Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project City of La Verne Revised Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration



Prepared For:

City of La Verne 3660 "D" Street La Verne, CA 91750

Prepared By:

EcoTierra Consulting, Inc. 5776-D Lindero Canyon Road #414 Westlake Village, CA 91362

April 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE	<u>1</u>
	RECIRCULATION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION	1
	PROJECT INFORMATION AND ANALSYS	3
1.	PROJECT TITLE	<u>1 3</u>
2.	LEAD AGENCY & ADDRESS	
3.	CONTACT PERSON & PHONE	1 <u>3</u>
4.	PROJECT LOCATION	1 <u>3</u>
5.	PROJECT SPONSOR NAME AND ADDRESS	1 <u>3</u>
6.	EXSITING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	1 <u>3</u>
7.	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	
8.	EXISTING ZONING	
9.	PROPOSED ZONING	
10.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	<u>-</u>
11	SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING	<u> </u>
12		
14.		······································
40		
13.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED	
13.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION	5 <u>7</u>
13. 14.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> 21 23
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>21 23</u> <u>22 24</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION	<mark>5 <u>7</u> <u>20 22</u> <u>21 23</u> <u>22 24</u> <u>25 27</u></mark>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION	<mark>5 7 <mark>20 22</mark> <mark>21 23</mark> <u>25 27</u> <u>27 29</u></mark>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources	<mark>20 22</mark> <mark>21 23</mark> <u>22 24</u> <u>25 27</u> <u>27 29</u> <u>35 37</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources	5 <u>7</u> <u>20 22</u> <u>21 23</u> <u>22 24</u> <u>25 27</u> <u>27 29</u> <u>35 37</u> <u>51 66</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources V. Energy	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>54</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources V. Biological Resources	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>54</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>73</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy VII. Geology and Soils III. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> 21 <u>23</u> 22 <u>24</u> 25 <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy VII. Geology and Soils III. Greenhouse Gas Emissions IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Water Quality	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy VII. Geology and Soils III. Greenhouse Gas Emissions IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Water Quality X. Land Use and Planning	5 <u>7</u> <u>20</u> <u>22</u> <u>21</u> <u>23</u> <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>74</u> <u>89</u> <u>86</u> <u>102</u> <u>80</u> <u>104</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics. II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources. III. Air Quality. IV. Biological Resources. V. Cultural Resources. VII. Energy. /II. Geology and Soils. IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials. X. Hydrology and Water Quality. XI. Land Use and Planning. KI. Mineral Resources.	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>74</u> <u>89</u> <u>89</u> <u>104</u> 80 105
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Land Use and Planning KI. Mineral Resources III. Noise IV. Ponulation and Housing	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u>
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy VII. Geology and Soils IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Land Use and Planning KII. Noise IV. Population and Housing V. Public Services	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>89</u> <u>104</u> <u>89</u> <u>105</u> <u>102</u> <u>117</u> <u>103</u> 119
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VII. Geology and Soils III. Greenhouse Gas Emissions IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Vater Quality XI. Land Use and Planning KII. Mineral Resources VIII. Orise VIII. Population and Housing V. Public Services VI. Recreation	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>89</u> <u>104</u> <u>89</u> <u>105</u> <u>102</u> <u>117</u> <u>103</u> <u>119</u> <u>109</u> 124
13. 14. 15.	HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY & CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS I. Aesthetics II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources III. Air Quality IV. Biological Resources V. Cultural Resources VI. Energy //I. Geology and Soils /II. Greenhouse Gas Emissions IX. Hazards and Hazrdous Materials X. Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Land Use and Planning KII. Mineral Resources VII. Population and Housing VV. Public Services VI. Recreation //II. Transportation	5 <u>7</u> 20 <u>22</u> <u>24</u> <u>23</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>25</u> <u>27</u> <u>27</u> <u>29</u> <u>35</u> <u>37</u> <u>51</u> <u>66</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>54</u> <u>69</u> <u>58</u> <u>73</u> <u>64</u> <u>79</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>74</u> <u>89</u> <u>69</u> <u>84</u> <u>74</u> <u>89</u> <u>69</u> <u>104</u> <u>102</u> <u>117</u> <u>109</u> <u>124</u> <u>109</u> <u>124</u> <u>109</u> 125

Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project

XIX.	Utilities and Service Systems	. 119	134
XX.	Wildfire	. 128	143
XXI.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	130	147
16. MITIG	ATION MONITORING PROGRAM	137 (<u>153</u>

Appendices

- A. Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Report
- B. Biological Resources
 - B.1 Biological Resources Assessment
 - B.2 Significant Tree Report
- C. Geotechnical and Paleontological Resources
 - C.1 Geotechnical Report
 - C.2 Paleontological Resources Records Search
- D. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- E. Hydrology Report
- F. Noise Report
- G. Transportation Memorandum
- H. Sacred Lands File Search

List of Figures

Figure 1	Regional and Project Vicinity Map 6 8
Figure 2	Aerial Photograph of the Project Site
Figure 3	Existing Views of the Project Site
Figure 4	Proposed Annexation
Figure 5	Proposed Development Plan 10 12
Figure 6	Open Space Plan 11 13
Figure 7	Floor Plan B 12 14
Figure 8	Floor Plan B Elevation Option 1 13 15
Figure 9	Floor Plan B Elevation Option 2
Figure 10	Floor Plan A 15 17
Figure 11	Floor Plan A Elevations 16 18
Figure 12	Floor Plan C 17 19
Figure 13	Floor Plan C Elevations 18 20
Figure 14	Development Calculations 19 21
Figure 15	Plant Communities and Drainages
Figure 16	Impacts of Project to Plant Communities and Drainages
Figure 17	Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area, No. 18 Sand Dimas Canyon/San Antonio Wash
Figure 18	Significant Tree Locations
Figure 19	Noise Measurement Location Map

Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project

List of Tables

Table 1	Project Development Summary	
Table 2	Construction-Related Regional Pollutant Emissions	29 <u>32</u>
Table 3	Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions	30 <u>32</u>
Table 4	Local Construction Emissions at Nearest Receptors	31 <u>34</u>
Table 5	Summary of Impacts to Plant Communities	36 <u>41</u>
Table 6	Summary of Impacts to Jurisdictional Resources	4 2 <u>56</u>
Table 7	Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	65 <u>80</u>
Table 8	Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures	67 <u>82</u>
Table 9	Existing and Proposed Drainage Stormwater Runoff Comparison	81 <u>97</u>
Table 10	Construction Noise Standards	90 <u>106</u>
Table 11	Typical Human Reaction and Effect on Buildings Due to Groundborne Vibration	91 <u>107</u>
Table 12	City of La Verne Noise/Land Use Compatibility Matrix	92 <u>108</u>
Table 13	Construction Noise Levels	97 <u>112</u>
Table 14	Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CNEL)	99 <u>114</u>
Table 15	Trip Generation Rates	110 <u>126</u>
Table 16	Project Trip Generation	110 <u>126</u>
Table 17	Actual Water Deliveries 2015 and Projected Water Deliveries Through 2035	123 <u>139</u>
Table 18	Normal Year Supply (2001) and Demand Comparison	123 <u>139</u>
Table 19	Single Dry Year (2001) Supply and Demand	124 <u>139</u>
Table 20	Multiple Dry Year (2013-2015) Supply and Demand Comparison	124 <u>140</u>
Table 21	Average Year Supply and Demand Comparison	125 <u>141</u>
Table 22	Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison	125 <u>141</u>
Table 23	Multiple Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison	125 <u>141</u>



INITIAL STUDY City of La Verne California

INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This document contains an initial study, with supporting environmental studies, which concludes that a mitigated negative declaration is the appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document for the proposed 88 Sunnyside Lane 4-Lot Residential Subdivision project (project). This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.

An initial study is conducted by a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, an environmental impact report (EIR) must be prepared if an initial study indicates that the proposed project under review may have a potentially significant impact on the environment that cannot be initially avoided or mitigated to a level that is less than significant. A negative declaration may be prepared if the lead agency also prepares a written statement describing the reasons why the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore why it does not require the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15070, a negative declaration is to be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either:

- a) <u>The initial study shows there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole</u> record before the agency, that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, or
- b) <u>The initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but:</u>
 - (1) <u>Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed negative declaration is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and</u>
 - (2) <u>There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.</u>

If revisions are adopted in the proposed project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15070(b), including the adoption of mitigation measures included in this document, a mitigated negative declaration can be prepared.

RECIRCULATION OF MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that a negative declaration shall be recirculated for public review and comment prior to adoption when there are new or more severe significant

avoidable effects not analyzed in the draft IS/MND which require new mitigation measures or project revisions.

"Recirculation" means that the public is provided an opportunity to comment on the revised IS/MND. Recirculation is not required unless significant new information is being added to the document. Recirculation is not required where the new information merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications to the IS/MND. This document is the revised IS/MND for the 500 Baseline Single-Family Residential and Annexation project.

Purpose of Document

Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that a negative declaration shall be recirculated for public review and comment prior to adoption when there are new or more severe significant avoidable effects not analyzed in the draft IS/MND which require new mitigation measures or project revisions.

"Recirculation" means that the public is provided an opportunity to comment on the revised IS/MND. Recirculation is not required unless significant new information is being added to the document. Recirculation is not required where the new information merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications to the IS/MND. This document is the revised IS/MND for the 500 Baseline Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project.

Reason for Recirculation

The draft IS/MND for the proposed project was circulated for public review from December 11, 2020 to January 11, 2021. The City received comments from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding potential impacts on previously unidentified species including Crotch's Bumble Bee and Bats. New and additional analysis and mitigation measures are also included for Aquatic and Riparian Resources, Wildlife Dispersal in a Wildland-Urban Interface, White-Tailed Kite, California Gnatcatcher and Coastal Cactus Wren, Species of Special Concern (SSC), Rare Plants. The analysis found that that the project would create additional significant impacts requiring new mitigation measures. These changes have resulted in the need to recirculate the IS/MND pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5. In the revised text, additions are underlined, and deletions are shown in strikeout.

Minor revisions to the draft IS/MND are also shown in this revised IS/MND. These revisions are editorial only and do not affect the analysis or conclusions in the document.

Project Changes

There are no changes to the project as described and analyzed in the draft IS/MND.

