Emissions in pounds/day					
Activity	NOx	СО	PM10	PM2.5		
Demolition	33.20	21.75	2.7	1.62		
Grading	26.39	16.05	4.22	2.69		
Combined Park Feature Construction and Architectural Coatings	20.87	18.68	1.23	1.16		
Paving	14.07	14.65	0.75	0.69		
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions	33.20	21.75	4.22	2.69		
SCAQMD Thresholds for 25 meters ¹	183	1,814	12	9		
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No		

Table 7: Construction-Related Local Criteria Pollutant Emissions

The nearest sensitive receptors are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet (1.59 meters) from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. According to SCAQMD methodology, all receptors closer than 25 meters are based on the 25-meter threshold.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 and SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-Up Tables for five acres in Air Monitoring Area 11.

The data provided in Table 7 shows that construction-related emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's local air concentration thresholds. In addition, construction emissions would be short-term, limited only to the period when construction activity is taking place. As such, construction-related local air concentrations would be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

Operational Emissions

The Proposed Project consists of implementing various improvements to an existing City Park. The Proposed Project may generate air emissions from vehicular emissions, area sources, and energy usage. The Proposed Project would not expand the size of the Park or change the hours of operation of the Park. As such, implementation of the Proposed Project is not likely to increase vehicle trips to the Proposed Project site. However, in order to provide a conservative analysis, the default vehicle trip rates for a City Park were utilized in the CalEEMod model for the approximately 9.3 acres of the Park that would be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project. In addition to emissions from new vehicle trips, the Proposed Project may also create emissions from new area sources that include consumer products (i.e., aerosol sun screen), architectural coating off-gassing, and landscaping equipment as well from energy use associated with natural gas appliances such as hot water heaters. Table 8 shows the estimated worst-case daily emissions from operation of the Proposed Project.

Activity	Pollutant Emissions in pounds/day							
	ROG	NOx	СО	SO ₂	PM 10	PM2.5		
Area Sources ¹	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Energy Usage ²	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Mobile Sources ³	0.24	1.10	3.02	0.01	0.75	0.21		
Total Project Emissions	0.04	0.05	0.17	0.00	0.06	0.02		
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55		
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No		

Table 8: Operations-Related Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Notes:

¹ Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape equipment.

² Energy usage consists of emissions from natural gas usage (no natural gas appliances are anticipated to be installed as part of the Proposed Project).

³ Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust. Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2.

As shown in Table 8, operations-related emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds. As such, operations-related regional emissions would be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project's operations-related onsite air emissions may have the potential to exceed the State and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the Air Basin. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project site are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. In addition, La Puente High School is located as near as 30 feet to the southwest and homes are located as near as 90 feet to the northeast and 110 feet to the northwest of the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project.

The local air quality emissions from operations were analyzed in the same manner detailed above for construction emissions. Table 9 shows the emissions from the CalEEMod model and the emissions thresholds from the look-up tables.

A chivity	Onsite Pollutant Emissions in pounds/day			
Activity	NOx	Onsite Pollutant Emis CO 0 0.01 0 0.00 0 3.02 0 3.02 1,814 No	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile Sources	1.10	3.02	0.75	0.21
Total Project Emissions	1.10	3.02	0.75	0.21
SCAQMD Threshold for 25 meters ¹	183	1,814	4	2
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Table 9: Operations-Related Local Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Notes:

¹ The nearest sensitive receptors are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet (1.59 meters) from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. According to SCAQMD methodology, all receptors closer than 25 meters are based on the 25 meter threshold. Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 and SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-Up Tables for five acres in Air Monitoring Area 11.

The data provided in Table 9 shows that none of criteria pollutants would exceed the SCAQMD local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. As such, operations-related local emissions would be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant

c)	Where available, the significance	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	criteria established by the applicable air	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	quality management district or air	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	pollution control district may be relied		Incorporated		
	upon to make the following			\boxtimes	
	determinations would the project				
	expose sensitive receptors to				
	substantial pollutant concentrations?				

c) Less than Significant Impact. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project site are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet and La Puente High School, whose nearest outdoor use area is as near as 30 feet from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. In addition, homes are located as near as 90 feet to the northeast and 110 feet to the northwest of the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project. As discussed above in (b), the local concentrations of criteria pollutant emissions have been calculated for construction and operational activities. The analysis above found that less than significant criteria pollutant concentrations would occur during construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

In addition to the criteria pollutant emissions impacts analyzed above, construction activities have the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs), which would be created from the operation of diesel-powered equipment in the form of diesel particulate matter (DPM). According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from TACs are usually described in terms of "individual cancer risk." "Individual Cancer Risk" is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 70-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of standard risk-assessment methodology. Given the relatively limited number of heavy-duty construction equipment, the varying distances to the nearby sensitive receptors that construction equipment would operate, and the short-term construction schedule, the Proposed Project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 70 years) substantial source of toxic air contaminant emissions and corresponding individual cancer risk. In addition, California Code of Regulations Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9, Section 2449 regulates emissions from off-road diesel equipment in California. This regulation limits idling of equipment to no more than five minutes and requires equipment operators to label each piece of equipment and provide annual reports to CARB of their fleet's usage and emissions. This regulation also requires systematic upgrading of the emission Tier level of each fleet; currently, no commercial operator is allowed to purchase Tier 0 or Tier 1 equipment and by January 2023 no commercial operator is allowed to purchase Tier 2 equipment. In addition to the purchase restrictions, equipment operators need to meet fleet average emissions targets that become more stringent each year between years 2014 and 2023. Therefore, no significant short-term toxic air contaminant impacts would occur during construction of the Proposed Project.

Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant

d)	Where available, the significance	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	criteria established by the applicable air	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	quality management district or air	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	pollution control district may be relied		Incorporated		
	upon to make the following			\boxtimes	
	determinations would the project result				
	in other emissions (such as those				
	leading to odors adversely affecting a				
	substantial number of people?				

d) Less than Significant Impact. Any diesel equipment used during construction of the Proposed Project would consist of mobile equipment that would be changing locations, allowing the odors to disperse rapidly and not impact any nearby receptors. Should diesel equipment be required during maintenance at the Proposed Project site, it would also change locations, allowing the odors to disperse rapidly and not impact any nearby receptors. Construction and operation at the Proposed Project site would not introduce any other objectionable odors. Therefore, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant

4.3.4 <u>Biological Resources</u>

a)	Would the project have a substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	adverse effect, either directly or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	through habitat modification, on any	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	species identified as candidate,		Incorporated		
	sensitive or special status species in			\boxtimes	
	local or regional plans, policies or				
	regulations, or by the California				
	Department of Fish and Game or U.S.				
	Fish and Wildlife Service?				

a) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is a park located within an urban and developed area of the City. The area has a land use designation of 'Open Space.' The City is not located within a Significant Ecological Area (County of Los Angeles 2019). The Proposed Project does not contain any habitats designated for special status species, and the proposed activities do not involve any habitat modification within protected areas. Additionally, the Proposed Project is not part of any conservation easement nor is it an owned or operated land for conservation under the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (County of Los Angeles 2019). Finally, the Proposed Project does not contain any critical habitats designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2019a). As a result, impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

b) Would the project have a substantial Poil adverse effect on any riparian habitat or Sig sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	Incorporated		\boxtimes

b) No Impact. The Proposed Project is a park located within an urban and developed area of the City. The Proposed Project does not contain any critical habitats designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2019a) nor is it located within a Significant Ecological Area (County of Los Angeles 2019). According to the National Wetlands Inventory, the Proposed Project does not have any wetland habitat (USFWS 2019b). The Proposed Project does not have any sensitive communities or critical habitats. The Proposed Project is not located within a riparian habitat and, therefore, would not impact any sensitive natural communities.
c)	Would the project have a substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	adverse effect on state or federally	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	protected wetlands (including but not	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal,		Incorporated		
	etc.) through direct removal, filling,				\boxtimes
	hydrological interruption, or other				
	means?				

c) No Impact. The Proposed Project is located inland, within a developed area. The Proposed Project area includes no wetlands or other water bodies. The nearest wetland is located at the Industry Hills Golf Club located approximately 1 mile east from the Proposed Project (USFWS 2019b). No construction or operational activities would occur within a protected wetland. No impact would occur.

d)	Would	the	project	Interfere	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	substant	ially with	n the moven	nent of any	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	native r	esident	or migrato	ory fish or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	wildlife	species	or with o	established		Incorporated		
	native r	esident	or migrato	ory wildlife		\boxtimes		
	corridors	s, or imp	bede the us	e of native				
	wildlife r	nursery s	ites?					

d) No Impact. The Proposed Project is a public park with no areas designated as critical habitat, sensitive ecological area, or an established wildlife corridor. The Proposed Project does not house any wildlife nursery sites or water bodies capable of inhabiting migratory fish.

Although the Proposed Project would move the existing trees and ground disturbing activities would be temporary, the proposed construction activities has the potential to disturb ground-nesting birds and birds nesting in trees. The proposed construction activities must avoid the removal of trees, and disturbance of shrubs to be outside of the nesting season (February to September). If the moving of existing trees and other proposed construction activities must occur during the nesting season, implementation of BIO-1 would reduce impacts to birds to a level less than significant.

BIO-1: Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaty Act, nesting bird surveys shall be performed not more than 14 days prior to the scheduled construction in areas adjacent to trees identified for removal. Where feasibility, construction activities will be scheduled outside of the breeding season in areas where birds and nests may be present. Prior to construction activities, a daily sweep shall be conducted in areas where birds and nests have a high chance of occurrence. In the event that active nests are discovered, a suitable buffer should be established around such active nests and no construction within the buffer allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (e.g. the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest). No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the qualified biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is complete, and the

young have fledged the nest. Survey results shall be presented in a letter report and submitted to the City. Nesting bird surveys are not required for construction activities occurring between September 1 and January 31.

e)	Would the project conflict with any	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	local policies or ordinances protecting	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	biological resources, such as a tree	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	preservation policy or ordinance?		Incorporated		
			$\overline{\boxtimes}$		

e) Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 4.3.4 (a), the Proposed Project is not located within a critical habitat or significant ecological area. The Proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinance in the protection of biological resources because the Proposed Project does not involve the destruction of protected biological habitats or species. The Proposed Project involves the improvement of a functioning public park. The City has not adopted a tree preservation ordinance. The Proposed Project would result in tree relocation and tree removal, particularly for the diseased olive trees in the parking lot. Construction activities, including the moving of trees and other existing vegetation will be conducted outside of the nesting season. If the proposed construction activities must occur during nesting season, implementation of BIO-1 would reduce impacts to a level less than significant. A less than significant impact would occur with mitigation incorporated.

f)	Would the project conflict with the	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	provisions of an adopted Habitat	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	Conservation Plan, Natural	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	Conservancy Conservation Plan, or		Incorporated		
	other approved local, regional, or state				\boxtimes
	habitat conservation plan?				

f) No Impact. The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area surrounded by commercial, residential, and public facilities. The Proposed Project site is neither located within nor affected directly or indirectly by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

4.3.5 <u>Cultural Resources</u>

Would the	project cau	ise a substai	ntial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
adverse cha	ange in the	significance	of a	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
historical	resource	pursuant	to	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
§15064.5?					Incorporated		
					Π .		\square
	Would the adverse cha historical §15064.5?	Would the project cau adverse change in the historical resource §15064.5?	Would the project cause a substan adverse change in the significance historical resource pursuant §15064.5?	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Would the project cause a substantial Potentially adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Impact §15064.5?	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant toPotentially Significant ImpactLess than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated§15064.5?ImpactImpactImpact	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant toPotentially Significant ImpactLess than Significant Impact

a) No Impact. The Proposed Project would not involve the removal of a historic resource. The buildings within the Proposed Project are not considered to have historic significance. The National Register of Historic Places database identifies one property in the City to have historic

significance, which is the La Puente Valley Woman's Club. The La Puente Valley Woman's Club is located at 200 North First Street (NPS 2019). The Proposed Project is not located adjacent to the La Puente Valley Woman's Club, nor would it involve any construction work in that property. The implementation of the Proposed Project would not affect this resource. No impact would occur.

b)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	§15064.5?		Incorporated		

b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project is an active public park within an urbanized area. Facilities surrounding the Proposed Project include single-family homes, public facilities, schools, and commercial buildings. An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared for a Municipal Code amendment and installation and operation of three electronic billboards and sign at the western boundary of La Puente City Park (City 2019). While the IS/MND identified that the City of La Puente is located within the cultural area formerly occupied by the Gabrieleño-Kizh, the proposed activities are not likely to disturb native soils that would result in significant impacts to archaeological resources.

Most of the surfaces within the Proposed Project have been previously disturbed. Any proposed groundwork, including the sewer line upgrades that are 8 to 12 feet below surface, are not expected to reach further depths that would impact native soils. However, unknown resources may be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. Due to the potential sensitivity of archaeological resources within the area, the following mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure that the discovery of archaeological resources uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. The Proposed Project would comply with Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines in determining the significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

CUL-1: Archaeological Monitoring: For adequate coverage and the protection of potentially significant buried resources, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the City to monitor all ground-disturbing construction activities in areas not previously disturbed, and during activities that may encounter native soils. The project archaeologist shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting potentially significant resources. Salvage operation requirements pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines shall be followed, and the treatment of discovered Native American remains shall comply with State codes and regulations of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Any significant archaeologist and offered to a qualified repository for curation. Any resulting reports will be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton.

c)	Would the project disturb any human	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	remains, including those interred	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	outside of formal cemeteries?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
				\bowtie	

c) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project, or areas within the vicinity of the Proposed Project, are not designated cemeteries. The Proposed Project area is in an urban environment and on lands that have been previously disturbed. It is not anticipated that the Proposed Project would uncover human remains because ground-disturbing activities are not expected to reach depths that would disturb native soils. Due to the context and location of the Proposed Project, no human remains are expected to be uncovered.

In the event that any human remains are encountered, the Proposed Project would comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 that states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Compliance with the State Health and Safety Code would reduce any potential impacts associated with the discovery of human remains. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.6 <u>Energy</u>

This section describes the potential energy usage effects from implementation of the Proposed Project. Construction and operational energy usage modeling was performed through use of the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 and EMFAC2017 models. The EMFAC2017 model output files are provided in Appendix C, and the CalEEMod model output files are provided in Appendix E and were also utilized for the greenhouse gas emissions analysis.

a)	Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to	Potentially Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	No Impact
	wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.	Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	
	during project construction or operation?			\boxtimes	

a) Less than Significant Impact. The following calculates the potential energy consumption associated with the construction and operations of the Proposed Project and provides a determination if energy consumption utilized by the Proposed Project is wasteful, inefficient, or an unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Construction Energy Usage

Construction activities for the Proposed Project would consume energy in three general forms:

- Petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Proposed Project Site, construction worker travel to and from the Proposed Project Site, as well as delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling demolition material to offsite reuse and disposal facilities)
- Electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during Project Proposed construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity to power any necessary lighting during construction, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power
- Energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass

Construction-Related Electricity

Construction activities for the Proposed Project would require the consumption of electricity. Where possible, electricity would be supplied to the Proposed Project site by Southern California Edison and would be obtained from the existing electrical lines in the vicinity of the Proposed Project site. The use of electricity from existing power lines rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators would minimize impacts on energy use. Electricity consumed during project construction would vary throughout the construction period based on the construction activities being performed. Various construction activities include electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during project construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity to power any necessary lighting during construction, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power. Such electricity demand would be temporary and nominal and would cease upon the completion of construction. Overall, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would require limited electricity consumption that would not be expected to have an adverse impact on available electricity supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, the use of electricity during project construction would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Since the Proposed Project would consist of improvements to an existing developed park, it is anticipated that only nominal improvements would be required to Southern California Edison distribution lines and equipment with development of the Proposed Project. Where feasible, the new service installations and connections would be scheduled and implemented in a manner that would not result in electrical service interruptions to other properties. Compliance with City's guidelines and requirements would ensure that the Proposed Project fulfills its responsibilities relative to infrastructure installation, coordinates any electrical infrastructure removals or relocations, and limits any impacts associated with grading, construction, and development. Construction of the project's electrical infrastructure is not anticipated to adversely affect the electrical infrastructure serving the surrounding uses or utility system capacity.

Construction-Related Natural Gas

Construction activities for the Proposed Project would not involve the consumption of natural gas. Natural gas would not be supplied to support construction activities; thus, no demand would be generated by construction. Since the Proposed Project site is located in a developed portion of the City that has natural gas lines in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, construction of the Proposed Project would be limited to the relocation of existing natural gas line (if necessary) within the Proposed Project site. Construction-related energy usage impacts associated with the relocation of natural gas connections are expected to be confined to trenching in order to place the lines below surface. In addition, prior to ground disturbance, the Proposed Project would notify and coordinate with SoCalGas to identify the locations and depth of all existing gas lines and avoid disruption of gas service. Therefore, construction-related impacts to natural gas supply and infrastructure would be less than significant.

Construction-Related Petroleum Fuels

Construction of the Proposed Project would utilize petroleum fuels for both off-road equipment and from on-road vehicles that include automobiles for transporting workers to and from the Proposed Project site as well as trucks transporting dirt from the Proposed Project site and building supplies to the Proposed Project site.

The off-road construction equipment fuel usage was calculated through use of the off-road equipment assumptions utilized in the CalEEMod model run (see Appendix C) and the fuel usage calculations provided in the 2017 Off-road Diesel Emission Factors spreadsheet, prepared by CARB (https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/msei/ordiesel.htm). The off-road construction equipment fuel calculations are shown in Appendix C, which found that the off-road equipment utilized during construction of the Proposed Project would consume 30,473 gallons of fuel.

For the on-road construction trips, the fleet average miles per gallon rates have been calculated through use of the EMFAC2017 model (<u>https://www.arb.ca.gov/emfac/2017/</u>); and the EMFAC2017 model printouts are provided in Appendix C. Appendix C also shows the on-road construction vehicle trips modeled in CalEEMod and the fuel usage calculations, which found that the on-road construction-related vehicle trips would consume 14,893 gallons of fuel.

As shown in Appendix C, the combined fuel used from off-road construction equipment and onroad construction trips for the Proposed Project would result in the consumption of 45,366 gallons of fuel. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be required to adhere to all State and SCAQMD regulations for off-road equipment and on-road trucks, which provide minimum fuel efficiency standards. As such, construction activities for the Proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts regarding transportation energy would be less than significant. Development of the Proposed Project would not result in the need to manufacture construction materials or create new building material facilities specifically to supply the Proposed Project. It is difficult to measure the energy used in the production of construction materials such as asphalt, steel, and concrete; it is reasonable to assume that the production of building materials such as concrete, steel, etc. would employ all reasonable energy conservation practices in the interest of minimizing the cost of doing business.

Operational Energy Usage

The ongoing operation of the Proposed Project would require the use of energy resources for multiple purposes, including electrical usage associated with lighting and transport of water, natural gas usage for heating of the new fitness building, and petroleum fuel usage associated with new vehicle trips to the Proposed Project site and landscape equipment.

Operations-Related Electricity Usage

Operation of the Proposed Project would result in consumption of electricity at the Proposed Project site. According to the CalEEMod model run provided in Appendix E, operation of the Proposed Project would utilize an additional 48,787 kilowatt-hours per year of electricity. It should be noted that the Proposed Project would include the removal of the existing field lighting that utilizes high pressure sodium lamps with new LED field lighting that is anticipated to use less electricity for field lighting. In addition, the Proposed Project would comply with all federal, State, and City requirements related to the consumption of electricity, including the CalGreen Building Standards. Therefore, it is anticipated the Proposed Project will be designed and built to minimize electricity use and that existing and planned electricity capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the Proposed Project's electricity demand. Thus, impacts with regard to electrical supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operations-Related Petroleum Fuel Usage

Operation of the Proposed Project would result in increased consumption of petroleum-based fuels related to vehicular travel to and from the Proposed Project site. According to the CalEEMod model run provided in Appendix E, operation of the Proposed Project would generate an additional 106,626 vehicle miles traveled per year. According to the EMFAC2017 model run (see Appendix C), the fleet average miles per gallon rate for all gasoline-powered vehicles in southern California in the year 2020 is 24.6 miles per gallon. Based on this rate, operation of the Proposed Project would use 4,338 gallons of transportation fuel per year. It should be noted that the Proposed Project would comply with all federal, State, and City requirements related to the consumption of transportation energy that includes California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11 California Green Building Standards that require all new non-residential parking lots to provide preferred parking for clean air vehicles as well as provide electric vehicle charging spaces. Therefore, it is anticipated the Proposed Project will be designed and built to minimize transportation energy through the promotion of the use of electric-powered vehicles, and it is anticipated that existing and planned capacity and supplies of transportation fuels would be sufficient to support the Proposed Project's demand. Thus, impacts with regard to transportation energy supply and infrastructure capacity would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

In conclusion, the Proposed Project would comply with regulatory compliance measures outlined by the State and City related to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG), Transportation/Circulation, and Water Supply. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable City Building and Fire Codes. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Would the project Conflict with or	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	obstruct a state or local plan for	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
				\bowtie	

b) Less than Significant Impact. Energy consumption from new projects that do not include residential uses, such as the Proposed Project, are primarily controlled by Title 24, Part 11 California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), which provides minimum requirements for bicycle parking, carpool/vanpool/electric vehicle parking spaces, use of water-efficient plumbing and landscaping fixtures, recycling and use of recycled materials in building products. Specific CalGreen requirements that are applicable to the Proposed Project include requiring that a minimum of 65 percent of construction waste be diverted from landfills and providing bicycle parking spaces, as well as providing electric vehicle charging stations within the proposed parking lot. Through implementation of the above programs, regulations, and policies, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.7 <u>Geology and Soils</u>

a) i) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury,	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
or death involving 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.		Incorporated		

a) i) Less than Significant Impact. The City is in a region of Southern California with several active faults. A Geotechnical Report was prepared for the construction of Stormwater Storage and Infiltration Facilities within the eastern portion of La Puente City Park (Appendix D). The report identified known faults within 13 miles of the Park. These faults include Walnut Creek, San Jose, Whittier, Indian Hill, East Montebello, Sierra Madre, Raymond, clamshell-Sawpit, and Chino/Central Avenue faults. The San Andreas Fault is located 28 miles to the northeast of the Proposed Project (Appendix D). The Proposed Project is not located within an active Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (General Plan 2004; Appendix D). According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) U.S. Quaternary Faults, the Walnut Creek Fault intersects the Proposed Project. The fault crosses through the vicinity of Temple Avenue and Gaylawn Court, through North Hacienda Boulevard and North Cadbrook Drive, and across the baseball and football fields. The Walnut Creek Fault is a nundifferentiated quaternary fault. A quaternary fault is a fault that has been active in the last 1.6 million years (USGS 2019).