PROJECT INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

1.	PROJECT TITLE:	Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Tentative Tract Map 82001 Project				
2.	LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:	City of La Verne; 3660 "D" Street; La Verne, CA 91750				
3.	CONTACT PERSON AND TELEPHONE:	Candice Bowcock, Principal Planner; (909) 596-8706				
4.	PROJECT LOCATION:	Candice Bowcock, Principal Planner; (909) 596-8706 The approximately 19.44-acre site is located north of West Baseline Road, west of Broken Spur Road, in the West Claremont area of unincorporated Los Angeles County (Project Site). The Project Site encompasses Assessor Parcel Number 8666-006- 035 and is bounded by undeveloped land in the City of La Verne to the north, West Baseline Road to the south, Broken Spur Road and undeveloped land to the east, and the current City of La Verne boundary to the west. Local access to the Project Site is provided by West Baseline Road, and regional access is provided by the Foothill Freeway (State Route (SR) 210), approximately 0.25-mile to the south. See Figure 1 – Regional and Project Vicinity Location Map, Figure 2 – Aerial Photograph of Project Site and Eigure 3 – Existing Views of the Project Site				
5.	PROJECT SPONSOR NAME AND ADDRESS:	Ramzy Fakhoury, 203 Rebecca Drive, San Dimas, CA 91773				
6.	EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:	Light Agriculture (County of Los Angeles)				
7.	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:	Hillside Residential (0 to 2 dwelling units per acre) (City of La Verne)				
8.	EXISTING ZONING:	A-1-15000 (County of Los Angeles)				
9.	PROPOSED ZONING:	PR 3D – Planned Residential 3 D.U. per Acre				

PR 3D – Planned Residential 3 D.U. per Acre Detached (City of La Verne)

10. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project (Project) would annex an approximately 19.44-acre undeveloped the West Claremont portion parcel in of unincorporated Los Angeles County into the City of La Verne (City) and the development of seven singlefamily dwelling units and associated infrastructure. The Project Site is located outside of the City boundaries but is located within the City's Sphere of Influence, which designated the area as Hillside Residential. Due to the existing topography of the site, combined with the City limitations regarding hillside development, only the southern portion of the Project Site would be developed. See Figure 4, Proposed **City Annexation.**

Approximately, 5.59 acres (243,720 square feet) of the parcel would be subdivided into 7 lots, each containing a single-family dwelling unit and attached garage; an additional 8th lot (approximately 2.66 acres) would be designated as a debris basin, and a 9th lot comprising approximately 10.75 acres would be dedicated to open space. See Figure 5, Proposed Development Plan, and Figure 6, Open Space Plan.

The dwelling units would range in size from 4,563 square feet to 7,628 square feet, with a total of 35,430 square feet of new development (28,651 square-feet of livable space¹). Lot 1 through Lot 4 would each contain a 4-bedroom, 4.5-bathroom 4,563 square-foot dwelling unit with attached 3-car garage (Floor Plan B). Lot 5 and Lot 6 would each contain a 4-bedroom, 4.5-bathroom 4,774 square-foot dwelling unit with attached 3-car garage (Floor Plan B). Lot 5 and Lot 6 would each contain a 4-bedroom, 4.5-bathroom 4,774 square-foot dwelling unit with attached 3-car garage (Floor Plan A). The dwelling unit at Lot 7 would contain 6 bedrooms, 6.5 bathrooms, and a 3-car garage (Floor Plan C).

A summary of the Project development is provided on **Table 1, Project Development Summary**. See **Figures 7 through 13,** below, for floor plans and elevations.

¹ Livable space does not include square-footage associated with garages or porches.

		Dwellir	ng Unit Deve	lopment		
			Summary			
Lot	Size (sf)	Total Size (sf)	Footprint (sf)			
Lot 1	10,335	4,563	3,638	2,798		
Lot 2	10,099	4,563	3,638	2,798		
Lot 3	10,091	4,563	3,638	2,798		
Lot 4	10,079	4,563	3,638	2,798		
Lot 5	13,585	4,774	4,042	2,840		
Lot 6	37,408	4,774	4,042	2,840		
Lot 7	152,123	7,628	6,013	4,515		
Total	Total 243,720 35,430 28,651					
sf = square-feet Source: Land Design Consultants, Inc., June 10, 2020.						

Table 1
Project Development Summary

Access to the proposed dwelling units would be provided from two new paved roadway segments and paved driveways totaling 1.1-acre, including, a 350foot road extending north from Baseline Road and terminating in a cul-de-sac; a 200-foot road extending west from Broken Spur Road; a 150-foot driveway parallel to Baseline Road and intersecting with the 350-foot road; and a driveway leading to the debris basin. (See **Figure 14, Development Calculations**).

Construction activities would include grading and other Site preparation work, dwelling unit construction, installation of associated utilities, and construction and paving of roadway segments and driveways. Grading and soil stabilization would occur at the location of the proposed dwelling units, the slopes surrounding the dwelling units, and in the locations of the proposed roadway segments and driveways for a total of 4.6 acres, including the location of the proposed debris basin. In accordance with the fuel modification requirements of the City of La Verne and Los Angeles County Fire Departments, vegetation within 200 feet of buildings (a total of 3.7 acres would be removed). Grading and other Project Site preparation work is anticipated to begin in October 2021 September 2022 and be completed by April 2022 March 2023. Home construction is anticipated to begin in April 2022 2023 and be completed by April 2023 2024.

11. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The Project Site is located within an area of unincorporated eastern Los Angeles County. The rectangular-shaped Project Site is comprised of one parcel that has remained undeveloped. Topographically, the Project Site is located in a hillside area and steeply slopes from south to north. Elevations in the northern portion of the Site exceed 1,400 feet above mean sea level (amsl); however, elevations within the area of proposed residential development vary from approximately 1,205 to 1,345 feet amsl.²

The Project Site is located entirely within the San Dimas/San Antonio Wash Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area (SEA). On-site vegetation consists of six plant communities, including, Deer Weed Scrub (5.90 acres), Laurel Sumac Scrub (4.16 acres), Canyon Live Oak Forest (3.94 acres), Coast Prickly Pear Scrub (2.71 aces), Eucalyptus Groves (0.61 acre), and Disturbed (2.01-acres).³ There are 119 ordinance-sized significant trees located on the Site, including 89 coast live oaks, 6 Scrub oaks, 24 California sycamores, and 1 Southern California black walnut.⁴

Urban residential development designated by the City's General Plan as Hillside Residential and zoned PR 3D is located immediately adjacent to the west and south across West Baseline Road. The remaining surrounding areas are undeveloped areas of the SEA. California protected areas Marshall Canyon Conservation Corridor and Live Oak Reservoir and Park occur approximately 2,000-feet north of the parcel, partially within the SEA. The Site is also adjacent to the southeast of the Sugarloaf Mountain/Keller Peak - San Gabriel/Cucamonga connection, a habitat linkage and wildlife migration corridor.

Associated Soils Engineering, Inc., Report of Geotechnical Due Diligence Investigation, Proposed New Residential Development, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne Area, County of Los Angeles California, December 8, 2014, p. 2.

³ Biological Resources Assessment, 500 East Baseline Project, South Environmental, July 2019.

⁴ Significant Tree Report, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 082001, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne, City of La Verne, Carlberg Associates, August 2, 2018.

12. PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED:

The City is the lead agency for the Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City, therefore, has the primary authority over the Project's discretionary approvals. Permits and approvals anticipated to be required for Project implementation include, but are not necessarily limited to: annexation of the parcel from the County of Los Angeles, a zone change, a General Plan amendment, and Tree Removal Application. Additionally, a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would be required for grading and fuel modification activities within the existing drainages and the canyon live oak forest.

13. HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY AND CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21080.3.1? IF SO, HAS CONSULTATION BEGUN? In compliance with AB 52 and SB 18, an information letter was mailed to a total of seven Tribes known to have resources in the Project area on April 6, 2020 as part of the environmental review for the Project. These tribes include the following:

- Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation
- Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
- Gabrielino/Tongva Nation
- Gabrielino/Tongva Tribe
- Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians/Pauma & Yuma Reservation
- San Fernando Band of Mission Indians

On April 15, 2020, the City received a response from Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation). On November 19, 2020, City staff met with a representative from Kizh Nation and agreed upon Mitigation Measures MM TCR-1 through MM TCR-5. Adherence to these mitigation measures would ensure potential impacts to Native American resources are appropriately reduced to less than significant.







Photo 1: View looking north from Baseline Road towards western portion of Project Site.



Photo 2: View looking northeast from Baseline Road towards eastern portion of Project Site with views of off-site residences along Broken Spur Road.



PROJECT SITE PHOTO LOCATION MAP

Source: EcoTierra Consulting, December 2019.



Source: Land Design Consultants, October 2018.





Source: Land Design Consultants, October 2018.

Figure 7 Floor Plan B



30-0° 5 20-

[2C] [22]

B-L2 TOP

B-L2 B-L1_TOP TPEE BELEVATION - WEST



[1C]

30-0" ALLOWABLE BUILDING HEIGH

MAX.

Figure 8 Floor Plan B Elevation Option 1







Source: Feng XIAO Architect, Inc., January 2020.



Source: Feng XIAO Architect, Inc., January 2020.

Figure 10 Floor Plan A

10A [1A] [22] 14A [26] [1A] _____14A ____10A ____ n LEVEL 2 TOP 20' - 10" LEVEL 2 TOP 20' - 10" LEVEL 2 LEVEL 1 TOP LEVEL 2 LEVEL 1 TOP 10' - 0" LEVEL 1 LEVEL 1 [21A] (3) <u>TYPE A ELEVATION - NORTH</u> 1/8" = 1'-0" 10A 21A [2A] 21A 18A 1/8" = 1'-0" [20] [1A] 14A 10A [22] 22 [19] [1A] 14A LEVEL 2 TOP 20' - 10" LEVEL 2 TOP 20' - 10" LEVEL 2 EVEL 1 TOP 10' - 0" LEVEL 2 L<u>EVEL</u> 1 <u>TOP</u> 10' - 0" _ LEVEL 1 LEVEL 1 [2A] 11A 2 TYPE A ELEVATION - WEST 1/8" = 1'-0" 14A (4) TYPE A ELEVATION - SOUTH 1/8" = 1'-0" 6D] Source: Feng XIAO Architect, Inc., January 2020.

> Figure 11 Floor Plan A Elevations



Figure 12 Floor Plan C



Figure 13 Floor Plan C Elevations



Source: South Environmental, July 2019.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The Project would not affect any environmental factors resulting in a Potentially Significant Impact. A summary of the environmental factors potentially affected by this Project, consisting of a Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated, include:

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

DETERMINATION. (To be completed by lead agency) Based on this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been included in this project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ 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.
- 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.

4/5/21

15. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less 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.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: 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." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a

previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\boxtimes	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but no limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, o other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a state scenic highway?	ot or s			
c. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existin visual character or quality of public views of the site and it surroundings? (Public views are those that are experience from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in a urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicabl zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	g s d n e		\boxtimes	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which woul adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	d 🗌		\boxtimes	

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Less Than Significant Impact.

As stated in the City's General Plan Resource Management Element, scenic views within La Verne consist of the San Gabriel Mountains, foothills, and canyons located in the northern portion of City. The Project Site is located to the north of Baseline Road in a hillside area. Views from Baseline Road include the foothills, which slope up from Baseline Road. Broken Spur Road extends north from Baseline Road, connecting with Roughrider Road. Broken Spur Road is a narrow road that is gated at its intersection with Roughrider Road (and not a through road). Therefore, Roughrider Road serves as access to a single-family home near Baseline Road and is not a frequently used public road that would provide views to the public.

The Project would annex the Project Site into the City and construct seven single-family dwelling units and associated infrastructure. As shown in Figure 5, due to the existing topography of the site and City limitations regarding hillside development, only the southern portion of the Project Site would be developed. One home site would be accessed from Broken Spur Road. Of the 19.44-acre parcel, approximately 5.59 acres would be subdivided into lots, 10.75 acres would be dedicated to open space, and the reminder developed with roadways and the debris basin. Undeveloped areas on the Project Site would total 76 percent, with the remaining 24 percent of land developed with the Project improvements.