The Proposed Project is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active region. Residents of the City and users of the Park may experience ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. However, the Proposed Project would not introduce additional structures that would permanently house residents within the site that could cause a significant loss or injury due to ground shaking. Any facilities that are proposed for construction would not exceed one story. New buildings and the amphitheater would be designed and constructed to comply with all seismicsafety development requirements, including the Title 24 standards of the current California Building Code. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault.

a) ii) Would the project directly or indirectly	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
cause potential substantial adverse	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
effects, including the risk of loss, injury,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
or death involving strong seismic		Incorporated		
ground shaking?			\bowtie	

a) ii) Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 4.3.7 a) i), the Proposed Project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The Walnut Creek Fault intersects the western portion of the Proposed Project from Temple Avenue to Hacienda Boulevard. The Proposed Project will comply with existing building regulations. The Proposed Project would not introduce additional structures that would permanently house residents within the site that could cause a significant loss or injury due to ground shaking. The design and construction of the new facilities such as the new fitness building and amphitheater would comply with all seismic-safety development requirements, including the Title 24 standards of the current California Building Code. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

a) iii) Would the project directly or indirectly	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
cause potential substantial adverse	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
effects, including the risk of loss, injury,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
or death involving seismic-related		Incorporated		
ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes

a) iii) No Impact. Liquefaction occurs in areas where groundwater levels intersect with loose, unconsolidated soils that lose cohesion. Liquefaction is a prominent secondary ground failure effect of earthquakes. According to the Geotechnical Report investigation, groundwater was not encountered during the field exploration. The results from the sensitivity analyses indicated that the fine-grained materials at the site below groundwater are not considered susceptible to liquefaction or seismic sensitivity (Appendix D). According to the City's General Plan, the Proposed Project is not within an area prone to liquefaction (General Plan 2004). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction. No Impact would occur.

a) iv) Would the project directly or indirectly	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
cause potential substantial adverse	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
effects, including the risk of loss, injury,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
or death involving landslides?		Incorporated		
				\boxtimes

a) iv) No Impact. The Proposed Project is relatively flat. According to the General Plan, areas close to the Industry Hills Recreation Center and portions of the Babe Zaharias Golf Course are subject to earthquake-induced landslides due to the proximity to steep slopes (General Plan 2004). The Proposed Project is not located within an Earthquake-Induced Landslide Hazard Zone on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map (CDC 2019). No evidence of landslides were observed on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Therefore, an occurrence of an earthquake-induced landslide is not considered to be a hazard to the site. The Proposed Project is not located within an area that is susceptible to landslides. No impact would occur.

b)	Would the project result in substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
				\boxtimes	

b) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed construction activities include ground-disturbing activities that may result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Ground-disturbing activities would include site grading, trenching for the sewer line, and turf replacement. Although the Proposed Project site is relatively flat, the amount of ground-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Project would require implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would outline how the Proposed Project would minimize stormwater pollution from sources of sediment and other pollutants. A SWPPP is required for projects that disturb more than 1 acre of developed land. The Proposed Project would also implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce soil erosion during ground-disturbing activities. Typical construction BMPs for reducing erosion include, but are not limited to, soil cover of inactive areas, gravel bags, and fiber rolls. The City has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The Proposed Project would comply with the City's NPDES permit to prevent stormwater pollution. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.

c)	Would the project be located on a	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	that would become unstable as a result	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	of the project, and potentially result in		Incorporated		
	on- or off-site landslide, lateral			\boxtimes	
	spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or				
	collapse?				

c) Less than Significant Impact. Lateral spreading is characterized by landslides that occur on gentle slopes caused by earthquake-induced liquefaction. Subsidence occurs the there is a downward settling of the grounds' surface. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.7 (a), the City contains areas that are subject to landslides and liquefaction. However, the Proposed Project is located on relatively flat terrain and in an area that has been previously disturbed. Per the Geotechnical Report prepared by Tetra Tech, the site is not located in an area mapped by the USGS where either historical or current subsidence has been recorded. Therefore, subsidence is not considered a hazard for this site (Appendix D). The Proposed Project would comply with Title 24 standards of the California Building Code to ensure that potential impacts due to unstable soils would be less than significant.

d)	Would the project be located on	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	B of the Uniform Building Code (1994),	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	creating substantial direct or indirect		Incorporated		
	risks to life or property?			\bowtie	

d) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is located in the City, and expansive soil is prevalent in the City. The Proposed Project is in an area of expansive soils. Expansive soils may become unstable during ground shaking and could cause damage to buildings. The Proposed Project would involve new construction of a fitness building, stage, amphitheater, and pavilions. However, the new buildings and structures are not meant for habitation. The Proposed Project would comply with Title 24 standards to ensure that potential impacts due to expansive soils would be less than significant. Proposed activities requiring site preparation would implement, where feasible, site and grading preparation as identified in the Community Safety Element. In the section discussing expansive soils, site preparation may include prewetting, removal of expansive soil and replacement with non-expanding soils, and chemical treatments. Grading would be designed so that any excess surface water would be safely discharged. Structural designs of the new buildings must consider the potential effects of expansive soils on selected building materials. (General Plan 2004). Impacts would be less than significant.

e)	Would the project have soils incapable	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	of adequately supporting the use of	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	septic tanks or alternative waste water	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	disposal systems where sewers are not		Incorporated		
	available for the disposal of waste				\boxtimes
	water?				

e) No Impact. The Proposed Project does not include the construction of a septic tank or restrooms that would require modification of existing septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Proposed Project would tie into the existing municipal sewer line. No impact would occur.

f)	Would the project directly or indirectly	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	destroy a unique paleontological	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	resource or site or unique geologic	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	feature?		Incorporated		
				\boxtimes	

f) Less than Significant Impact. Most of the surfaces within the Proposed Project have been previously disturbed. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The Proposed Project does not currently house any unique paleontological or geological feature. Due to the disturbed nature of the area, likelihood for the discovery of unique features is low. Furthermore, ground-disturbing activities are not expected to go beyond 8 to 12 feet in depth and disturb native soils. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.8 <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>

This section describes the potential global climate change effects from implementation of the Proposed Project. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emission modeling was performed through use of the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2. The CalEEMod model output files are provided in Appendix E.

a)	Would	the	project	generate	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	greenhous	e gas	emission	is, either	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	directly or	indired	ctly, that m	nay have a	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	significant	impact	on the env	ironment?		Incorporated		
							\bowtie	

a) Less Than Significant Impact. Significant legislative and regulatory activities directly and indirectly affect climate change and GHGs in California. The primary climate change legislation in California is Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California, and AB 32 requires that GHGs emitted in California be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. In addition to AB 32, Executive Order B-30-15 was issued on April 29, 2015, that aims to reduce California's GHG emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. In September 2016, AB 197 and Senate Bill (SB) 32 codified into statute the GHG emission reduction targets provided in Executive Order B-20-15.

CARB is the State agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of GHGs in California that contribute to global warming in order to reduce emissions of GHGs. The CARB Governing Board approved the 1990 GHG emissions level of 427 million tons of CO₂ equivalent (MtCO₂e) on December 6, 2007. Therefore, in 2020, annual emissions in California are required to be at or below 427 MtCO₂e. The CARB Board approved the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in December 2008, the First Update to the Scoping Plan in May 2014, and California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan in November 2017. The Scoping Plans define a range of programs and activities that will be implemented primarily by State agencies but also include actions by local government agencies. Primary strategies addressed in the Scoping Plans include new industrial and emission control technologies; alternative energy generation technologies; advanced energy conservation in lighting, heating, cooling, and ventilation; reduced-carbon fuels; hybrid and electric vehicles; and other methods of improving vehicle mileage. Local government will have a part in implementing some of these strategies. The Scoping Plans also call for reductions in vehicle-associated GHG emissions through smart growth that will result in reductions in vehicle miles traveled (CARB 2018, 2017a, 2016, 2010).

The CalEEMod model used above to calculate the criteria pollutant emissions was also utilized to calculate the GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project (see Appendix E). The CalEEMod model calculated GHG emissions generated from the Proposed Project that include construction and operation of the proposed improvements to the Park. Per the analysis methodology presented in the SCAQMD Working Group meetings, the construction emissions were amortized over 30 years. Table 10 shows the estimated GHG emissions that would be predicted from development of the Proposed Project.

A otivity	Greenhouse Gas Emissions in metric tons/year						
Activity	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO₂e			
Area Sources	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Energy Usage	15.54	0.00	0.00	15.60			
Mobile Sources	48.00	0.00	0.00	48.07			
Solid Waste	0.09	0.01	0.00	0.23			
Water and Wastewater	22.35	0.00	0.00	22.43			
Total Construction Emissions Amortized over 30 Years ¹	13.14	0.00	0.00	13.21			
Total Project Emissions	99.12	0.01	0.00	99.54			
SCAQMD Draft Threshold of Significance							
Exceed Threshold?				No			

Table 10: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Project

Notes:

¹ Construction emissions amortized over 30 years as recommended in the SCAQMD GHG Working Group on November 19, 2009. Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 (see Appendix E). This analysis proposes to use the "Tier 3" quantitative threshold for all land use projects³ as recommended by the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD proposes that if a project generates GHG emissions below 3,000 MTCO₂e, it could be concluded that the Project's GHG contribution is not "cumulatively considerable" and is therefore less than significant under CEQA. As shown in Table 10, the Proposed Project would generate 99.54 MTCO₂e per year, which would not exceed SCAQMD draft annual threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e. As such, it could be concluded that the Project's GHG contribution is not "cumulatively considerable" and is therefore less than significant under CEQA.

b)	Would the project conflict with an	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	applicable plan, policy, or regulation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	adopted for the purpose of reducing	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	the emissions of greenhouse gases?		Incorporated		
				\boxtimes	

b) Less than Significant Impact. The California State Legislature adopted AB 32 in 2006, which requires the state's GHG emissions by 2020 to meet the GHG emissions level created in 1990, and adopted AB 197 and SB 32 in 2016, which require the state's GHG emissions to be 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

In order to achieve the target provided in AB 32, the SCAQMD developed a Working Group that developed a tiered approach in order to determine if proposed land use projects would contribute to an exceedance of the GHG emissions targets detailed in AB 32. As shown above in Table 10, the Proposed Project would generate 99.544 MTCO₂e per year from construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The GHG emissions generated from the Proposed Project would be within the "Tier 3" quantitative threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year for all land use projects as recommended by the SCAQMD.

The SCAQMD has not yet updated its Tier 3 quantitative threshold to address AB 197 and SB 32. However, it is anticipated that the Tier 3 thresholds would be reduced around 40 percent, which is equivalent to how much more stringent AB 197 and SB 32 are over AB 32. Since the Proposed Project's GHG emissions are 97 percent below the Tier 3 threshold, it is anticipated that the Proposed Project's GHG emissions would remain less than significant under any future thresholds developed to address AB 197 and SB 32. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for reducing the emissions of GHGs. Less than significant impacts would occur.

³ Greenhouse Gas CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group Meeting # 15. South Coast Air Quality Management District. September 2010.

4.3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a)	Would the project create a significant	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	hazard to the public or the environment	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	through the routine transport, use, or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	disposal of hazardous materials?		Incorporated		
				\bowtie	

a) Less than Significant Impact. Construction of the Proposed Project would involve the use of construction-related chemicals. These include but are not limited to hydraulic fluids, motor oil, grease, runoff, and other related fluids and lubricants. The construction activities would involve the disposal and recycling of materials, trash, and debris.

The City's General Plan Community Safety Element addresses potential hazards in the City and identifies goals and policies to reduce risks and damages associated with hazards, including disposal of hazardous materials due to human activities. The Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division provides business inspections for waste generators and ensures handlers/generators of hazardous wastes are complying with the appropriate regulatory guidelines. Goal 2 of the Community Safety Element is for the safe use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials with the following policies outlined below. Compliance with Goal 2 of the Community Services Element would reduce impacts to less than significant during transport of hazardous materials (General Plan 2004).

- Policy 2.1 Cooperate with federal, State, and County agencies to reduce risks to residents associated with the use or transport of hazardous materials
- Policy 2.2 Develop and maintain a coordinated emergency operations plan, and educate the community on emergency procedures to respond to natural and human activity hazards
- Policy 2.3 Continue to educate the community regarding the safe use and disposal of household hazardous waste

While the Proposed Project would include transport of materials to and from the site during the construction schedule, transport activities will be temporary once the Proposed Project is completed. The Proposed Project would implement BMPs to minimize impacts in the event of a spill or release of hazardous materials used on site. These include, but are not limited to routine cleaning, inspection, and maintenance, development of procedures to mitigate spills, provide signage in construction areas, proper storage and handling procedures, and providing secondary containment of liquid materials. No routine transport or use of hazardous materials would occur. With adherence to State and federal compliance and implementation of BMPs, impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Would the project create a significant	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	hazard to the public or the environment	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	through reasonably foreseeable upset	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	and accident conditions involving the		Incorporated		
	release of hazardous materials into the			\bowtie	
	environment?				

b) Less than Significant Impact. Construction of the Proposed Project would utilize potentially hazardous materials from construction equipment and other related materials. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.9 (a), the Proposed Project would comply with the goals and policies under the Hazard Mitigation section of the General Plan to ensure the safe use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials (General Plan 2004). Project-specific BMPs would be implemented, including but not limited to, providing temporary containment for spills, use of drip pans beneath potential leak points, segregation of potentially hazardous materials from non-hazardous debris, and storage and disposal procedures of hazardous materials. During normal operations, potentially hazardous materials that would be introduced in the Proposed Project area include cleaning and maintenance materials. These would be used only by designated park employees and would be stored and maintained in accordance with the appropriate chemical safety data sheets and in compliance with City and County regulations on hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c)	Would the project emit hazardous	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	emissions or handle hazardous or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	acutely hazardous materials,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	substances, or waste within one-		Incorporated		
	quarter mile of an existing or proposed			\bowtie	
	school?				

c) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is immediately adjacent to Saint Joseph School and La Puente High School. Saint Joseph School is separated from the Park by a chain link fence. La Puente High School is separated from the Park by an access road that divides the Park and the school and is bordered by a chain link fence. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.9 (a) and (b), construction of the Proposed Project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials from construction equipment and other related materials. To minimize the risk of the accidental release of acutely hazardous materials to the nearby schools, any areas under construction would be locked to prevent trespassing of school children or other visitors. Hazardous materials would be properly sealed and stored in designated areas that are not easily accessed by the general public. Staging areas would not be located immediately adjacent to the school property. Any hazardous materials that will be transported to and from the site would be sealed. In the event of a spill or release, the Proposed Project would comply with proper cleanup and disposal procedures and will coordinate with the Los Angeles County Fire Department Health Hazardous Materials Division, Department of Toxic Substances Control, Environmental Protection Agency, and the City's Director of Emergency Services and Public Safety Officer, as necessary. Impacts would be less than significant.

d)	Would the project be located on a site	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	which is included on a list of hazardous	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	materials sites compiled pursuant to	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	Government Code Section 65962.5 and,		Incorporated		
	as a result, would it create a significant			\bowtie	
	hazard to the public or the				
	environment?				

d) Less than Significant Impact. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control GeoTracker database, a leaking underground storage tank (LUST) is located on Hill Street and Glendora Avenue at 501 Glendora Avenue in La Puente. The status of the cleanup of this site is recorded as completed as of 2008 (DTSC 2019). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public because no proposed activities would occur on the LUST cleanup site. Impacts would be less than significant.

e)	For a project located within an airport	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	land use plan or, where such a plan had	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	not been adopted, within 2 miles of a	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	public airport or public use airport,		Incorporated		
	would the project result in a safety			\bowtie	
	hazard or excessive noise for people				
	residing or working in the project area?				

e) No Impact. The nearest public airport is the San Gabriel Airport located approximately 7 miles northwest from the Proposed Project. Haddicks Heliport and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Heliport are located approximately 0.6 miles southwest and 2 miles southeast from the Proposed Project site, respectively; both are for private use (Google Maps 2019). The Proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan, and no proposed activities would occur near any airports. The Proposed Project would not utilize any nearby airports. Because the nearest airports are for private use, it would not involve continued uses and noise disturbances to users of the Park. No structures are proposed that would impact the utilization of the nearby airports or result in a safety hazard to the airport.

The Proposed Project is located outside of the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours of El Monte Airport. The Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the surrounding area to excessive levels of airport-generated noise. As such, airport and airstrip noise impacts to the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

f)	Would	the	pr	oject	impair	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	implemen	tation	of	or	physically	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	interfere	with an	ado	pted	emergency	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	response	plan or e	merg	gency	evacuation		Incorporated		
	plan?							\boxtimes	

f) Less than Significant Impact. According to the Los Angeles County Public Works, Hacienda Boulevard, which is located west of the Proposed Project, is identified as a disaster route (Los Angeles County 2008). Hacienda Boulevard consists of two lanes in each direction. A parking lot for the Park is located along Hacienda Boulevard across Prichard Street.

The Proposed Project would not involve significant roadwork or alteration of the existing roadways that would interfere with any disaster routes. The replacement of the sewer line along Hacienda Boulevard would result in impacts to traffic flow. The Proposed Project could result in a slowdown of traffic due to construction equipment and vehicles entering and exiting the site. Access to the Park via Hacienda Boulevard and via Glendora Avenue, where the main entrance is located, would be temporarily impacted during construction of the Proposed Project. Implementation of a traffic control plan and coordination with the City's Engineering Division to address transportation and access concerns.

The City's General Plan Community Safety Element addresses potential hazards in the City and identifies goals and policies to reduce risks and damages associated with disasters that would require activation of the City's emergency response procedures. Goal 3 of the Community Services Element focuses on providing adequate emergency response to public health and safety threats (General Plan 2004). Policies include:

- Policy 3.1 Prepare and Maintain an Emergency Operations Plan that addresses all potential disasters affecting the community
- Policy 3.2 Promote public awareness of emergency procedures for residents, the business community, City staff, and public officials
- Policy 3.3 Continue to contract with experienced and well-qualified service providers for hazardous materials response

The City's Emergency Operations Plan is a comprehensive system that provides guidelines to appropriately respond to emergency events such as natural disasters, technological, and humancaused events (City 2017). The Proposed Project does not involve physical modifications that would directly alter the Emergency Operations Plan. The sewer line replacement and closures of the Park would be temporary in nature and would not result in long-term delays along Hacienda Boulevard and Glendora Avenue. The implementation of the PMP would not require changes to the City's Emergency Operations Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

g)	Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	death involving wildiand mes:				\boxtimes

g) No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located within a State Responsibility Area or Local Responsibility Area for Fire Hazard Severity zones (CAL FIRE 2007). The Proposed Project is surrounded by urban development; it is not a designated wildland area. The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fire. No impact would occur.

4.3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

a)	Would the project violate any water	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	quality standards or waste discharge	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	requirements, or otherwise	lmpact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	substantially degrade surface or ground	l	Incorporated		
	water quality?			\bowtie	
			_	_	

a) Less than Significant Impact. The City is one of the municipal permittees under the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit Order No. R4-2012-0175 issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City adopted ordinance No. 15-936 to amend Chapter 4.16 of the City's municipal code relating to Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements by imposing Low Impact Development (LID) strategies on projects that require building, grading, and encroachment.

The Proposed Project would result in potential impacts to surface water quality during turf replacement and other ground-disturbing activities for new facility installations. Construction activities could potentially result in the generation of water quality pollutants that includes debris, silt, chemicals, and other solvents. During construction, if soil is not contained and is directly exposed to rain, soil erosion and sediment could flow into the storm drain system, resulting in the potential degradation of water quality. The Proposed Project would implement a SWPPP to minimize stormwater pollution from sources of sediment and other pollutants. The Proposed Project will comply with the MS4 Permit and LID standards to minimize impacts to water quality.

Impacts from discharge or runoff from the proposed construction activities would be minimized by implementing site-specific BMPs. These would include but not be limited to erosion control plans, sediment control, non-stormwater management, and waste management and materials control to limit or reduce potential pollutants at the source. The Proposed Project also includes upgrading of the sewer line on North Hacienda Boulevard that comes into the Park adjacent to the existing parking lots that will also improve surface drainage.

The Proposed Project will comply with the City's revised ordinance to lessen water quality impacts by integrating LID standards to the Proposed Project. Adherence to the LID standards and BMPs will reduce impacts to water quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Would the project subs	tantially	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	decrease groundwater supp	lies or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	interfere substantially	with	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	groundwater recharge such t	hat the		Incorporated		
	project may impede sus	tainable			\boxtimes	
	groundwater management	of the				
	basin?					

b) Less than Significant Impact. The City purchases its supply of water from the Suburban Water Systems, La Puente Valley County Water District, and the San Gabriel Valley Water Company. The Proposed Project is located within the La Puente Valley County Water District service area. La Puente Valley County Water District provides water from three groundwater wells in the San Gabriel Basin. They have a three-million-gallon reservoir located on Main Street and plans pipeline, tank, pump, and well refurbishments (General Plan 2004).

The Proposed Project is not a designated recharge area. The construction and operational activities would not result in the significant depletion of groundwater supplies because the uses on site would be consistent with activities typically found in parks. Water supply for the construction and operational needs would be obtained from existing water lines connected to the Park. Maintenance and care of the site, including watering landscaped areas, would not change. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) i) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

-	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
2	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
2	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
-		Incorporated		
f			\bowtie	
1				
-				

c) i) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is a developed park, and all construction and operational activities would occur within its boundaries. No streams or rivers are currently located within the Proposed Project site. The Proposed Project would not alter the existing drainages on site. While site grading and the removal and installation of new turf would create a temporary impact on soils, the Proposed Project would comply with project-specific BMPs to manage erosion, sediment, and stormwater runoff. The Proposed Project would implement the adopted SUSMP requirements on LID strategies to lessen water quality impacts and improve the quality of the runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) ii) Would the project substantially alter Potentially Less than Less than No the existing drainage pattern of the site Significant Significant Significant Impact area, including through the Impact With Mitigation Impact or alteration of the course of a stream or Incorporated river or through the addition of \boxtimes impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
 - c) ii) Less than Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.10 c), no streams or rivers are currently located within the Proposed Project site. No activities associated with the Proposed Project would involve the alteration of the existing drainage. The addition of the splash pads and other on site additions would increase the amount of impervious surfaces which may increase the runoff to the nearest storm drain. Implementation of the LID program would control pollutants and pollutant loads and runoff from impervious surfaces. These methods include use of infiltration basins, dry wells, and pervious pavement. Project-specific BMPs would be implemented to manage potential erosion from ground disturbances. In addition, the excess water from the splash pad would be captured, recycled, and reused on site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) iii) Would the project substantially alte the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream of river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner whicl would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity o planned existing or stormwate drainage systems or provide substantia additional sources or polluted runoff?

r	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
е	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
е	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
r		Incorporated		
f			\boxtimes	
h				
r				
of				
r				
al				

c) iii) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is in an urbanized location, within an active park. The installation of the splash pads and other new site features would decrease the permeability of the site and increase runoff. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with the MS4 permit during construction by implementing strategies to lessen water quality impacts by minimizing soil compaction, design projects to minimize impervious areas, and employ LID design principles. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in increased polluted runoff or exceed the capacity of existing or planned drainage systems. In addition, the water from the splash pad would be captured, recycled, and reused on site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c)	iv) Would the project substantially alter	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	the existing drainage pattern of the site	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	or area, including through the	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	alteration of the course of a stream or		Incorporated		
	river or through the addition of			\bowtie	
	impervious surfaces, in a manner which				
	would impede or redirect flood flows?				

c) iv) Less than Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.10 a) through c), the Proposed Project is located in an urbanized area with no rivers or streams in the immediate vicinity. New park additions would decrease the permeability of the site such as the addition of the splash pads; however, the water from the splash pad would be captured, recycled and reused on site, and the fields will include installation of new, natural turf to allow permeability. Implementation of BMPs and compliance with the MS4 permit would result in less than significant impacts.

d)	Would the project in flood hazard,	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	pollutants due to project inundation?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
					\boxtimes

d) No Impact. The Proposed Project is located inland, approximately 30 miles north of the Pacific Ocean. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps, the Proposed Project is located in Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2019). The City's General Plan states that the Proposed Project is not located within the flood inundation areas of the Puddingstone Reservoir, Santa Fe Dam, or Whittier Narrows Dam (General Plan 2004). No impact would occur.

e)	Would the project conflict with or	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	obstruct implementation of a water	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	quality control plan or sustainable	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	groundwater management plan?		Incorporated		
				\square	

e) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would comply with the City's MS4 permit, SUSMP and LID programs to lessen water quality impacts. Implementation of project BMPs from the SWPPP during proposed construction activities would reduce any impacts associated with water quality to less than significant. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not use groundwater for construction or operation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project does not include any activities that will interfere with any groundwater management plan, as all construction would occur within the vicinity of the Park. The Proposed Project includes a sewer line replacement which would improve drainage of the site. Improvements to the sewer line would comply with the General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element in improving efficiency of the existing systems. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.11 Land Use Planning

a)	Would the project physically divide an	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	established community?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	Impact
			Incorporated		\boxtimes

a) No Impact. The Proposed Project would not involve rezoning of the Proposed Project site and would not alter the existing land use. The construction and operation of the Proposed Project would occur within the vicinity of the Park and would not require the displacement of any nearby businesses or residents. No impact would occur.

b)	Would the project cause a significant	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	environmental impact due to a conflict	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	with any land use plan, policy, or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	regulation adopted for the purpose of		Incorporated		
	avoiding or mitigating an				\boxtimes
	environmental effect?				

b) No Impact. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.4 f), the Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area surrounded by commercial, residential, and public facilities. The Proposed Project site is neither located within nor affected directly or indirectly by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

4.3.12 Mineral Resources

a)	Would the project result in the loss of	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	availability of a known mineral resource	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	that would be of value to the region and	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	the residents of the state?		Incorporated		
					\square

a) No Impact. The Proposed Project site is identified as a Mineral Resource Zone 1 by the California Department of Conservation, California Division of Mines and Geology (1994). Mineral Resource Zone 1 is defined as an area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. The Proposed Project would not involve any mining activities that would result in the loss of known mineral resources. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is located in an urbanized area surrounded by development. No impact would occur.

b)	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes

b) No Impact. As discussed in Section 4.3.12 a), the Proposed Project is located in an area where no known significant mineral deposits are present. No mining activities are proposed during construction and operation of the Proposed Project. No impact would occur.