The Project would be visible from Baseline Road. However, views of the foothills from Baseline Road are distant and would still be accessible from Baseline Road. Currently, views of the hillside west of Broken Spur Road from Baseline Road are obscured by vegetation along Baseline Road. The Project would retain vegetation near Broken Spur Road and the single home site accessible from Broken Spur Road would be only minimally visible with no substantial changes to publicly available views.

As shown on Figure RM-5 of the City's General Plan,⁵ the nearest City designated view corridors are along Esperanza Drive from Baseline Road to Golden Hills Road (the climb into the hills, views looking north at the mountains, and looking south upon the valley) and Golden Hills Road (views of the foothills). Esperanza Drive is located approximately 2,000 feet west of the Project Site at Baseline Road. Golden Hills Road is located 1.5 miles to the north of the Project Site at the end of Esperanza Drive. The Project Site is not visible from Esperanza Drive due to intervening development and vegetation on the southern portion and topography and vegetation on the northern portion. Similarly, the Project Site is not visible from Golden Hills Drive due to topography, development, and vegetation. Therefore, no scenic vistas would be blocked or obstructed or otherwise adversely affected by Project implementation. As such, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural features within a state scenic highway? **No Impact.**

The nearest State-designated scenic highway is State Route 2, located approximately 20 miles northwest of the project site. The project site would not be visible from State Route 2. Accordingly, **no impacts** to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur as a result of the Project and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public 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? Less Than Significant Impact.

⁵ City of La Verne General Plan, December 7, 1998.

The Project Site is located in unincorporated Los Angeles County and adjacent to the urbanized area of the City of La Verne. Changes to existing visual character or quality of public views is described under I.(a) above. Consistency with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality is described below.

The Project is consistent with the Zoning Code for the PR3D zone. Additionally, as discussed in section *XI.(b)* (*Land Use*), the Project would be consistent General Plan policies. Specifically, the Project would be consistent with policies protecting hillside and open space areas by not grading on a ridgetop, placing development in areas that does not alter the natural appearance of hillsides, and preserves and maintains open space on the site. (Policies LU 5.1 and 5.2)

The Resource Management Element of the City's General Plan describes scenic views within La Verne as of the San Gabriel Mountains, foothills, and canyons located in the northern portion of City. As discussed in section *I.(a) (Aesthetics)* above, the Project would not substantially alter a scenic vista. No other scenic quality regulations, such as design guidelines or specific plans, are applicable to the Project Site. Accordingly, impacts related to scenic quality would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? Less Than Significant Impact.

Existing sources of light and glare within the project area include existing surrounding residential buildings and vehicle headlights from motorists driving by the project site on Baseline Road. These sources emit light and glare during daytime and nighttime hours.

Development of the project site would create new sources of light from the proposed residential uses as well as from street lighting and security lighting on each property. At night, the project's interior and exterior building lights and landscape lighting may be visible from the nearby residential dwellings on Rodeo Lane and surrounding public streets. However, these light sources would not have a significant impact on the night sky, as they would not exceed existing background light levels already occurring from surrounding residential development. All development in the City, which includes light generated from residential development, is required to adhere to lighting requirements contained in the City's Municipal Code. Specifically, Section 18.76.090 requires illumination to be designed so that light is shielded and directed away from adjoining properties and the public right-of-way.

Sources of glare from the project would include reflective building materials, such as windows and light emanating from windows during nighttime hours. Any glare produced by reflective surfaces would be temporary, as the location of the sun would change throughout the day. Exterior surfaces of the proposed residences would be finished with a combination of architectural coatings and other materials (e.g., stucco, brick, wood, or stone). Materials utilized for the proposed residences would not contain large expanses of reflective metal or other material that would generate substantial glare. The residences would include site landscaping as well as along the perimeter of the internal roadways and site in accordance with Section 18.60.080 (Institutional Zone – Landscaping) and Chapter 18.118 (Water

Efficient Landscapes) of the City Municipal Code. This landscaping would minimize glare impacts resulting from any reflective surfaces from buildings. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly increase the amount of daytime light or glare in the project area. Project conformance with applicable local lighting and building design regulations would ensure that the potential for the Project to generate substantial light or glare impacts would be reduced to **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. 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:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				\boxtimes
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?				\boxtimes
 c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? 				\boxtimes
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				\boxtimes
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				\boxtimes

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? **No Impact.**

The State of California's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program does not identify the Project Site as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance."⁶ Furthermore, the Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site; however, the Site has been vacant since at least 1972.⁷ Thus, the Project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, **no impact** would occur, and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? No Impact.

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-15000, Light Agriculture by the County of Los Angeles. However, the Project proposes an annexation to the City. The Project Site is currently located outside of the City boundaries but is identified as within the City's Sphere of Influence by the City's General Plan, which designates the area as Hillside Residential. The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site; however, the Site has been vacant since at least 1972.⁸ Therefore, the Project Site is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract. As such, upon approval of the annex, the Project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract or existing agricultural zoning. Therefore, **no impact** would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? **No Impact.**

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-15000, Light Agriculture by the County of Los Angeles. However, the Project proposes an annexation to the City. The Project Site is currently located outside of the City boundaries but is identified as within the City's Sphere of Influence by the City's General Plan, which designates the area as Hillside Residential. The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site; however, the Site has been vacant

⁶ State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2016 Map, published July 2017, website: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/los16.pdf, accessed: April 2020.

Phase I, Environmental Site Assessment, page i, Partner Engineering and Science Inc., February 2020 (Appendix D)

⁸ Ibid.

since at least 1972.⁹ There are no lands zoned or currently used for forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production at or in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, **no impact** would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? No Impact.

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-15000, Light Agriculture by the County of Los Angeles. However, the Project proposes an annexation to the City. The Project Site is currently located outside of the City boundaries but is identified as within the City's Sphere of Influence by the City's General Plan, which designates the area as Hillside Residential. The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site; however, the Site has been vacant since at least 1972 and is not currently zoned or used for forest land. Therefore, **no impact** to forest land would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? **No Impact.**

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-15000, Light Agriculture by the County of Los Angeles. However, the Project proposes an annexation to the City. The Project Site is currently located outside of the City boundaries but is identified as within the City's Sphere of Influence by the City's General Plan, which designates the area as Hillside Residential. The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site; however, the Site has been vacant since at least 1972 and is not used for farmland or forest land. Therefore, **no impact** to farmland or forest land would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY . Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes	
b. 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?			\boxtimes	
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes	

⁹ Ibid.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			\bowtie	

The following information summarized in this section of the IS/MND is based on *500 East Baseline Road Residential Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* prepared for the Project by Ganddini Group, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The *Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* is provided as *Appendix A* to this IS/MND.

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Less Than Significant Impact.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a discussion of any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable General Plans and Regional Plans (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125). The regional plan that applies to the proposed project includes the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook states that "New or amended General Plan 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 or 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 2016 or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

Criteria 1 – Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations

Based on the air quality modeling analysis, short-term construction impacts would not result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD regional and local thresholds of significance. The analysis also found that long-term operations impacts would not result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD local and regional thresholds of significance. Therefore, the proposed project is not projected to contribute to the exceedance of any air pollutant concentration standards and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the first criterion.

Criteria 2 – Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP?

Consistency with the AQMP assumptions is determined by performing an analysis of the 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 2016-2040 Regional Transportation/Sustainable Communities Strategy prepared by SCAG includes chapters on: the challenges in a changing region, creating a plan for our future, and the road to greater mobility and sustainable growth. These chapters currently respond directly to federal and state requirements placed on 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 Verne General Plan Land Use Plan defines the assumptions that are represented in the AQMP.

The Project Site is currently located in unincorporated County of Los Angeles. The Project Site would be annexed into the City of La Verne as part of the Project. The Project Site is currently located in the City of La Verne's Sphere of Influence and is designated as Hillside Residential (HR) (0 to 2 dwelling units per acre) on the City of La Verne General Plan. The Project proposes to develop the approximately 19.44 acre project site with seven single-family detached residential dwelling units. The proposed residential uses would be consistent with the City's land use designation. Therefore, the Project would not exceed the AQMP assumptions for the Project Site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the second criterion.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) 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? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project area is out of attainment for ozone and in 2018 was out of attainment for PM₁₀. Construction and operation of cumulative projects will further degrade the local air quality, as well as the air quality of the South Coast Air Basin. The greatest cumulative impact on the quality of regional air cell will be the incremental addition of pollutants mainly from increased traffic volumes from residential, commercial, and industrial development and the use of heavy equipment and trucks associated with the construction of these projects. Air quality will be temporarily degraded during construction activities that occur separately or simultaneously. However, in accordance with the SCAQMD methodology, projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD criteria or can be mitigated to less than criteria levels are not significant and do not add to the overall cumulative impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would add a cumulatively considerable contribution of a federal or state non-attainment pollutant.

Construction-Related Regional Impacts

The construction-related criteria pollutant emissions for each phase are shown below in **Table 2, Construction-Related Pollutant Emissions**, which shows that none of the project's emissions will exceed regional thresholds. Therefore, a **less than significant** regional air quality impact would occur from construction of the Project and no mitigation measures are required.

Construction-Kelated Regional Fondant Emissions							
	Pollutar	nt Emission	s (pounds/c	lay)	P		
Ac	tivity	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Sito	On-Site ¹	1.23	12.87	6.30	0.01	3.04	1.89
Droporation	Off-Site ²	0.09	0.06	0.73	0.00	0.20	0.05
Preparation	Subtotal	1.32	12.93	7.02	0.01	3.24	1.94
	On-Site ¹	1.35	14.75	12.54	0.02	1.05	0.63
Grading	Off-Site ²	0.10	0.07	0.81	0.00	0.23	0.06
	Subtotal	1.44	14.82	13.34	0.03	1.27	0.69
Duilding	On-Site ¹	1.85	17.08	18.32	0.03	0.89	0.83
Construction	Off-Site ²	1.45	9.96	11.91	0.05	3.54	0.98
Construction	Subtotal	3.30	27.04	30.24	0.08	4.43	1.81
	On-Site ¹	1.18	10.19	14.58	0.02	0.51	0.47
Paving	Off-Site ²	0.06	0.04	0.51	0.00	0.17	0.05
	Subtotal	1.24	10.23	15.10	0.02	0.68	0.52
Architactural	On-Site ¹	19.67	1.30	1.81	0.00	0.07	0.07
Conting	Off-Site ²	0.22	0.14	1.75	0.01	0.57	0.16
Coaling	Subtotal	19.89	1.44	3.56	0.01	0.65	0.23
Total for over	lapping						
phases ³		24.42	38.71	48.89	0.12	5.75	2.56
SCAQMD Th	resholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Thre	sholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Notes:							

Table 2 I Dellutent Emissione

(1) On-site emissions from equipment operated on-site that is not operated on public roads. On-site site preparation and grading PM-10 and PM-2.5 emissions show mitigated values for fugitive dust compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403.

(2) Off-site emissions from equipment operated on public roads.

(3) Construction, painting, and paving phases may overlap.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2

Operations-Related Regional Air Quality Impacts

The worst-case summer or winter criteria pollutant emissions created from the proposed project's longterm operations were calculated and are shown below in Table 3, Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions. The results show that none of the SCAQMD regional thresholds would be exceeded. Therefore, a less than significant regional air quality impact would occur from operation of the Project.

Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions						
Activity	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area Sources ¹	1.05	0.11	0.62	0.00	0.01	0.01
Energy Sources ²	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile Sources ³	0.11	0.46	1.51	0.01	0.48	0.13
Total Emissions	1.17	0.62	2.15	0.01	0.50	0.15
SCAQMD Thresholds of Significance	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Tahlo 3
Regional Operational Polititant Emissions							
Δοτίνιτα	Emissions (pounds per day)						
Activity		NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	
Notes:							
(1) Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment.							
 (2) Energy usage consists of emissions from generation of electricity and on-site natural gas usage. (3) Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust. 							
Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2; the higher of either	summe	r or wint	er emiss	ions.			

Table 3 Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions

Summary

As discussed above, the regional construction-related and operational emissions generated by the Project would not exceed any of the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAMD. Therefore, the Project's emissions meet SCAQMD regional thresholds and will not result in a significant cumulative impact. The cumulative air quality impacts associated with the Project would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Less Than Significant Impact.

A significant impact may occur if a project were to generate pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Project-related construction 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 South Coast 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. The localized emissions of concern are NO_X, CO, PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$.

Construction

Construction-Related Local Impacts

Construction-related 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 South Coast Air Basin. The Project was analyzed for the potential local air quality impacts created from: construction-related fugitive dust and diesel emissions; from toxic air contaminants; and from construction-related odor impacts.

The maximum number of acres disturbed in a day would be 1.5 acres during grading. The local air quality emissions from construction were analyzed using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate Localized Significant Threshold Look-up Tables and the methodology described in Localized Significance Threshold Methodology prepared by SCAQMD (revised July 2008). The Look-up Tables were developed by the SCAQMD in order to readily determine if the daily emissions of CO, NOx, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from the Project could result in a significant impact to the local air quality. The emission thresholds were calculated based on the Pomona-Walnut Valley

Source Receptor Area (SRA) 10 and a disturbance value of one acre per day, to be conservative. According to LST Methodology, any receptor located closer than 25 meters (82 feet) shall be based on the 25-meter thresholds. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located adjacent to the west of the project site; therefore, the SCAQMD Look-up Tables for 25 meters was used. **Table 4, Local Construction Emissions at Nearest Receptors,** shows the on-site emissions from the CalEEMod model for the different construction phases and the LST emissions thresholds.

Activity	Emissi	ons (po	unds p	er day)		
Activity	NOx	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}		
Site Preparation	12.87	6.30	3.04	1.89		
Grading	14.75	12.54	1.05	0.63		
Building Construction	17.08	18.32	0.89	0.83		
Paving	10.19	14.58	0.51	0.47		
Architectural Coating	1.30	1.81	0.07	0.07		
SCAQMD Thresholds of Significance ⁽¹⁾	103	612	4	3		
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No		
Source: Calculated from CalEEMod and SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-up Tables for 1 acre, to be conservative, at a distance of 25 m in SRA 10						
(1) The nearest sensitive receptors are the existing single-family located adjacent to the west of the project site; therefore, the 2	detached 25-meter t	l resident threshold	ial dwelli. was use	ng units d.		

Table 4	
Local Construction Emissions at Nearest Receptor	S

Note: The project will disturb up to a maximum of 1.5 acres a day during grading (see Table 7 in Appendix A).

The data provided in Table 4 shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, a less than significant local air quality impact would occur from construction of the proposed project and no mitigation measures would be required.

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during construction of the proposed project. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SCAQMD Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis (August 2003), health effects from TACs are described in terms of individual cancer risk based on a lifetime (i.e., 30-year) resident exposure duration. Given the temporary and short-term construction schedule (approximately 18 months), the Project would not result in a long-term (i.e., lifetime or 30-year) exposure as a result of project construction. Furthermore, construction-based particulate matter (PM) emissions (including diesel exhaust emissions) do not exceed any local or regional thresholds.

The Project would comply with the CARB Air Toxics Control Measure that limits diesel powered equipment and vehicle idling to no more than 5 minutes at a location, and the CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation; compliance with these would minimize emissions of TACs during construction. The Project would also comply with the requirements of

SCAQMD Rule 1403 if asbestos is found during the renovation and construction activities. Therefore, impacts from TACs during construction would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operations

Project-related 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 South Coast Air Basin. The Project has been analyzed for the potential local CO emission impacts from the Project-generated vehicular trips and from the potential local air quality impacts from on-site operations. The following analysis analyzes the vehicular CO emissions, local impacts from on-site operations per SCAQMD LST methodology, and odor impacts.

Local CO Emission Impacts from Project-Generated Vehicular Trips

CO is the pollutant of major concern along roadways because the most notable source of CO is motor vehicles. For this reason, CO concentrations are usually indicative of the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator of potential local air quality impacts. Local air quality impacts can be assessed by comparing future without and with Project CO levels to the State and Federal CO standards.

To determine if the Project could cause emission levels in excess of the CO standards, a sensitivity analysis is typically conducted to determine the potential for CO "hot spots" at a number of intersections in the general project vicinity. Because of reduced speeds and vehicle queuing, "hot spots" potentially can occur at high traffic volume intersections with a Level of Service E or worse.

The analysis prepared for CO attainment in the South Coast Air Basin by the SCAQMD can be used to assist in evaluating the potential for CO exceedances in the South Coast Air Basin. CO attainment was thoroughly analyzed as part of the SCAQMD's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (2003 AQMP) and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan). As discussed in the 1992 CO Plan, peak carbon monoxide concentrations in the South Coast Air Basin are due to unusual meteorological and topographical conditions. and not due to the impact of particular intersections. Considering the region's unique meteorological conditions and the increasingly stringent CO emissions standards, CO modeling was performed as part of 1992 CO Plan and subsequent plan updates and air quality management plans. In the 1992 CO Plan, a CO hot spot analysis was conducted for four busy intersections in Los Angeles at the peak morning and afternoon time periods. The intersections evaluated included: South Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway (Lynwood); Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue (Westwood); Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue (Hollywood); and La Cienega Boulevard and Century Boulevard (Inglewood). These analyses did not predict a violation of CO standards. The busiest intersection evaluated was that at Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority evaluated the Level of Service in the vicinity of the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection and found it to be Level of Service E during the morning peak hour and Level of Service F during the afternoon peak hour.

The Trip Generation Analysis showed that the Project would generate a maximum of approximately 66 daily vehicle trips and did not even require a Traffic Impact Analysis. The 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan) showed that an intersection which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day would not violate the CO standard. Therefore, as the Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 66 daily vehicle trips, no CO "hot spot" modeling was performed and no significant long-term air quality impact is anticipated to local air quality with the on-going use of the Project.

Local Air Quality Impacts from On-Site Operations

Project-related air emissions from on-site sources such as architectural coatings, landscaping equipment, on-site usage of natural gas appliances as well as the operation of vehicles onsite 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 receptor that may be impacted by the Project are the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located adjacent to the west (along Rodeo Lane), approximately 30 feet southeast (across Broken Spur Road), approximately 90 feet east (across Broken Spur Road), approximately 100 feet south (across Baseline Road), and approximately 450 feet northeast of the Project Site.

According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources (such as heavyduty trucks) that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site; such as industrial warehouse/transfer facilities. The Project consists of a residential use, and does not include such uses. Therefore, due the lack of stationary source emissions, no long-term localized significance threshold analysis is warranted.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? Less Than Significant Impact.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the application of materials such as asphalt pavement. The objectionable odors that may be produced during the construction process are of short-term in nature and the odor emissions are expected to cease upon the drying or hardening of the odor producing materials. Due to the short-term nature and limited amounts of odor producing materials being utilized, no significant impact related to odors would occur during construction of the Project. Diesel exhaust and VOCs would be emitted during construction of the Project, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the Project Site and therefore should not reach an objectionable level at the nearest sensitive receptors. Potential construction impacts associated with objectionable odors would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operational odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. The Project involves the construction and operation of new residential uses, which are not typically associated with odor complaints. Potential sources that may emit odors during the on-going operations of the proposed project would include odor emissions from the intermittent diesel delivery truck emissions and trash storage areas. Due to the distance of the nearest receptors from the project site and through compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 402 no significant impact related to odors would occur during the on-going operations of the proposed project. Therefore, the potential operational impacts associated with objectionable odors would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BI	OLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Ha ha sei pol	ve a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through bitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, nsitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, licies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish d Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b. Ha oth pla Fis	we a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or ner sensitive natural community identified in local or regional ans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of sh and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		\boxtimes		
c. Ha pro poe inte	ve a substantial adverse effect on state or federally otected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal ol, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological erruption, or other means?				\boxtimes
d. Inte res natuse	erfere substantially with the movement of any native sident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established tive resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the e of native wildlife nursery sites?		\boxtimes		
e. Co bic po	onflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting plogical resources, such as tree preservation licy/ordinance?		\boxtimes		
f. Co Co oth pla	onflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat onservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or her approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation on?			\boxtimes	

The following information utilized in this section of the Initial Study is based, in part, on the <u>a</u> <u>revised</u>—*Biological Resources Assessment, 500 East Baseline Road,* ("Biological Report") prepared for the Project by South Environmental <u>originally</u> in July 2019 <u>and updated in February</u> <u>2021</u>, and the *Significant Tree Report, Venting Tentative Tract Map No. 082001, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne, City of La Verne*, ("Tree Report") prepared by Carlberg Associates on August 2,

2018. These reports are incorporated by reference and provided as *Appendix B.1* and *Appendix B.2*, to this IS/MND, respectively.

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**

As part of preparation of the Biological Report, field reconnaissance, including a plant community mapping and an animal inventory, and a rare plant survey were conducted of the Project Site. The field reconnaissance identified a total of six plant communities on the Site, as shown in **Figure 15, Plant Communities and Drainages**, and described as follows:¹⁰

- **Coast prickly pear scrub** covers 2.6 acres of the northern and central portions of the Project Site. Coast prickly pear scrub has a Global Rank of 4 and a State Rank of 3, indicating that it is apparently secure globally and vulnerable in California due to a restricted range, relatively few populations, and/or recent a widespread decline.
- **Deer weed scrub** covers 5.9 acres of the northern portion of the Project Site. Deer weed scrub has a Global Rank of 5 and a State Rank of 5 indicating that it is demonstrably secure to ineradicable both globally and in California.
- Canyon Coast live oak forest occurs on 3.9 acres of the northern and central portions of the Project Site. Canyon Coast live oak forest has a Global Rank of 5 and a State Rank of 5 indicating that it is demonstrably secure to ineradicable both globally and in California.
- Laurel sumac scrub occurs on 4.1-acres of the southern portion of the Project Site. Laurel sumac scrub has a Global Rank of 4 and a State Rank of 4 indicating that it is apparently secure both globally and in California.
- **Eucalyptus groves** occur on 0.6-acre of the southern portion of the Project Site. Eucalyptus groves have no Global or State Rank.
- **Disturbed areas** occur on 2.0 acres in the southwest corner of the Project Site. Disturbed areas have no Global or State Rank.

¹⁰ Biological Resources Assessment, pages 10 to 13, South Environmental, July 2019 (Appendix B.1).



Source: South Environmental, July 2019.



Source: South Environmental, July 2019.

Habitat Impacts

As shown in **Figure 16, Impacts of Project to Plant Communities and Drainages**, and detailed in **Table 5, Summary of Impacts to Plant Communities**, development and fuel modification activities of the Project would directly impact the six plant communities identified on the Project Site.