4.3.13 <u>Noise</u>

This section describes the existing noise setting and potential noise and vibration effects from project implementation on the site and its surrounding area (study area). Construction noise modeling was performed through use of the Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) Version 1.1. The model output is provided in Appendix F along with the noise measurement printouts and a photo index of the noise measurement locations.

Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project site is located within the City. Currently, the primary sources of noise within the study area consist of vehicles operating on Hacienda Boulevard and Temple Avenue as well as from people using the existing park features. In order to determine the existing noise levels, three long-term (approximately 11-hour) ambient noise measurements were taken at the existing Park between 9:40 a.m. and 8:43 p.m. on Saturday, September 21, 2019. The results of the noise level measurements are presented in Table 11, and the noise measurement printouts and photos of the noise measurement sites are provided in Appendix F.

Site	Site Description	11–hr Average	1-hr Average (dBA L _{eq} /Time)		
No.	Site Description	(dBA Leq)	Minimum	Maximum	
1	On tree, approximately 30 feet from picnic	EQ 7	53.2	61.7	
	shelters	36.7	10:11 AM	6:46 PM	
2	On fence, approximately 5 feet from	EQC	55.5	62.7	
	basketball courts	56.0	2:09 PM	7:42 PM	
3	On light post, approximately 50 feet from	E2 6	50.2	56.6	
	football field	53.0	10:45 AM	5:36 PM	

Table 11: Existing Noise Level Measurements

Source: Larson-Davis Model LXT1 Type 1 sound level meters programmed in "slow" mode to record noise levels in "A" weighted form.

dBA: The relative loudness of sounds in air as perceived by the human ear.

 L_{eq} : The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value that takes into account the total sound energy over a period of time.

City of La Puente Noise Standards

For construction activities within the City of La Puente, Municipal Code Section 4.34.020(f) prohibits the operation of any tools, equipment, impact devices, derricks, or hoists used on construction, drilling, repair, alteration, demolition, or earthwork between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or at any time on Saturdays, Sundays, or City holidays. Within the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., interior construction is permissible on Saturdays.

For operational activities, the Municipal Code Section 4.34.030(c) exempts activities conducted on City Parks from the City noise standards.

- a) Would the project result in generation Potentially Less than No Less than of substantial temporary Significant Significant Significant Impact а or permanent increase in ambient noise With Mitigation Impact Impact Incorporated levels in the vicinity of the project in \boxtimes excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
 - a) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. Both construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to generate noise in excess of standards and have been analyzed separately below.

Construction-Related Noise

Construction activities for the Proposed Project are anticipated to be completed in three phases with the first phase beginning in early 2020 and would be completed by the end of summer 2020. The remaining phases would occur over the next three to five years and will be dependent on available funding. The construction activities would include: (1) demolition of the existing basketball courts, handball courts, picnic and lunch shelters, and sidewalks; (2) grading of all areas to be improved as well as for the new sewer pipeline; (3) construction of all proposed park features; (4) application of architectural coatings on the new structures and features that is anticipate to occur concurrently with building construction; and (5) paving of reconfigured parking lot area and new basketball courts, amphitheater stage, batting cages, splash area, and new sidewalks. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Proposed Project site are students and staff at St. Joseph School, which is as near as 5 feet and La Puente High School, whose nearest outdoor use area is as near as 30 feet from the proposed area of the Park to be disturbed. In addition, homes are located as near as 90 feet to the northeast and 110 feet to the northwest of the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the Proposed Project.

Municipal Code Section 4.34.030(d) exempts construction noise from the City's noise standards, provided that construction activities are conducted between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays. However, the City construction noise standards do not provide any limits to the noise levels that may be created from construction activities during allowable hours; and, even with adherence to the City standards, the resultant construction noise levels may result in a significant substantial temporary noise increase to the nearby school and homes. In order to determine if

the proposed construction activities would create a significant substantial temporary noise increase, the FTA construction noise criteria thresholds (FTA 2018) have been utilized, which show that a significant construction noise impact would occur if construction noise exceeds 90 A-weighted decibels (dBA) during the daytime at the nearby school and homes.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) compiled noise level data regarding the noisegenerating characteristics of several different types of construction equipment used during the Central Artery/Tunnel project in Boston. Table 12 below provides a list of the construction equipment measured, along with the associated measured noise emissions and measured percentage of typical equipment use per day. From this acquired data, FHWA developed the Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM). The RCNM, which uses the Spec 721.560 L_{max} at 50 feet, has been used to calculate the construction equipment noise emissions (see Appendix F).

Table 12: Construction	Equipment Emissions	and Usage Factors
------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor ¹ (Percent)	Spec 721.560 L _{max} @ 50 Feet ² (dBA, slow ³)	Actual Measured L _{max} @ 50 feet ⁴ (dBA, slow)
Auger Drill Rig	20	85	N/A
Backhoe	40	80	78
Compressor (air)	40	80	78
Concrete Mixer Truck	40	85	79
Concrete Pump	20	82	81
Concrete Saw	20	90	90
Crane	16	85	81
Dozer	40	85	82
Dump Truck	40	84	76
Excavator	40	85	81
Flatbed Truck	40	84	74
Front End Loader	40	80	79
Generator	50	82	81
Gradall (Forklift)	40	85	83
Mounted Impact Hammer	20	90	90
Paver	50	85	77
Roller	20	85	80
Tractor	40	84	N/A
Welder/Torch	40	73	74

¹ Acoustical use factor is the percentage of time each piece of equipment is operational during a typical workday.

² Spec 721.560 is the equipment noise level utilized by the Roadway Construction Noise Model program.

³ The "slow" response averages sound levels over 1-second increments. A "fast" response averages sound levels over 0.125-second increments.

⁴ Actual Measured is the average noise level measured of each piece of equipment during the Central Artery/Tunnel project in Boston, Massachusetts primarily during the 1990s.

Source: Federal Highway Administration, 2006.

dBA: The relative loudness of sounds in air as perceived by the human ear.

L_{eq}: The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value that takes into account the total sound energy over a period of time.

L_{max}: The maximum sounds level, during a measurement period or a noise event.

The anticipated areas of construction were obtained from the Project applicant, and the anticipated construction equipment utilized for each phase of construction was obtained from the default equipment lists from the CalEEMod model utilized in Section 4.3.3, Air Quality (Appendix B). For each area of development, the nearest piece of equipment was placed at the shortest distance from the proposed area to the nearest sensitive receptor, and each subsequent piece of equipment was placed an additional 50 feet away. The results are shown below in Table 13.

Table 13: Proposed Project Construction Noise Levels at Nearby Sensitive Receptors Prior to Mitigation

	Construct	ion Noise Level at: (dE	BA L _{eq})
Construction Phase	St Joseph School to Southeast	La Puente High School to Southwest	Homes to Northeast
Demolition	97	82	75
Grading	97	83	77
Combined Park Feature Construction and Architectural Coatings	93	81	75
Paving	94	80	72
Construction Noise Threshold ¹	90	90	90
Exceed Threshold?	Yes	No	No

Notes:

¹ Construction Noise Thresholds from Federal Transit Administration, 2006.

Source: RCNM Version 1.1 (see Appendix F).

dBA: The relative loudness of sounds in air as perceived by the human ear.

L_{eq}: The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value that takes into account the total sound energy over a period of time.

Table 13 shows that the greatest construction noise impacts would occur during demolition and grading activities with a noise level as high as 97 dBA L_{eq} at St. Joseph School, located on the southeast side of the Proposed Project site. Table 13 shows that construction noise impacts from the Proposed Project would exceed the 90-dBA noise standard for all phases of construction at St. Joseph School. This would be considered a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1 is proposed that would require the contractor to either: (1) Install a temporary 8-foot high sound wall on the northwest property line of St Joseph School; or (2) Restrict any construction activities from occurring within 30 feet of St Joseph School, while the School is occupied.

The construction-related noise has been recalculated based on implementation of MM-NOI-1 and the results are shown in Table 14. As shown in Table 14 with implementation of MM-NOI-1, construction of the Proposed Project would be reduced to within the applicable noise standards. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM NOI-1.

Table 14: Mitigated Proposed Project Construction Noise Levels at Nearby Sensitive Receptors

	Construction Noise Level at: (dBA L _{eq})			
Construction Phase	St Joseph School to Southeast ¹	La Puente High School to Southwest	Homes to Northeast	Homes to Northwest
Demolition	89	87	79	77
Grading	89	83	77	75

Combined Park Feature Construction and Architectural Coatings	85	81	75	74
Paving	86	80	72	71
Construction Noise Threshold ²	90	90	90	90
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Notes:

¹ Calculated noise levels include implementation of MM-NOI-1 that is anticipated to provide 8 dB of attenuation.

² Construction Noise Thresholds from Federal Transit Administration, 2006.

Source: RCNM Version 1.1 (see Appendix E).

dBA: The relative loudness of sounds in air as perceived by the human ear.

L_{eq}: The method to describe sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value that takes into account the total sound energy over a period of time.

Operation-Related Noise

The Proposed Project consists of implementing various improvements to an existing city park. All of the proposed improvements would consist of enhancing activities that already occur at the city park. However, the proposed improvements to the Park may result in a moderate increase in usage of the Park that may result in the creation of higher onsite noises as well as generate additional vehicle trips that may increase traffic-related noise levels on the nearby roadways.

Onsite Noise Impacts

Municipal Code Section 4.34.030(c) exempts outdoor activities conducted on city parks from the City noise standards. As such, the onsite noise impacts created from the Proposed Project would not exceed any noise standards. It should also be noted that the potential major sources of noise include concerts in the park and major sport activities such as football, baseball, and basketball games. All of these uses currently occur within the Park, and implementation of the Proposed Project would not alter the hours of operation of the Park, nor would it alter the schedules of when any concerts or sporting activities occur at the Park. As such, implementation of the Proposed Proposed Project would result in a less than significant noise impact from onsite noise sources.

Offsite Roadway Noise Impacts

Vehicle noise is a combination of the noise produced by the engine, exhaust, and tires. The level of traffic noise depends on three primary factors (1) the volume of traffic, (2) the speed of traffic, and (3) the number of trucks in the flow of traffic. The Proposed Project does not propose any uses that would require a substantial number of truck trips, and the Proposed Project would not alter the speed limit on any existing roadway, so the Proposed Project's potential offsite noise impacts have been focused on the noise impacts associated with the change of volume of traffic that would occur with development of the Proposed Project.

Goal 4 of the General Plan requires that new development provide protection from undesirable traffic noise; however, the policies associated with Goal 4 do not provide quantitative noise thresholds of what constitutes a significant impact from an increase in traffic noise generated by a project. As such, this impact analysis has utilized guidance from the FTA for a moderate impact and finds that found a project's contribution to the noise environment may result in a significant

noise impact between an increase in noise of 0 and 7 dB, which is dependent on the existing noise levels.

The CalEEMod model runs utilized for the Air Quality analysis (see Appendix B) found that implementation of the Proposed Project would generate an additional 10 weekday, 121 Saturday and 89 Sunday daily trips. According to 24-Hour Volume Counts for the City of La Puente (Willdan Engineering 2016), in the vicinity of the Park, Hacienda Boulevard has 38,576 daily trips, Temple Avenue has 17,591 daily trips, and Glendora Avenue has 13,720 daily trips. In order for project-generated vehicular traffic to increase the noise level of Glendora Avenue, which has the smallest traffic volumes of the nearby roads, by 3 dB, the roadway traffic would have to double, and for the roadway noise levels to increase by 1.5 dB, the roadway traffic would have to increase by 50 percent. Since the Proposed Project would only result in a maximum of a 0.9 percent increase in traffic volumes on Glendora Boulevard, the project-related roadway noise increase is anticipated to be negligible. Offsite roadway noise impacts from operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Accordingly, with implementation of NOI-1, the Proposed Project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of La Puente.

NOI-1: The City shall require the contractor to either: (1) Install a temporary 8-foot high sound wall on the northwest property line of St Joseph School; or (2) Restrict any construction activities from occurring within 30 feet of St Joseph School, while the School is occupied.

b)	Would the project result in generation	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	of excessive groundborne vibration or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	groundborne noise levels?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
			\boxtimes		

b) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project would consist of implementing various improvements to an existing city park. Construction activities would require the operation of off-road equipment and trucks that are known sources of vibration. Construction activities may occur as near as 75 feet from the nearest school structure at St. Joseph School (vibration impacts typically are noticeable only to people who are sitting or lying down, as such impacts are limited to buildings where these activities may occur).

Section 4.34.010 of the City's Municipal Code prohibits any vibrations which are physically annoying to reasonable persons of ordinary sensitivity or which are so harsh or prolonged as to contribute unreasonably and unnecessarily to discomfort on surrounding land uses. Since the City's Municipal does not provide a quantifiable vibration level, guidance from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has been utilized, which defines the threshold of perception from transient sources at 0.25 inch per second peak particle velocity (PPV). Table 15 shows the typical PPV produced from some common construction equipment that would likely be utilized during construction of the Proposed Project.

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity in inches per second at 25 feet	Vibration Level (L_{ν}) at 25 feet
Pile diver (impact)	0.644	104
Pile driver (sonic)	0.170	93
Clam shovel drop	0.202	94
Hydromill		
- in soil	0.008	66
- in rock	0.017	75
Vibratory roller	0.210	94
Hoe ram	0.089	87
Large bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson drill	0.089	87
Loaded truck (off road)	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58

Table 15: Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Emissions

From the list of equipment shown in Table 15, a vibratory roller with a vibration level of 0.210 inch-per-second PPV would be the source of the highest vibration levels of all equipment utilized during construction activities for the Proposed Project. Based on typical propagation rates at 5 feet, this would result in a vibration level of 3.2 inch-per-second PPV at the nearest offsite structure to construction activities. The construction-related vibration levels would exceed the 0.25 inch-per-second PPV threshold detailed above. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation measure NOI-2 is proposed that would require the contractor to limit the use of construction equipment within 30 feet of St Joseph School, to off-road equipment that does not exceed 150 horsepower, which would result in vibration levels similar to a small bulldozer of 0.003 inch-per-second PPV as shown in Table 15. Through implementation of MM-NOI-2, the vibration level would be reduced to 0.02 inch-per-second PPV at St Joseph School and would not exceed the 0.25 inch-per-second PPV threshold. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of NOI-2.

The ongoing operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the creation of any known vibration sources. Therefore, a less than significant vibration impact is anticipated from the operation of the Proposed Project.

Accordingly, with implementation of NOI-2, the Proposed Project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

NOI-2: The City shall require the contractor to restrict operation of any off-road equipment that exceeds 150 horsepower from operating within 50 feet of St Joseph School.

4.3.14 **Population and Housing**

a)	Would the project induce substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	unplanned population growth in an	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	area, either directly (for example, by	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	proposing new homes and businesses)		Incorporated		
	or indirectly (for example, through				\boxtimes
	extension of roads or other				
	infrastructure)?				

a) No Impact. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The proposed improvements could result in the increased use of the Park based on the recommendations of the existing residents. However, the increased uses of the Park would be from existing residents of the City. The Proposed Project would not induce substantial growth through the addition of new homes or businesses or from the extension of roads. No Impact would occur.

b)	Would the project displace substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	numbers of existing people or housing,	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	necessitating the construction of	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	replacement housing elsewhere?		Incorporated		
					\boxtimes

b) No Impact. The Proposed Project would not displace residents or businesses from the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The proposed activities would not involve the demolition of any existing residences that would require new replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

4.3.15 <u>Public Services</u>

a)	i) Would the project result in substantial	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	adverse physical impacts associated	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	with the provision of new or physically	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	altered governmental facilities, need		Incorporated		
	for new or physically altered			\bowtie	
	governmental facilities, the				
	construction of which could cause				
	significant environmental impacts, in				
	order to maintain acceptable service				
	ratios, response times or other				
	performance objectives for fire				
	protection?				

a) i) Less than Significant Impact. The nearest fire departments to the Proposed Project are the Los Angeles County Fire Department Station 26, located at 15336 Elliot Avenue, La Puente, and Los

Angeles County Fire Department Station 43, located at 921 South Stimson Avenue, La Puente. Station 26 is located approximately 0.55 mile north from the Proposed Project, and Station 43 is located approximately 1.2 miles south from the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not interfere with the services provided by the fire stations nor would it require expansion of the existing facilities. The Proposed Project would not involve the development of residential, commercial, or industrial facilities that would result in increased populations and affect fire protection services. The Proposed Project operations would be consistent with existing uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

a) ii) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?



a) ii) Less than Significant Impact. Public safety services for law enforcement are provided by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department through the Industry Sheriff's Station at 150 North Hudson Avenue in the City of Industry (City 2019a). It is located approximately 0.2 mile southwest from the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not interfere with the services provided by the Sheriff's Department nor would it require expansion of their facilities. The Proposed Project would not introduce new development that would increase the existing populations or provide activities to the area that would require an increase in protection services. The Proposed Project currently and historically hosted numerous public events that required security services. Both private and public security services would be provided to the Proposed Project and would remain consistent with historic uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

a)	iii) Would the project result in	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	substantial adverse physical impacts	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	associated with the provision of new or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	physically altered governmental		Incorporated		
	facilities, need for new or physically			\bowtie	
	altered governmental facilities, the				
	construction of which could cause				
	significant environmental impacts, in				
	order to maintain acceptable service				
	ratios, response times or other				
	performance objectives for schools?				
1					

- a) iii) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is immediately adjacent to La Puente High School and Saint Joseph School. The Proposed Project's construction and operational activities would not require the existing schools to expand or modify their facilities. No activities are proposed that would occur within the campuses. No new residential or commercial businesses are included with the Proposed Project that would create an influx of new residents, thereby increasing school demands and services. While construction may create visible and auditory disturbances to the school users, these would be limited during construction hours and would cease once construction activities are complete. Impacts would be less than significant.
- a) iv) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?



a) iv) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The implementation of the PMP would result in the alteration of La Puente City Park. However, the modifications to the Park are in response to the residents' recommendations to improve the Park and include new facilities within the Park to improve the user experience. While the proposed construction activities would result in a closure of specific Park areas, thereby reducing access to the residents, the closures would be temporary. Other areas of the Park would remain open for use during construction and will not result in interruption of services. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in less than significant, but beneficial impact.

a) v) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public				
facilities?				

a) v) No Impact. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. The Proposed Project would result in new and improved facilities to the

Park. The Proposed Project would not require modification of any other nearby facilities such as hospitals, libraries, and churches. The Proposed Project would not require modification of the La Puente Parks and Recreation building/Community Complex located along Glendora Avenue. During construction, these facilities would not experience closures. While the Proposed Project would include disturbances to the immediate area during construction, these would be limited during construction hours. No impact would occur.

4.3.16 <u>Recreation</u>

a)	Would the project increase the use of	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	existing neighborhood and regional	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	parks or other recreational facilities	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	such that substantial physical		Incorporated		
	deterioration of the facility would occur			\boxtimes	
	or be accelerated?				

a) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project implements improvements and upgrades that match the expected usage of the park and prevent physical deterioration of the facility. The Project provides a beneficial impact to recreation resources. The Proposed Project would comply with the City's Community Resources Element Action CR-1 and Policy 1.1 that states the following:

Action CR-1: Implement the Park Master Plan

Periodically assess current park conditions and maintenance and recreation needs according to the standards set forth in the Community Resources Element and the La Puente Park Master Plan. Prioritize funding to preserve La Puente's main recreational resource.

Policy 1.1: Maintain La Puente Park as an important community resource by providing regular investments in landscaping, equipment, recreational and community facilities, and playground equipment. Intensify the recreational uses at the park to allow for a more efficient use of the facilities.

b)	Does the project include recreational	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	facilities or require the construction or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	expansion of recreational facilities	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	·
	which might have an adverse physical		Incorporated	·	
	effect on the environment?			\bowtie	

b) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of implementing the PMP which includes repositioning and installation of new park features and improvements listed in Section 2. The development of this Initial Study analyzes the construction and improvements to an existing recreational facility in the City of La Puente. Each resource area was analyzed to determine the level of impact of the Proposed Project. The Project provides a beneficial impact to recreation resources.

4.3.17 Transportation

a)	Would the project conflict with a	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	program, plan, ordinance or policy	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	addressing the circulation system,	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	including transit, roadways, bicycle and		Incorporated		
	pedestrian facilities?		\boxtimes		

a) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Transportation within the City of La Puente must comply with the City's General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element, Community Resources Element, and the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program, which includes cities within the San Gabriel Valley (General Plan 2004; County 2019). As noted in the General Plan, it encourages the use of alternatives to automobiles such as mass transit and local transit.

The La Puente LINK Shuttle and Dial-A-Ride are local transits through the City. Dial-A-Ride is a program for advance reservation transit services for La Puente residents over 55 years old and for individuals with disabilities. The La Puente LINK Shuttle provides transit routes through the City and includes access to the Park. The Yellow Line and Green Line stops travel through Temple Avenue to Glendora Avenue with stops at the intersection of Temple Avenue and Hacienda Boulevard, Glendora Avenue and Temple Avenue, and Glendora Avenue and Hill Street (City 2019b). Designated Inter-City and Intra-City Bikeways are located along Temple Avenue and Glendora Avenue as indicated in the General Plan, Master Plan of Bikeways.

The Proposed Project does not include designs that would alter existing bikeways or interfere with bikeway access (General Plan 2004). The Proposed Project does not include road modification activities that that would conflict with any circulation system or public/pedestrian uses and transit. The Proposed Project will not permanently interfere with the bus stops located along Hacienda Boulevard, Temple Avenue, and Glendora Avenue.

Potential impacts of the Proposed Project would result from temporary roadway delays with the presence of construction equipment, and during the replacement of the sewer line along Hacienda Boulevard. The sewer line replacement is scheduled to begin in January to February 2020 and will last approximately 3 months. Implementation of TRA-1 would ensure efficient movement of traffic along the roadways of the Proposed Project. Plans and permits issued by the City's Engineering Division would address any transportation and access concerns through conditions of approval to maintain transit services and pedestrian access around the Proposed Project. A less than significant impact would occur.