Summary of Impacts to Plant Communities								
	Impacted by							
	Impacted by	Fuel	Total					
	Development	Modification	Impacted					
Plant Community	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)					
Laurel Sumac Scrub	1.32	<u>2.57 2.62 </u>	<u>3.89</u>					
Canyon Live Oak Forest	0.86	<u>0.79</u>	<u>1.65</u>					
Coast Prickly Pear Scrub	0.24	<u>0.00 </u>	<u>0.24</u>					
Deer Weed Scrub	0.01	0.00	0.01					
Eucalyptus Groves	0.58	0.03	0.61					
Disturbed	1.72	0.0	1.72					
Total	4.73	3.74	8.12 8.47					
Source: South Environmental,	Biological Resour	rces Assessment, 5	500 East Baseline					
Road, February 2021 July 2019 .								

Table 5	
Summary of Impacts to Plant Communities	

The impacts to native plant communities are minimized by siting the proposed development close to current development (to the west) and utilizing existing disturbed areas (approximately 1.72 acres). However, the proposed debris basin would impact the coast live oak forest (approximately 0.86 acres). Further, a proposed single family home graded pad (lot 7) would be located on an elevated area of laurel sumac scrub. Lots 5 and 6, and roadway preparation would also involve grading and removal of laurel sumac scrub. Fuel modification for the Project would affect approximately 2.57 acres of laurel sumac scrub.

As shown in Table 5, the Project would directly impact a total of 8.47 acres of plant communities. Based on the results of the focused rare plant survey of the Project Site, no rare or protected plants occur in the plant community areas that would be impacted by the development or fuel modification activities associated with the Project. Therefore, **no impacts** to special status plants would occur under the Project. Fuel modification proposed for the Project would occur on 3.74-acres of habitat on the Project Site, largely within the laurel sumac scrub with approximately 2.57-acres, and 0.79-acres within the coast live oak forest. However, fuel modification would not result in the loss or removal of trees in the coast live oak forest and would only result in the potential pruning of trees for fire safety.

The coast live oak forest surrounds streams on the Project Site and is considered a sensitive riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Impacts to the streams (discussed below under subsection IV.,b) and the riparian habitat is considered significant according to CEQA and permitting under Fish and Game code, section 1600 et. seq., is the process for mitigating the loss of this habitat. Furthermore, the coast prickly pear scrub and laurel sumac scrub supports coastal cactus wren, limited distribution plants (CRPR 4.2) Southern California black walnut and San Gabriel leather oaks

and other special-status animals have the potential to occur on site. Therefore, the loss of scrub habitats with Project implementation (development and fuel modification) would result in a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-1**, **Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement**, described below, is required. MM BIO-1 requires permitting for the loss of CDWF jurisdictional riparian habitats and streambeds and habitat replacement for the loss of coast prickly pear and laurel sumac scrub habitats. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to habitat would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Special-Status Plants

Southern California black walnut and San Gabriel leather oak (both California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) 4.2) are known to occur in the proposed impact area in the coast live oak forest and laurel sumac scrub. Plants that are ranked CRPR 4 are limited in distribution and are not considered rare, threatened, or endangered; therefore, impacts to these species would be less than significant. Based on the results of the focused rare plant survey conducted by South Environmental, no rare or protected plants (CRPR 1 or 2) occur in the impact areas that were surveyed by foot. However, areas with steep slopes and dense mature vegetation were not surveyable and if protected plants (CRPR 1 or 2) occur in these areas, Project implementation could result in potential significant impacts to these special-status plant species. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-2, Phased Rare Plant Surveys and Impact Mitigation, described below is required. MM BIO-2, requires survey of the steep slopes for rare plants if grading and vegetation removal is required in these areas. If rare plants are found, the mitigation measure requires a rare plant mitigation plan to be prepared and if California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Endangered Species Act (ESA)-threatened or endangered plant species are detected, a robust avoidance plan shall be prepared and the CDFW and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) be notified. Further, specific direction is provided if endangered or threatened, or candidate for listing under CESA cannot be avoided as a result of Project implementation. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status plants would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Special-Status Animals

Reptiles and Mammals

However, bBased on the animal inventory and field reconnaissance conducted at the Site, a total of 14 special status animals are likely to occur within the habitats identified at the Project Site, <u>Species with a high or medium potential to occur</u> includeing four reptiles, four mammals,

and six birds, including the Coastal California Gnatcatcher, which is federally listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.¹¹

The four special status reptiles and four special status mammals and their associated habitat include the following: southern California legless lizard may occur in the oak forest near the drainages, California glossy snake may occur in the scrub habitats, coastal whiptail and coast horned lizard may occur in the scrub and forest habitats, pallid bat may occur as a forager on the parcel, western mastiff bat may forage or roost in the mature trees on the parcel, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit may occur in the scrub or forest habitats, and San Diego desert woodrat may occur in the scrub habitats. If present during construction, these species could be killed by construction equipment which could result in a significant impact to these species. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-13, Preconstruction Surveys Reptile and Mammal Surveys and Protection/Relocation Plan, described below, is required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-13 requires the identification and relocation of any reptiles or mammals from vegetation to be cleared immediately prior to its removal during initial Site preparation implementation of species surveys, monitoring activities, implementation of a protection/relocation plan and worker awareness training. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, reptiles and mammals, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Nesting Birds

Numerous birds have the potential to nest on the Project Site and these species and their nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. These include six special-status birds: oak titmouse was observed in the canyon coast live oak forest, coastal cactus wren was observed nesting in the coastal cactus scrub immediately adjacent to the proposed fuel modification zone, Lawrence's goldfinch may occur in the canyon coast live oak forest, whitetailed kite and loggerhead shrike may occur in the forest and scrub habitats, and federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher could occur in the scrub habitats.¹² Nests, eggs, and young that are dependent on the nest are vulnerable to direct loss from construction equipment or removal of vegetation, and indirect loss from abandonment of eggs or nests that may result from noise and vibration from nearby construction equipment. Impacts from construction such as death of a bird or loss of a nest, young, or egg of a bird protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act would be considered significant. Furthermore, the coast prickly pear scrub and laurel sumac scrub within the impact area is suitable for nesting and foraging coastal California gnatcatchers, which are a federally threatened species. Accordingly, mitigation measures MM BIO-24, Nesting Bird Surveys and Raptor Surveys, and MM BIO-3, Coastal California Gnatcatcher Preconstruction Surveys, described below, are is required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-24 requires a nesting bird survey be conducted within any vegetation to be removed and within a 500-foot buffer should construction activities occur between March January 1 and August 31. In accordance with mitigation measure MM BIO-

¹¹ Ibid, page 24 <u>30</u> (Appendix B-1).

¹² Ibid, pages <u>31</u>25 and 26 (Appendix B-1).

24, active nests would be protected from construction activities by a buffer where no construction work may occur until the nest is no longer active. Mitigation measure MM BIO-3 requires that a specific survey to determine the presence or absence of coastal California gnatcatchers be conducted within 30 days of the start of construction. Should coastal California gnatcatchers be identified during the survey or at any time during construction of the Project, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 requires consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Survey. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, nesting birds, would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

White-Tailed Kite

White-Tailed Kite, a fully protected species, has the potential to nest in the forest habitat and forage in the scrub habitats on the Project Site. Project construction activities conducted during the raptor breeding and nesting season could result in the incidental loss of eggs or young, which would be considered a significant impact. The nesting bird and raptor surveys as described in MM BIO-4 are not sufficient to avoid impacts to this sensitive specie. Therefore, mitigation measure **MM BIO-5**, **White-Tailed Kite Focused Surveys and Nest Avoidance**, is required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-5 requires a White Tailed Kite focused survey be conducted within any vegetation considered habitat to be removed and within a 500-foot buffer should construction activities occur between January 1 and August 31. In accordance with mitigation measure MM BIO-5, active nests would be protected from construction activities by a 1,000 foot buffer where no construction work may occur until the nest is no longer active. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Cactus Wren

Coastal cactus wren is known to nest in the densest areas of coast prickly pear on the Project Site and was observed nesting immediately outside of the proposed fuel modification areas. Mitigation measure, **MM BIO-4**, **Nesting Bird Surveys and Raptor Surveys** would ensure that direct impacts to nests during construction of the Project would be avoided. However, proposed development would result in the loss of 0.24-acres of coast prickly pear scrub. In addition to the potential impacts to nesting birds during construction activities, development and fuel modification activities associated with the Project would permanently remove 1.24acres of coast prickly pear scrub, which serves as habitat for coastal cactus wren. Because coastal cactus wren is an obligate nester in coastal cactus scrub, the loss of habitat would be considered a significant impact.¹³ Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-4**, **Coast Prickly Pear Nesting Habitat Avoidance-MM BIO-1,-Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement**, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-4<u>1</u> requires the preservation -replacement of coast prickly pear habitat to the extent possible at no less than 1:1 for all temporary and permanent impacts.

¹³ Ibid, pages <u>33</u>25-26 (Appendix B-1).

Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, cactus wren, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Coastal California Gnatcatcher

The coast prickly pear scrub and laurel sumac scrub within the impact area is suitable for nesting and foraging coastal California gnatcatchers, which are a federally threatened species. Significant impacts to the coastal California gnatcatchers would occur if the species was nesting within coast prickly pear scrub or laurel sumac scrub that will be removed due to Project implementation. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-6, Coastal California Gnatcatcher Protocol Survey and ESA Compliance, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-6 requires focused surveys be prepared to determine the presence or absence of coastal California gnatcatchers. Minimum of six surveys be conducted from March 15 through June 30 and minimum of nine surveys at least two weeks apart from July 1 through March 14. Should coastal California gnatcatchers found to occur on the habitat of the Project Site, MM BIO-6 requires consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife (USFW) in advance of construction activities and/or vegetation removal that may impact gnatcatcher. In addition, the loss of habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher would be considered a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-1, Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-1 requires the replacement of coast prickly pear habitat at no less than 1:1 for all temporary and permanent impacts. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to lessthan-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, coastal California gnatcatcher, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Crotch's Bumble Bee

Implementation of the Project would remove habitat that has the potential to support Crotch's bumble bee and ground disturbing activities and vegetation removal could cause death or injury of adults, eggs and larva, burrow collapse, nest abandonment, and reduced nest success. Crotch's bumble bee has a State ranking of S1/S2, which means that the species is critically imperiled or imperiled, and as a result, impacts to the species or its habitat would be considered a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-7, Crotch's Bumble Bee Surveys and Avoidance, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-7 requires a survey to be conducted within one year prior to grading and/or vegetation removal. Survey to be conducted between March 1 to September 1 when the species is above ground and likely to be detected. If detected, an avoidance plan is required, however if impacts cannot be avoided, coordination with CDFW is required to obtain appropriate handling and take permits and mitigation for the species habitat. In addition, the loss of habitat for the Crotch's bumble bee would be considered a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-1, Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-1 requires the replacement of Project Site habitat at no less than 1:1 for all temporary and permanent impacts. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, crotch's bumble bee, would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

<u>Bats</u>

Pallid bat and western mastiff bat may forage or roost in the Project Site in the forest habitats. If present during construction activity, they could be disturbed by the construction directly if roosting sites, such as trees are removed, or indirectly by noise or vibration near a roosting site. Disturbance could make the bats abandon roosting sites or harm roosting bats, which would be a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure MM BIO-8, Focused Bat Surveys and Roosting Site Protection, described below, would be required. Mitigation measure MM BIO-8 requires bat surveys conducted with specific mitigation measures identified to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Surveys to be conducted prior to construction, such as ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal near locations of roosting habitats for bats. If bats are not detected, tree removal shall involve a push down method using heavy machinery rather than felling with chainsaw as roosting bats may be still present. If maternity roost are found, then construction work shall be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of maternity roosting season. As such, implementation of this measure would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to special-status animals, bats, would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Following implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-1, impacts to special status reptiles and mammals would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4, impacts to nesting and special status birds would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-1, impacts to habitat would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-2, impacts to special-status plants would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of MM BIO-1, MM BIO-3, MM BIO-4, MM BIO-5, MM BIO-6, MM BIO-7 and MM BIO-8, impacts to specialstatus animals, reptiles and mammals, nesting birds, white-tailed kite, coastal California gnatcatcher, crotch's bumble bees and bats would be reduced to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to special status species subject to the plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 Preconstruction Surveys. Prior to removal of native plant communities, a preconstruction survey for reptiles and mammals shall be conducted to identify protected species and remove them from the development site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and any reptiles or mammals relocated shall be moved or directed to an area that is at least 100-feet from any future impacts.