TRA-1: A Traffic/Encroachment Permit shall be obtained from the City of La Puente at least 45 days prior to the start of construction if lane closures on Hacienda Boulevard, Temple Avenue, or Glendora Avenue are necessary. Temporary lane closures shall be, per the standards and guidelines of the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (WATCH), in compliance with current editions of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Traffic Detour Plans prepared by a registered Traffic Engineer shall be prepared and submitted to the City of La Puente. The Traffic Detour Plans shall provide commuters
and contractors the schedule of road work, detour schedules, alternate routes, and required temporary structures and barriers.

b)	Would the project Conflict or be	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
				\bowtie	

b) Less than Significant Impact. In 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the updated CEQA Guidelines which included implementation of Senate Bill 743 (Section 15064.3) (SB 743). SB 743 identified a new way to analyze transportation impacts under CEQA. The Office of Planning and Research amended the CEQA guidelines to provide and alternate to 'Level of Service' (LOS) to evaluate transportation impacts. Under SB 743, auto delays in traffic would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Rather, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be the primary metric for environmental impacts. VMT measures the sum of the number of miles traveled by each vehicle.

Per the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1), projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled, such as pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects, should have a less than significant impact. Per the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2), transportation projects which reduce vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.

The Proposed Project is not identified to be a transportation project, and no land use changes are proposed. While the Proposed Project would introduce new site uses such as a splash pad, and upgraded park facilities, the Proposed Project would not introduce new activities or events to the Park that would result in significant trips to and from the area. Summer events such as movies and concerts have historically been part of annual Park activities. And, the Proposed Project is a walking distance for existing residents, allowing them easy access to the Park's amenities.

The Proposed Project is located within 0.5 mile of a transit stop and is accessible via the La Puente LINK and Dial-A-Ride Shuttle. The Proposed Project would not modify the existing public transit stops or access. Based on these conditions, impact would be less than significant.

c)	Would	the	project	subst	antially	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
-,	increase	hazar	ds due t	o a geo	ometric	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	design fe	eature	(e.g., sh	arp cui	ves or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	dangerou incompat equipmer	is ible nt)?	interseo uses	ctions) (e.g.	or farm		Incorporated		

c) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project does not involve any roadway modifications or include incompatible uses of the area. New features and uses of the Proposed Project such as the splash pad are not considered incompatible because these are typically found in parks. While the Proposed Project includes a sewer line replacement along Hacienda Boulevard, this would not

result in a significant increase in hazards. However, temporary delays may occur due to work occurring within the roadway. The Proposed Project would implement TRA-1 to address transportation and access concerns.

The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated with the existing roads.

d)	Would the project result in inadequate	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	emergency access?	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
			Incorporated		
				\boxtimes	

d) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The proposed construction and operational activities would not include any new design or development that would prevent access to the Proposed Project area in the event of an emergency or prevent users of the Park from evacuating the area. During construction, access to certain areas of the Park may be limited. However, these would occur only during construction, and other areas of the Park will remain open.

As discussed in Section 4.3.9, Hacienda Boulevard is identified as a disaster route. During the replacement of the sewer line, traffic along Hacienda Boulevard would be impacted. However, implementation of a traffic control plan will ensure efficient movement of traffic within the Proposed Project. While temporary delays may occur in the area due to construction equipment and vehicles accessing the site, these will be temporary and will not result in long delays that would impede emergency vehicles from utilizing the roads. Impacts therefore would be less than significant.

4.3.18 <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u>

- a) Would the project cause a substantial Potentially Less than Less than No adverse change in the significance of a Significant Significant Significant Impact tribal cultural resource, defined in Impact With Mitigation Impact Public Resources Code section 21074 as Incorporated either a site, feature, place, cultural \bowtie 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 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)?
 - a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. According to PRC Chapter 2.5, Section 21074, tribal cultural resources are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and items with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in Section 5020.1. The Proposed Project would occur within an active park that has been previously disturbed. Due to the location of the Proposed Project and its developed surroundings, it is unlikely that tribal cultural resources of high significance would be encountered. A previously prepared Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared by Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning in 2019 for a project within the La Puente City Park. The project includes the installation of electronic billboard signs states that the City of La Puente is located within the cultural area that was formerly occupied by the Gabrieleño-Kizh. The Proposed Project is not an area known to have tribal cultural significance such as cultural landscapes of sacred places (Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning 2019).

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 mandates early tribal circulation prior to and during CEQA review with a requirement to formally conclude consultation. AB 52 established a new category of tribal cultural resources for which only tribes are experts. The mandate requires CEQA documents to incorporate findings, not just in terms of mitigation measures, but also in terms of which type of CEQA document is appropriate.

Tribal consultation was conducted in accordance with AB 52. Notification letters were distributed on September 20, 2019, to tribal parties on the list provided by the City. The tribal parties were the San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe. A response was received from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to schedule a consultation. Incorporation of this mitigation would result in less than significant impacts in the event that tribal cultural resources or human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities.

- **TCR-1:** A Native American monitor shall be retained to monitor all ground-disturbing construction activities into native soils. During excavation, the Native American monitor shall have the authority to halt any activities adversely impacting tribal resources. If human remains are uncovered, the Los Angeles Coroner, Native American Heritage Commission, local Native American representatives, and archaeological monitor shall determine the nature of further studies, as warranted in accordance with Public Resource Code 5097.98 and the City's standard conditions of approval.
- b) Would the project cause a substantial Potentially Less than Less than No adverse change in the significance of a Significant Significant Significant Impact tribal cultural resource, defined in Impact With Mitigation Impact Public Resources Code section 21074 as Incorporated either a site, feature, place, cultural \boxtimes 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 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?
 - b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. As previously discussed, the Proposed Project is located in an urban environment on lands that have previously been disturbed. No sites, features, or cultural landscapes are located within the Park. Due to its location, it is unlikely that objects and areas of cultural significance would be encountered. Most of the surfaces within the Proposed Project have been previously disturbed. Any proposed groundwork, including the sewer line upgrades, are not expected to reach depths that would impact native soils. The City will consult with the tribal parties to discuss the Proposed Project, and discuss if any additional mitigation is necessary to minimize impacts to a tribal cultural resource. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

a)	Would the project require or result in	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	the relocation or construction of new or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	expanded water, wastewater	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	treatment or stormwater drainage,		Incorporated		
	electric power, natural gas, or			\boxtimes	
	telecommunications facilities, the				
	construction or expansion of which				
	could cause significant environmental				
	effects?				

a) Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project consists of existing facilities requiring construction and operation of the proposed elements of the PMP. It includes improvements and new features to the Park. While the Proposed Project includes a new fitness/multi-function building with restrooms, any additional utility needs would tie in to existing utilities being provided to the Park. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, large office buildings ranging from 200,000 to 500,000 square-feet, utilize an estimated 15,000 gallons per day of water use (EIA 2017). The new building for the Proposed Project would be approximately 5,000 square-feet and would only be periodically operated. There would be no proposed activities that would require significant water needs. Operations of the Proposed Project would not introduce residential, commercial, or industrial facilities that would require new or expanded water, wastewater, and other utility systems.

The installation of new field lighting and light poles would not require additional electrical facilities or result in a significant increase in electrical usage. The new light poles will be designed to avoid trees and be placed in open areas to avoid interference with utilities such as gas and sewer lines and approximately 10 feet or more from the court/field sideline areas for safety purposes. Existing lighting will be replaced with modern and energy-efficient systems.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant increase in users. Per the General Plan, the City's Sewer Master Plan does not project significant increases in wastewater flows because most of the City is built out. The City of La Puente would work in close coordination with service providers to monitor the infrastructure systems to be able to maintain and rehabilitate the system when needed. The upgrade of the sewer line along Hacienda Boulevard would improve wastewater flows. Improvements to the sewer line would comply with the General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element in improving efficiency of the existing systems.

The Proposed Project would result in the enhancement of the park experience to existing users. The proposed activities would not result in a significant increase in utility demands. Impacts would be less than significant.

b)	Would the project have sufficient water	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	supplies available to serve the project	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	and reasonably foreseeable future	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	development during normal dry and		Incorporated		
	multiple dry years?			\boxtimes	

b) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed uses within the Park are anticipated to be consistent with existing uses; however, the splash pad would be a new feature to the Park. Publicly available information shows that the average water use of a splash pad can range between from 70 to 100 gallons per minute (between 20,000 to 40,000 gallons per day) but can reach up to 2,500 gallons per minute (approximately 750,000 gallons per day) depending on the square-footage, design, operation schedule, and flow rate of the splash pad systems (Steinbach 2014). According to the *Ellsworth American* article on splash pad uses, the splash pad at Knowlton Park in Maine used up to 3.3 million gallons of water annually (Cough 2018). In August 2019, the City of Akron in Ohio constructed a 1,600-square-foot splash pad at the Joy Park Community Center and was estimated to use 89.5 gallons per minute (Akron Beacon Journal 2019). At this rate, the estimated daily usage during the spring and summer months be 30,000 to 40,000 gallons per day.

The La Puente Valley County Water District (District) services the City. The annual water demand of the District is approximately 521 million gallons with an annual per capita consumption of 55,000 gallons, which equates to 150 gallons a day (0.104 gallons per minute) per capita (La Puente Valley County Water District 2019). If the splash pad is estimated to require 4 million gallons of water annually (which translates to approximately 28,000 gallons per day during the spring and summer months), the amount of water required would be 0.7 percent of the current annual demand. In addition, the splash pad area would be operated primarily during the warmers seasons in Spring and Summer and would be user-activated. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in water demands above the existing demands within the District. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Would the project result in a Potentially Less than Less than No determination by the wastewater Significant Significant Significant Impact treatment provider which serves or Impact With Mitigation Impact may serve the project that it has Incorporated \square adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
 - c) Less than Significant Impact. According to the City's General Plan, because most of the City is built out, the City's Sewer Master Plan does not project significant increases in wastewater flows. Wastewater demands would be accommodated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, also known as the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (General Plan 2004). The Sanitation District owns and operates 11 wastewater treatment plants and handles over 500 million gallons per day of wastewater (Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County 2014). Assuming the wastewater generated would be 4 million gallons annually, the amount is less than 1 percent (0.002 percent) of the existing wastewater that is being treated. Therefore, the Proposed Project

would not generate significant quantities of water that could decrease the capacities of existing wastewater treatment providers. Impacts would be less than significant.

-					
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	or local standards, or in excess of the	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	capacity of local infrastructure, or	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	otherwise impair the attainment of		Incorporated		
	solid waste reduction goals?			\boxtimes	

d) Less than Significant Impact. Per the City's General Plan, service providers for the City include the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts 15 and 21. The role of these providers is to construct, operate, and maintain facilities to collect, treat, recycle, and dispose of sewage and industrial wastes, while also managing the nearby Puente Hills Landfill. Private contractors provide solid waste collection services (General Plan 2004).

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in generation of solid waste such as concrete, soils, packaging materials, plastics, and other construction wastes. Once operational, the Proposed Project would not generate wastes in excess of local standards or capacity of existing infrastructure because the Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in population that would generate additional wastes.

Based on the proposed activities during construction and operation, the Proposed Project would solid waste. Wastes generated during operations would be similar to previous uses because no expansion of the Park is proposed. The Proposed Project would comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) that requires diversion of 50 percent of the waste stream from land disposal by fulfilling requirements established in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE). It is anticipated that some construction waste may be recycled, thereby resulting in a reduction of waste that would be transported in landfills. This would comply with the City's General Plan's commitment to waste management in waste diversion (General Plan 2004) and with the municipal code Chapter 4.13 for Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Program. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact associated with enough landfill capacity.

e)	Would the project negatively impact	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	the provision of solid waste services or	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	impair the attainment of solid waste	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	reduction goals?		Incorporated		
				\boxtimes	

e) Less than Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Section 4.3.19 (d), the Proposed Project would generate minimal amounts of construction and operational wastes. During construction and operation of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project would comply with all City, County, and State solid waste diversion, reduction, and recycling mandates. Project-related BMPs would be implemented to facilitate compliance with existing solid waste reduction statutes. Impacts would be less than significant.

f)	Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	related to solid waste?		Incorporated	\boxtimes	

f) Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in the previous Section 4.3.19 (e), the Proposed Project would generate minimal wastes and comply with all City, County, and State solid waste diversion, reduction, and recycling mandates. Project-related BMPs would be implemented to facilitate compliance with existing solid waste reduction statutes. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.20 <u>Wildfire</u>

-					
a)	If located in or near state responsibility	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	areas or lands classified as very high fire	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	hazard severity zones would the project	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	impair an adopted emergency response		Incorporated		
	plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes

a) No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE 2007). The proposed construction and operational activities would not result in the impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan within a fire hazard severity zone. No impact would occur.

b)	If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones would the	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?		Incorporated		

b) No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE 2007). The proposed construction and operational activities would not exacerbate wildlife risks or expose the residents and businesses to pollutant from wildfires. No impact would occur.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Implementation of the La Puente Park Master Plan La Puente, California

- c) If located in or near state responsibility Potentially Less than Less than No areas or lands classified as very high fire Significant Significant Significant Impact hazard severity zones would the project With Mitigation Impact Impact require the installation or maintenance Incorporated \boxtimes of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
 - c) No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE 2007). The proposed construction and operational activities would not require installation of maintenance of associated structures that would exacerbate wildfire risk. No impact would occur.

d)	If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes?				

d) No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE 2007). The proposed construction and operational activities would not expose people or structures to risks involving post-fire slope instability or drainage changes. No impact would occur.

4.3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a) Does the project have the potential to Potentially Less than Less than No substantially degrade the quality of the Significant Significant Significant Impact environment, substantially reduce the With Mitigation Impact Impact habitat of a fish or wildlife species, Incorporated cause a fish or wildlife population to \boxtimes drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
 - a) Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project is located within a developed area of the City and is an active park. The Proposed Project would not degrade or reduce habitats of fish or wildlife species because the Park contains no designated sensitive communities or critical habitats and no riparian habitats or areas designated as a significant ecological area.

The Proposed Project does not contain structures of historic significance. However, based on previously prepared studies and results from consultation with Native American tribes, the Park is identified to be in an area of high archaeological significance. While it is not expected that ground-disturbing activities would impact native soils, the Proposed Project would implement CUL-1 and TCR-1 to minimize impacts to resources that may be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities where depths may reach areas not previously disturbed.

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b)	Does the project have impacts that are	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	individually limited, but cumulatively	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	considerable? ("Cumulatively	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	considerable" means that the		Incorporated		
	incremental effects of a project are			\bowtie	
	considerable when viewed in				
	connection with the effects of past				
	projects, the effects of other current				
	projects, and the effects of probable				
	future projects?)				

b) Less than Significant. Per the City's Annual Budget for 2018-2019, carryover projects from the previous year include local street and resurfacing improvements, Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan, Arterial Parkway Improvements on Amar Road and Elliot Avenue, Energy Efficiency and Street Light Conversion, Park Restroom Improvements, Undergrounding of

Southern California Edison (SCE) Utilities, Traffic Signal, and Sewer Capital Improvements. New projects in the Capital Improvement Plan, in addition to the skate park project, include Crosswalk Enhancements, Major Street Resurfacing, Safe Routes to Schools, and Traffic Signal Improvements (City of La Puente 2019c). The surrounding area of the Proposed Project is highly urbanized. The ability to develop new major projects adjacent to the area is limited.

The following projects have been identified to occur or are currently scheduled within a 1-mile radius from the Proposed Project.

- Electronic Display Billboards and Electronic Park Sign within the La Puente City Park
- Construction of a Skateboard Park within the La Puente City Park
- 74-Unit Senior Housing (Arboleda Apartments)
- Crosswalk Enhancements at Glendora Avenue and Sierra Vista Court

The Electronic Display and Skateboard Park projects have been previously analyzed and approved as separate and distinct actions. The schedule of these projects could overlap. However, the Proposed Project improvements would occur in three phases. Activities of the Proposed Project will begin in the western portion of the Park along Hacienda Boulevard in January 2020 and will be completed by summer of 2020. These improvements include the field and athletic areas of the Park, including the skate park, relocation of the basketball courts, and parking lot resurfacing and re-striping. All other improvements would be staggered to avoid complete closure of the Park and to minimize onsite disturbances and construction overlap. These improvements would be implemented over the next three to five years based on available funding.

The Arboleda Apartments project would be located at 1040 North Unruh Avenue and is approximately 1 mile northwest from the Proposed Project. Construction of the apartments, which would be used for senior housing, is expected to begin in January 2020. The Proposed Project would not result in a cumulative impact with the construction of the Arboleda Apartments because the Proposed Project is not located within the immediate vicinity of the apartments and does not share a main roadway that could result in increased traffic.

The crosswalk enhancements would occur northeast from the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not result in a cumulative impact with the crosswalk enhancements because it would not block or disrupt the crosswalk activities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be contained within the Park boundaries, excluding the sewer line replacement along Hacienda Boulevard. Impacts, therefore, would be less than significant.

c)	Does the project have environmental	Potentially	Less than	Less than	No
	effects which will cause substantial	Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
	adverse effects on human beings, either	Impact	With Mitigation	Impact	
	directly or indirectly?		Incorporated		
			\square		

c) Less than Significant. During construction the Proposed Project could result in potential direct or indirect impacts regarding air quality, greenhouse gases, traffic and noise. As discussed in the environmental resource areas, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to human beings because the Proposed Project will implement project-specific BMPs and mitigation

measures to minimize impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of NOI-1, NOI-2, and TRA-1 would result in minimized noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, traffic delays, and provide commuters a safe access to and from the Proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

SECTION 5.0 – REFERENCES

Akron Beacon Journal

2019 Akron Breaks Ground on First Public Splash Pad. *Akron Beacon Journal*. July 9, 2019. Available online at: <u>https://www.ohio.com/news</u>. Accessed October 2, 2019.

California Air Resources Board (CARB)

- 2018 Area Designations Maps / State and National. Available Online at: https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm
- 2017a 2017 Off-Road Diesel Emission Factors. Available Online at: <u>https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mobile-source-emissions-inventory/road-documentation/msei-documentation-offroad-0</u>
- 2016 Ambient Air Quality Standards. Available Online at: <u>https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf</u>.
- 2010 Final Regulation Order Regulation for in-use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets. Available Online at: <u>https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/finaloffroadreg.pdf</u>2008

California Department of Conservation (CDC)

- 1994Division of Mines and Geology. Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of Los
AngelesAngelesCounty–SouthHalf.Availablehttp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR94-14.Accessed September 29, 2019.
- 2016 California Important Farmland Finder. Available online at: <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2017 State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. Available at: <u>ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2014%20Statewide%20Map/WA_2014_8.5%20x11</u> <u>.pdf.</u> Accessed October 2, 2019.
- 2019 Earthquake Zones of Required of Investigation. Available at <u>https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/</u>. Accessed September 30, 2019.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

2019 Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). Available at: <u>https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/.</u> Accessed September 30, 2019.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)

2007 Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Area. Available at: <u>https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6827/fhszl06_1_map.pdf.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2017 List of eligible and designated State Scenic Highways (XLSX). Available online at: <u>https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019. California State Water Resources Control Board

2018 Los Angeles MS4 Permit Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinances and Green Streets Policies. Draft LID Ordinance – City of La Puente. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/muni cipal/lid_and_greenst/doc/lid/lapuente_draftlid.pdf. Accessed September 27, 2019.

City of La Puente (City)

- 2004GeneralPlan.Availableonlineat:https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=477. Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2010 Recreation Services Department. La Puente Park User Guide. Available at: <u>https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=2447.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2015 Zoning Map. Available at: <u>https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=748.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2017 Emergency Operations Plan Basic Plan. Available online at: <u>https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=1032.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2019a Department of Public Safety. Available at: <u>https://www.lapuente.org/government/departments/public-safety.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2019b Transit Services. La Puente LINK Schedule. Available online at: <u>https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=533.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.
- 2019c
 Annual
 Budget.
 Available
 online
 at:

 https://www.lapuente.org/government/departments/finance
 Accessed September 23, 2019.

Cough, Kate

2018 Splash pad uses millions of gallons of water annually. *The Ellsworth American*, July 24. Available online at <u>https://www.ellsworthamerican.com/featured/splash-pad-uses-millions-of-gallons-of-water-annually/</u>. Accessed October 4, 2019.

County of Los Angeles (County)

- 2008 Department of Public Works. Disaster Route Maps (by City) City of La Puente. Available at: <u>https://dpw.lacounty.gov/dsg/DisasterRoutes/map/La%20Puente.pdf.</u> Accessed September 23, 2019.
- 2010 Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Congestion Management Program. Available at: http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/cmp/images/CMP_Final_2010.pdf. Accessed September 23, 2019.

- 2014 Department of Public Works. Low Impact Development Standards Manual. Available at: <u>https://dpw.lacounty.gov/ldd/lib/fp/Hydrology/Low%20Impact%20Development%20Sta</u> <u>ndards%20Manual.pdf.</u> Accessed September 27, 2019.
- 2019
 Department of Regional Planning. Planning & Zoning Information for Unincorporated L.A.

 County.
 Available
 at:

 http://rpgis.isd.lacounty.gov/Html5Viewer/index.html?viewer=GISNET_Public.GIS-NET_Public.GIS-NET_Public.

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

2019 EnviroStor. Available online at: <u>https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.</u> Accessed September 19, 2019.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

2019 FEMA Flood Map Service Center: City of La Puente. Available Online at: <u>https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor.</u> Accessed September 29, 2019.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

2018 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Available online at: <u>https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-</u> <u>innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-</u> <u>no-0123 0.pdf</u>. Accessed October 9, 2019.

Google Maps

2019 Google Maps. Available online at: <u>https://www.google.com/maps</u>

La Puente Valley Water District

 2019
 District
 Water
 Supply.
 Available
 online

 https://www.lapuentewater.com/District
 Water_Supply.
 Accessed September 27, 2019.

Lighting Design Lab

 2013
 Footcandle
 Light
 Guide.
 Available
 online
 at: https://www.lightingdesignlab.com/sites/default/files/pdf/Footcandle_Lighting%20Guid

 e
 Rev.072013.pdf.
 Accessed October 16, 2019.

National Recreation and Park Association

2012 Parks & Recreation. Spray Park Water Reuse. Available online at: <u>https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2012/february/spray-park-water-reuse/. January 31.</u> Accessed September 2019.

Peterson, David

2015 "Splish, splash — and squander? Popular splash pads scorned by some for wasting water." *The Star Tribune*, August 8. Available online at: <u>http://www.startribune.com/splish-splash-and-squander-popular-splash-pads-scorned-by-some-for-wasting-water/321146911/.</u> Accessed September 2019.

Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

2014 Wastewater Treatment and Water Reclamation. Available online <u>https://www.lacsd.org/wastewater/wwfacilities/moresanj.asp</u>. Accessed September 19, 2019.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)

1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook, page 7-6, April 1993.

Steinbach, Paul

2014 Key Considerations When Building a Splash Pad. North Carolina State University, Recreation Resources Services. August. Available online at: <u>https://rrs.cnr.ncsu.edu/keyconsiderations-when-building-a-splash-pad/</u>. Accessed October 4, 2019.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

2019 Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web Soil Survey – Map Unit Description. Available online at: <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.</u>

U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)

- 2017Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS): Water Consumption in Large
BuildingsBuildingsSummary.Availableonlinehttps://www.eia.gov/consumption/commercial/reports/2012/water/.Accessed October
11, 2019.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
 - 2019a ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System. USFWS Threatened & Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Report. Available online at: <u>https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe0</u> <u>9893cf75b8dbfb77.</u>Accessed September 2019.
 - 2019b National Wetlands Inventory: Wetlands Mapper. Available online at: <u>https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html.</u> Accessed September 2019.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

 2019
 U.S.
 Quaternary
 Faults.
 Available
 online
 at:

 https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5a6038b3a1684561a

 9b0aadf88412fcf.
 Accessed September 2019.

U.S. National Park Service (NPS)

2019 National Register Database and Research. Available online at: <u>https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm</u>. Accessed September 2019.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

2011 Montebello, California, Period of Record Monthly Climate Summary from January 1, 1981, through February 26, 2011. Available online at: https://wrcc.dri.edu/cgibin/cliMAIN.pl?ca5790. Accessed October 8, 2019.

Willdan Engineering

2016 Engineering and Traffic Survey. Available Online at: https://www.lapuente.org/home/showdocument?id=722