The survey shall be timed to occur immediately prior to the removal of vegetation during initial site preparation prior to construction.

<u>Habitat</u>

MM BIO-1 <u>Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat</u> <u>Replacement.</u>

- a. The project applicant must provide notification to CDFW pursuant Fish and Game Code, section 1600 et seq. to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. The application requires an online submittal at CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program website 1 Environmental Permit Information Management System (EPIMS) Permitting Portal. LSA Notification should occur prior to the City's issuance of a grading permit.
- b. The LSA Notification should include a hydrology report to evaluate whether altering streams within the Project's development, grading, and fuel modification zones could impair headwater streams, and should include a scour analysis to demonstrate that stream banks and streambed would not erode as a result of impacts downstream. The hydrology report should also include a hydrological evaluation of the 200, 100, 50, 25, 10, 5, and 2-year frequency storm event for existing and proposed conditions.
- c. Recommended mitigation for the impacts to streams and coast live oak riparian forest should include replacement of habitat up to 5:1 for the permanent impacts from development and 3:1 for impacts from fuel modification that would not result in the loss of habitat but would result in the alteration of the understory habitat.
- d. Recommended mitigation for the impacts to coast prickly pear scrub and laurel sumac scrub habitats should include replacing habitat at no less than 1:1 for all temporary and permanent impacts.
- e. Mitigation lands should be acquired immediately adjacent to the Project's 10.75-acres of dedicated open space and preserve in perpetuity as one contiguous parcel if possible. Mitigation lands should be located away from the Project's fuel modification zone. If additional acres are not available for purchase that support suitable replacement habitats, it is recommended that mitigation lands be acquired that expand the footprint of the Marshall Canyon Conservation Corridor and enhance wildlife habitat, corridors, and diversity. It is recommended that the City consider coordinating with the La Verne Land Conservancy to identify and select appropriate mitigation lands that support streams and coast live oak forest, as well as coast prickly pear and laurel sumac scrub habitats.

f. Mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094 (2012). Assembly Bill 1094 amended Government Code sections 65965-65968. Under Government Code section 65967(c), the lead agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the gualifications of a governmental entity, special district, or nonprofit organization to effectively manage and steward land, water, or natural resources on mitigation lands it approves. An appropriate non-wasting endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A mitigation plan should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts. Issues that should be addressed include, but are not limited to, restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, and increased human intrusion. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to the City's issuance of a grading permit.

Special-Status Plants

MM BIO-2 Phased Rare Plant Surveys and Impact Mitigation.

- a. Grading and vegetation removal on the steep slopes with dense vegetation in the coast live oak forest and laurel sumac shrubland should be conducted in a systematic and phased manner that would allow a botanist to survey the area for rare plants before proceeding with complete grading or vegetation clearing down to bare ground. Special consideration should be given to areas that were previously inaccessible that could become accessible during grading and vegetation removal activities. This includes areas of steep terrain, dense vegetation, and dense poison oak.
- b. If rare plants are found, all work in the immediate area should stop under the direction of a qualified botanist. Depending on the species, work may not resume until the proper notifications have been made to CDFW and/or USFWS and/or a qualified botanist prepares and submits a rare plant mitigation plan to the City in order to mitigate for impacts to rare plants.
- c. If a CESA- or ESA-listed threatened or endangered plant species is detected, the City should fully avoid impacts and notify CDFW and/or USFWS. A qualified biologist should develop a robust avoidance plan. The plan should include effective, specific, enforceable, and feasible measures. If CRPR 1, 2, 3, and 4 species are detected, CDFW recommends the City fully avoid impacts and notify CDFW of CRPR 1 and 2 species.
- d. <u>CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be</u> <u>significant without mitigation under CEQA. As to CESA, take of any</u>

endangered, threatened, candidate species that results from the project is prohibited, except as authorized by State law (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 786.9). Consequently, if the project, project construction, or any project-related activity for the duration of the project will result in a take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends the City seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing/continuing the project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit or a Consistency Determination in certain circumstances, among other options [Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a project and mitigation measures may be required to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that CDFW issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP unless the project CEQA document addresses all project impacts to CESA-listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP. For these reasons, biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA ITP.

- e. If the project cannot feasibly avoid impacts to CRPR species and habitat, either during project activities or over the life of the project, the City should compensate for the loss of individual plants and associated habitat at a ratio comparable to the project's level of impacts. Mitigation ratios should increase with impacts to a CRPR 2 species and should further increase with impacts to a CRPR 1 species.
- f. If the project proposes to set aside replacement habitat to be protected in perpetuity, mitigation lands should be in the same watershed as the project site and contains the rare plant species and habitat impacted. Replacement habitat should have similar vegetation composition, density, coverage, and species richness and abundance as the habitat impacted.

Special-Status Animals

Reptiles and Mammals

MM BIO-3 Reptile and Mammal Surveys and Protection/Relocation Plan,

a. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 650, the City/qualified biologist must obtain appropriate handling permits to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with project construction and activities. Please visit CDFW's Scientific Collection Permits webpage2 for information. An LSA Agreement may provide similar take or possession of species as described in the conditions of the agreement (see mitigation measure MM BIO-1).

- b. CDFW has the authority to issue permits for the take or possession of wildlife, including mammals; birds, nests, and eggs; reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants; and invertebrates (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1002, 1002.5, 1003). Effective October 1, 2018, a Scientific Collecting Permit is required to monitor project impacts on wildlife resources, as required by environmental documents, permits, or other legal authorizations; and, to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with otherwise lawful activities (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 650).
- c. The City should retain a qualified biologist(s) with experience surveying for or is familiar with the life history of each of the following species: southern California legless lizard, California glossy snake, orange-throated whiptail, coast whiptail, coast horned lizard, San Diego desert woodrat, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit. The qualified biologist should conduct focused surveys for SSC and suitable habitat no more than one month from the start of any ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal where there may be impacts to SSC. In addition, the qualified biologist should conduct daily biological monitoring during any activities involving vegetation clearing or modification of natural habitat. Positive detections of Species of Special Concern (SSC) and suitable habitat at the detection location should be mapped and photographed. The gualified biologist should provide a summary report of SSC surveys to the City prior to implementing any project-related ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal. Depending on the survey results, a qualified biologist should develop species-specific mitigation measures for implementation during the project.
- d. The City in consultation with a qualified biologist should prepare a worker environmental awareness training. The qualified biologist should communicate to workers that upon encounter with a SSC (e.g., during construction or equipment inspections), work must stop, a qualified biologist must be notified, and work may only resume once a qualified biologist has determined that it is safe to do so.
- e. If any SSC are harmed during relocation or a dead or injured animal is found, work in the immediate area should stop immediately, the qualified biologist should be notified, and dead or injured wildlife documented. A formal report should be sent to CDFW and the City within three calendar days of the incident or finding. Work in the immediate area may only resume once the proper notifications have been made and additional mitigation measures have been identified to prevent additional injury or death.

Nesting Birds

MM BIO-24 Nesting Bird Surveys and Raptor Surveys. Construction should be timed to occur between September 1 – January 31 to avoid impacts to nesting birds. If the Project occurs between March January 1 – August 31 a nesting bird and raptor

survey shall be conducted within area <u>project activities will occur</u> were vegetation will be removed and a surrounding 500-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall be timed to occur no more than 72-hours prior to removal of vegetation <u>any project activities (i.e., staging, mobilization, excavation, grading</u>). If active bird <u>or raptor</u> nests are identified, they shall be avoided by a 300foot no work buffer for passerines and a 500-foot buffer for raptors and other special-status species. No work buffers may be reduced at the discretion of a monitoring biologist, however, if the buffer is reduced, the biologist shall <u>must</u> monitor the nest during all work activities that occur within the reduced buffer area. The no-work buffer may be removed when the nest is determined to no longer be active or the young have left the nest, as determined by a qualified biologist.

White-Tailed Kite

MM BIO-5 White-Tailed Kite Focused Surveys and Nest Avoidance

- a. To avoid impacts to nesting white-tailed kites it is recommended that a qualified biologist with knowledge of white-tailed kite life history and survey experience conduct a thorough survey of all suitable nesting habitat with the project impact areas plus a 500-foot buffer (as access allows). Surveys should be completed no more than 3 days prior to beginning any project-related ground-disturbing activities (including staging and mobilization) or vegetation removal. Positive detections should be reported to CDFW prior to the any project-related grounddisturbing activities or vegetation removal.
- b. If white-tailed kite nests are detected, no project-related construction and activities should occur from January 1 through August 31. If Project construction and activities must occur between January 1 through August 31, the City, in consultation with a qualified biologist, develop a robust avoidance plan to specifically avoid impacts to white-tailed kite. The plan should include effective, specific, enforceable, and feasible measures. A minimum 1,000-foot no-disturbance buffer should be implemented around each white-tailed kite nest. No project related construction and activities should occur within the protected area while occupied by white-tailed kite nests and nestlings. An avoidance plan should be developed prior to beginning any project-related ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal.

Cactus Wren

MM BIO-1 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement.

See details above.

MM BIO-4 Nesting Bird Surveys and Raptor Surveys

See details above.

Coastal California Gnatcatcher

MM BIO-36 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Preconstruction Protocol Survey and ESA

Compliance. A biologist holding the appropriate survey permits shall conduct a single preconstruction presence/absence survey for coastal California gnatcatcher to determine if the species occurs on the parcel. The survey shall include the use of callback tapes to entice any local birds to vocalize at the location. The survey shall be timed to occur within 30 days of the proposed construction. If coastal California gnatcatcher is identified within the impact areas consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Survey regarding potential impacts shall be completed prior to starting the Project. If the species is identified at any time during the Project, such as during a preconstruction nesting bird or terrestrial animal survey, the Project shall seek consultation prior to starting the work.

- a. The City should retain a qualified biologist with a gnatcatcher survey permit. The qualified biologist should survey the project site to determine presence/absence of gnatcatcher. The qualified biologist should conduct surveys according to USFWS Coastal California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica) Presence/Absence.
- b. Survey Guidelines (USFWS 1997). The survey protocol requires a minimum of six surveys conducted at least one week apart from March 15 through June 30 and a minimum of nine surveys at least two weeks apart from July 1 through March 14. The protocol should be followed for all surveys unless otherwise authorized by the USFWS in writing (USFWS 1997). CDFW recommends gnatcatcher surveys be conducted and USFWS notified (per protocol guidance) prior to the City's issuance of a grading permit.
- c. A take under the ESA is more broadly defined than CESA; take under ESA also includes significant habitat modification or degradation that could result in death or injury to a listed species by interfering with essential behavioral patterns such as breeding, foraging, or nesting. If coastal California gnatcatcher is found to occur on the habitat on the project site, consultation with the USFWS, in order to comply with ESA, is advised well in advance of any ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal that may impact gnatcatcher.

Crotch's Bumble Bee

MM BIO-7 Crotch's Bumble Bee Surveys and Avoidance

a. Due to suitable habitat within the project site, within one year prior to grading and/or vegetation removal, a qualified entomologist familiar with the species behavior and life history should conduct surveys to determine the presence/absence of Crotch's bumble bee. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1 (Thorp et al. 1983). Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to the City prior to implementing project-related ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal where there may be impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. At minimum, a survey report should provide the following:

- i. A description and map of the survey area, focusing on areas that could provide suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee;
- ii. Field survey conditions that should include name(s) of qualified entomologist(s) and brief qualifications, date and time of survey, survey duration, general weather conditions, survey goals, and species searched;
- iii. Map(s) showing the location of nests/colonies; and,
- iv. A description of physical (e.g., soil, moisture, slope) and biological (e.g., plant composition) conditions where each nest/colony is found. A sufficient description of biological conditions, primarily impacted habitat, should include native plant composition (e.g., density, cover, and abundance) within impacted habitat (e.g., species list separated by vegetation class; density, cover, and abundance of each species).
- b. If Crotch's bumble bee is detected, the City in consultation with a qualified entomologist should develop a plan to fully avoid impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. The plan should include effective, specific, enforceable, and feasible measures. An avoidance plan should be submitted to the City prior to implementing project-related ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal where there may be impacts to Crotch's bumble bee.
- c. If Crotch's bumble bee is detected and if impacts to Crotch's bumble bee cannot be feasibly avoided during project construction and activities, the City/qualified entomologist should coordinate with CDFW to obtain appropriate handling permits for incidental take of Crotch's bumble bee and provide appropriate mitigation for impacts to Crotch's bumble bee habitat. CDFW recommends the City mitigate for impacts to Crotch's bumble bee habitat at a ratio comparable to the project's level of impacts.

<u>Bats</u>

MM BIO-8 Focused Bat Surveys and Roosting Site Protection

a. Where project-related implementation, construction, and activities would occur near potential roosting habitat for bats, such as tall trees or rock crevices a qualified bat specialist shall conduct bat surveys within these areas (plus a 100-foot buffer as access allows) to identify potential habitat that could provide daytime and/or nighttime roost sites, and any maternity roosts. Surveys should be conducted using acoustic recognition technology to maximize detection of bats. A discussion of survey results, including negative findings should be provided to the City. Depending on the survey results, a qualified bat specialist should discuss potentially significant effects of the project on bats and include species specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts to below a level of significance (CEQA Guidelines, § 15125). Surveys, reporting, and preparation of robust mitigation measures by a qualified bat specialist should be completed and submitted to the City prior to any project-related ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal at or near locations of roosting habitat for bats.

- b. If bats are not detected, but the bat specialist determines that roosting bats may be present at any time of year and could roost in trees at a given location, during tree removal, trees should be pushed down using heavy machinery rather than felling with chainsaw. To ensure the optimum warning for any roosting bats that may still be present, trees should be pushed lightly two or three times, with a pause of approximately 30 seconds between each nudge to allow bats to become active. The tree should then be pushed to the ground slowly and remain in place until it is inspected by a bat specialist. Trees that are known to be bat roosts should not be bucked or mulched immediately. A period of at least 24 hours, and preferable 48 hours, should elapse prior to such operations to allow bats to escape.
- c. If maternity roosts are found, to the extent feasible, work should be scheduled between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season when young bats are present but are yet ready to fly out of the roost (March 1 to September 30).
- d. If maternity roosts are found and the City determines that impacts are unavoidable, a qualified bat specialist should conduct a preconstruction survey to identify those trees proposed for disturbance that could provide hibernacula or nursery colony roosting habitat. Acoustic recognition technology should be used to maximize the detection of bats. Each tree identified as potentially supporting an active maternity roost should be closely inspected by the bat specialist no more than 7 days prior to tree disturbance to determine the presence or absence of roost bats more precisely. If maternity roosts are detected, trees/structures determined to be maternity roosts should be left in place until the end of the maternity season. Work should not occur within 100 feet of or directly under or adjacent to an active roost. Work should also not occur between 30 minutes before subset and 30 minutes after sunrise.
- **MM BIO-4 Coast Prickly Pear Nesting Habitat Avoidance**. The densest areas of coast prickly pear shall be preserved to the extent that is possible. Fuel modification shall not remove the areas of dense cactus where coastal cactus wren has been observed nesting in the past. In addition, areas of dense cactus north of that nest shall also be preserved to the extent that is possible. These dense cactus areas shall be flagged and marked as environmentally sensitive prior to construction or fuel modification that occurs near these areas. However, work that may affect an active nest (including installation or removal of fencing) shall be avoided until the nest is no longer active per the guidance in Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**

A Jurisdictional Delineation was conducted as part of the Biological Resources Assessment report in order to identify if waters of the U.S. that would be regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers exist on the Project Site. The Jurisdiction Delineation identified three drainages within the Canyon Coast Live Oak Forest communities of the Site, as shown in Figure 15 and described as follows:¹⁴

- **Drainage 1** is 567-feet long where it exists on the Project Site and forms a y-shape as two parts from a single drainage that flows north to south and onto an adjacent concrete culvert at the end of a driveway off of the Project Site to the west. Drainage 1 is approximately 1.5-feet wide at its northern end and approximately 8-feet wide where it leaves the Project Site.
- **Drainage 2** is 677-feet long where it exists on the Project Site where it flows to the southwest and terminates at an onsite tilled and graded area, which dams its flow. Drainage 2 is approximately 1.5-2-feet wide throughout its length.
- **Drainage 3** is 530-feet where it exists on the Project Site and flows from east to west. Drainage 3 is approximately 2-feet wide throughout its length and terminates at the same onsite tilled and graded area as Drainage 2.

Drainages 2 and 3 likely met in the past and continued to flow to the southwest, however, the onsite tilling and grading have severed their downstream connections and no streambed or banks are visible.¹⁵ As detailed below in section IV. c), because no downstream connections for the three drainages exist, they would not be considered waters of the U.S. However, the presence of a streambed and bank as well as areas showing signs of recent flow (moist soils and debris flows) indicates that the drainages are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife pursuant to Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code.

The USFWS National Wetlands Inventory database shows a fourth potential drainage in the southeastern corner of the parcel within the laurel sumac scrub and coast live oak forest, and comments received from CDFW after a review of the initial draft of this report requested that this potential drainage area be addressed. This area was surveyed during the original delineation and no streambed or bank, or signs of flowing water such as debris flows or scouring were observed. An additional survey of the area was conducted on February 8, 2021 to document the area more thoroughly, and again no streambed or bank was observed, and no signs of flowing water were present. The area is covered with upland vegetation and has disturbance from an abandoned homeless camp. Areas with steep slopes on each side are

¹⁴ Ibid, pages 17 and 18 (Appendix B-1).

¹⁵ Ibid, page 18 (Appendix B-1).

characterized by upland shrubs found in the laurel sumac scrub, and no drainage was apparent.

As shown in Figure 16, and detailed in **Table 6, Summary of Impacts to Jurisdictional Resources**, grading and fuel modification activities associated with the Project would have direct impacts to Drainages 2 and 3, which are California Department of Fish and Wildlife jurisdictional streambeds, and to the surrounding <u>canyon coast</u> live oak forest.

Summary of Impacts to Jurisdictional Resources										
		Streambed	Total		Oak Forest					
	Streambed	Impacted by	Streambed	Oak Forest	Impacted by	Total Oak				
	Impacted by	Fuel	Impacted	Impacted by	Fuel	Forest				
	Development	Modification	(linear	Development	Modification	Impacted				
Drainage	(linear feet)	(linear feet)	feet)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)				
Drainage Drainage 2	(linear feet) 270	(linear feet) 0	feet) 270	(acres) 0.36	(acres) 0 <u>.00</u>	(acres) 0.36				
Drainage 2 Drainage 3	(linear feet) 270 336	(linear feet) 0 100 0	feet) 270 4 36 <u>336</u>	(acres) 0.36 0.50	(acres) 0 <u>.00</u> 0.63 0.56	(acres) 0.36 <u>1.13</u> <u>1.06</u>				
Drainage 2 Drainage 3 Drainage 3	(linear feet) 270 336 606	(linear feet) 0 <u>100 0</u> 100 0	feet) 270 4 36 <u>336</u> 706 <u>606</u>	(acres) 0.36 0.50 0.86	(acres) 0 <u>.00</u> 0.63 0.56 0.63 0.56	(acres) 0.36 <u>1.13</u> <u>1.06</u> 1.49 <u>1.42</u>				

Table 6								
Sum	Summary of Impacts to Jurisdictional Resources							

As shown in Table 6, the Project would directly impact 706 606 linear feet of streambed and 1.49 1.42 acres of canyon coast live oak forest, which has the same characteristics as the Canyon Southern Coast Live Oak Ravine Riparian Forest designated as a sensitive natural community by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. These impacts would be significant.¹⁶ Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-51**, <u>Lake and</u> Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement, described below above, is Mitigation measure MM BIO-51 requires the Project to obtain a Streambed required. Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife prior to construction of the Project. In accordance with California Fish and Game Code Section 1602, the Streambed Alternation Agreement is required to contain reasonable measures necessary to protect resources subject to the Streambed Alteration Agreement and its incorporation would reduce the Project's impacts to Drainages 2 and 3 and the canyon coast live oak forest to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities subject to the plans, policies, and regulations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-51 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat <u>Replacement</u>. A Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be received prior to initiating construction of the Project. Detailed description of the mitigation measure is provided under Section IV. a), above.

¹⁶ Ibid, page 27 <u>37</u> (Appendix B-1).

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? **No Impact.**

The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The State of California Wetlands does not identify any wetlands on or in the vicinity of the Project Site.¹⁷ The National Wetlands Inventory identifies wetlands within the <u>Canyon Coast</u> Live Oak Forests on the Project Site.¹⁸ As detailed in response to Threshold 14.4(b) above, the Jurisdictional Delineation conducted as part of the Biological Report identified three drainages on the Site (shown in Figure 15), however, based on a review of historic aerial photographs <u>and topographic maps</u>, it was determined that the drainages on the parcel are isolated and have no current or previous downstream connection. Therefore, the drainages would not be considered waters of the U.S. regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.¹⁹ Accordingly, no state or federally protected wetlands exist on the Project Site. As such, the Project would not result in impacts to wetlands and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**.

The Project Site is located within the urban-wildlife interface. According to the Statewide Essential Habitat Connectivity Project Geospatial Dataset, the Project Site is adjacent to the southeast of the Sugarloaf Mountain/Keller Peak – San Gabriel/Cucamonga connection, which is an important linkage and wildlife migration corridor in southern California.²⁰ Furthermore, as shown on **Figure 17**, **Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area**, **No. 18**, **San Dimas Canyon/San Antonio Wash**, the Project Site is located entirely within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), Number 18, which links native habitats surrounding Live Oak Reservoir (approximately 0.75-mile north of the Site) to the Angeles National Forest. Although the Project Site is contiguous with hundreds of thousands of acres of pristine native habitat and provides habitat linkage and wildlife movement in the region, large portions of the Site have already been impacted by fuel modification associated with the residences adjacent to the western boundary of the Site, and these areas are not suitable for wildlife movement and lack native habitats.²¹

However, streams and drainages like those found in the canyons on the Project Site and described above under section IV.(b) above, are frequently used corridors for both movement

¹⁷ California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup, California Aquatic Resource Inventory (CARI) Interactive Map, hosted by EcoAtlas, South Coast Region, available at: https://www.ecoatlas.org/regions/ecoregion/south-coast, accessed April 2020.

¹⁸ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper, website: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html, accessed April 2020.

¹⁹ Biological Resources Assessment, pages 17 and 18, South Environmental, July 2019- February 2021(Appendix B.1).

²⁰ Ibid, page 10 (Appendix B.1)

²¹ Ibid, pages 27 <u>37</u> and 28 <u>38</u> (Appendix B.2).

of both large and small animals, particularly at the urban-wildlife interface. Nighttime lighting associated with housing could deter animals from movement if they are pointed at native habitats. In addition, the proposed project could increase pressures on wildlife dispersal due to loss of habitat and the potential to create barriers to wildlife dispersal such as fencing at the urban wildlands interface. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-69**, **Nighttime Lighting**, **Fencing**, **and No Rodenticide**, would be required.

Mitigation measure MM BIO-69 requires Project lighting to be directed away from native habitat and prevented from spilling onto adjacent areas. Prevention of light spillover onto native habitats would reduce impacts from night lighting to less than significant levels. In addition, appropriate fencing that is less harmful to wildlife and is permeable to allow for wildlife movement and avoiding use of rodenticides to avoid harming wildlife will reduce potential impacts to wildlife to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts to the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife nurseries would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO 6 Nighttime Lighting. All lighting constructed for the Project shall be directed away from native habitats and shall be shielded from spilling onto adjacent areas.

MM BIO 9 Lighting, Fencing, and No Rodenticide

- a. Any lighting constructed for the project should be directed away from native habitats and should be shielded from spilling onto adjacent areas.
- b. Due to the location of the project site, it is recommended that any fencing used during and after the project be constructed with materials that are not harmful to wildlife. Prohibited materials should include, but are not limited to, spikes, glass, razor, or barbed wire. Use of chain link and steel stake fence should be avoided or minimized as this type of fencing can injure wildlife or create barriers to wildlife dispersal. All hollow posts and pipes should be capped to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. These structures mimic the natural cavities preferred by various bird species and other wildlife for shelter, nesting, and roosting.

Raptor's talons can become entrapped within the bolt holes of metal fence stakes resulting in mortality. Metal fence stakes used on the project site should be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to avoid this hazard. A qualified biologist should move any wildlife out of harm's way so that no wildlife is enclosed inside any work zone or otherwise impacted by fence installation. The City should install the fence in a manner that excludes any wildlife from entering the work zone (i.e., embedded fence such that wildlife cannot enter from under the fence). Fences should not have any slack that may cause wildlife entanglement.

April 2021



Source: South Environmental, July 2019.

Figure 17 Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Area No. 18, San Dimas Canyon/San Antonio Wash

- c. The project should use permeable fencing such as that recommended by the <u>CDFW.²²</u>
- d. Rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides be prohibited during and after the project. The City should provide property owners and residents with pertinent context, research, and data to inform property owners why rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides area prohibited due to their harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife.
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy/ordinance? Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

As detailed above, the Project Site does not contain any wetlands or special status plants; however, the Site contains three drainages under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and six plant communities which provide habitat to special status animals, including the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher. Furthermore, tThe Project Site is located within Los Angeles County SEA No. 18 (San Dimas Canyon/San Antonio Wash) and is adjacent to the southeast of the Sugarloaf Mountain/Keller Peak – San Gabriel/Cucamonga connection, both of which provide important regional wildlife linkage. The Project would require the mitigation measures identified above to reduce impacts to these features and conflicts with policies and/or implementation measures identified in the City's General Plan Resource Management Element for the purposes of protecting biological resources to less than significant levels.

In addition to the biological resources detailed above, the Project Site contains numerous trees. The City has adopted Ordinance No. 999 Preservation, Protection, and Removal of Trees (Municipal Code Chapter 18.78), which establishes regulations regarding tree preservation, protection and the removal of trees. The purpose of this ordinance is to "protect certain trees in order to preserve cultural heritage, maintain and enhance the scenic beauty of the city, improve air quality, abate soil and slope erosion, preserve and enhance property values, and thereby promote public health, safety and welfare." The tree ordinance only applies to "Significant" trees and "Heritage" trees.

A Tree Report (refer to *Appendix B.2*) inventoried all of the trees that could potentially be affected by the Project. There are no Heritage trees located on or adjacent to the Project Site, however, there are 119 Significant trees located on and 1 Significant tree located adjacent to the Project Site. Significant trees include 89 coast live oaks, 24 California sycamores, 6 scrub oak trees, and 1 Southern California black walnut. As discussed in the Tree Report and shown in **Figure 18**, **Significant Tree Locations** (also shown in Exhibits 3 and 4 of *Appendix B.2*), the majority of the significant trees are located within the Project Site's drainages. Eleven of these trees (Tree Nos. 9, 28, 30, 42, 92, 105, 106, 111, 114, 117, and 118, which include 7 California Sycamores and 4 coast live oaks) have died and would be removed as part of site preparation prior to construction.²³ Significant impacts to Significant trees could occur should

²² <u>Https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FlleHandler.ashx?DocumentID=134713&inline</u>

²³ Significant Tree Report, Venting Tentative Tract Map No. 082001, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne, City of La Verne, Exhibits 3 and 4, pages 15 and 16, Carlberg Associates, August 2, 2018 (Appendix B.2)

these trees not actually be dead or if the incorrect trees are removed. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-7<u>10</u>**, **Dead Tree Removal**, below, requires that trees identified as dead are verified as dead and properly marked and their removal monitored. In addition to the dead trees, four additional Significant coast live oak trees (Tree Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49) would be removed as part of grading and development of the Project. These trees and are located within the debris basin facility. The removal of Significant trees is considered a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-8<u>11</u>**, **Significant Tree Removal**, below, requires that adequate replacement and monitoring of these Significant trees to be removed.

The remaining 85 Significant trees would be subject to protective measures detailed in Section 18.78.160 of the City Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant would be required to prepare and submit detailed construction plans prepared in conformance with applicable standards of the City. Construction plans would be subject to review by the City to ensure protection of Significant trees on site pursuant to Section 18.60.030 of the City Municipal Code. Compliance with the applicable policies of the City Municipal Code protecting Significant trees is codified in standard condition **SC BIO-1**. Therefore, Project impacts **would be less than significant with the standard condition**.

Standard Condition

The following Standard Condition (Section 18.78.160 of the City Municipal Code) is a regulatory requirement implemented as a routine action conditioned by the City to reduce impacts related to protected trees.

- **SC BIO-1** Any Significant trees that would not be removed by the Project, shall be subject to preservation and protective measures, to include (but not be limited to):
 - No grading, construction, or construction-related activities shall occur within the safety zone (i.e., the area within the dripline of a tree and extending therefrom either to a point of at least five feet outside the dripline or to a point 15 feet from the trunk, whichever distance is greater) of a significant tree as defined by Chapter 18.78 (Preservation, Protection, and Removal of Trees) of the La Verne Municipal Code, including, but not limited to, storage of materials, grade changes, or attachment of wires to or around tree trunks, stems, or limbs.
 - No structure shall be located within the safety zone or within a six-foot radius of the trunk perimeter, whichever is greater, of any significant tree. A tree with a caliper of 30 inches or more shall require additional space as determined by the city landscape architectural consultant or parks director.
 - Significant trees shall be shielded from damage during construction by chain link and steel stake fence enclosing the entire safety zone area. All exposed roots shall be inside the fence barrier, which shall have a minimum height of four feet measured from grade. In all cases where a fence barrier is to be used around a protected tree, the fence barrier shall be installed prior to commencement of any development on the site and shall remain in place throughout the construction period.



LEGEND



NOTE: 1. "SAFETY ZONE" OF A SIGNIFICANT TREE EXTENDS 5' FROM THE DRIPLINE OUTWARD, OR A MINIMUM OF 15' FROM THE TRUNK, WHICHEVER DISTANCE IS GREATER

Source: Carlberg Associates, August 2018.

• Branches that could be injured by vehicles or that interfere with construction shall be pruned to the satisfaction of the city landscape architectural consultant or designee.

This standard condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Director or designee.

Construction activities would encroach on the canopies and root zones of 20 Significant trees (Tree Nos. 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 44 and 45, which include 17 coast live oaks, 2 California sycamores, and 1 scrub oak). Encroachment can result in root severance, soil compaction, changes in existing grade, and alteration of the water table/drainage, all of which can have detrimental effects on the health or structure of the tree. Therefore, the Project would conflict with provisions of Section 18.78.160 of the City Municipal Code protecting Significant trees. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-9<u>12</u>**, **Significant Tree Protection**, below, is required.

During operation of the Project, maintenance of the debris basin and fuel modification activities associated with fire protection requirements could result in changes to the existing grade, alteration of the water table/site drainage, and pruning of Significant tree canopies within 200 feet of proposed residences (Tree Nos. 5, 10, 19, 22, 27, 31, 44, and 45), all of which can have detrimental effects on the health or structure of the tree. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-1013**, **Maintenance and Fuel Modification Procedures**, below, is required.

Following implementation of mitigation measure MM BIO-7<u>10</u>, potential construction-related impacts that would occur during the removal of dead trees would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-8<u>11</u>, potential construction-related impacts that would occur as a result of the removal of Significant trees would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-9<u>12</u>, potential construction-related impacts that would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-9<u>12</u>, potential construction-related impacts that would occur as a result of encroachment on Significant trees would be reduced to less than significant levels. Following implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-10<u>13</u>, potential operational impacts that would occur as a result of on-going maintenance and fuel modification activities would be reduced to less than significant levels. Accordingly, impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO 7<u>10</u> Dead Tree Removal. Prior to the issuance of a demolition or grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a certified arborist to verify and mark as dead, all trees identified as dead by the Tree Report (Tree Nos. 9, 28, 30, 42, 92, 105, 106, 111, 114, 117, and 118). Documentation of the verification and marking shall be provided to the Applicant, the construction contractor, and the City Community Development Department. Removal of the dead trees shall be monitored by the arborist.

- **MM BIO 811 Significant Tree Removal**. Prior to the issuance of a demolition or grading permit, the Project shall obtain a Tree Removal Permit from the City of La Verne for the four Significant trees to be removed (Tree Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49). The trees to be removed shall be replaced at a ratio of 4:1, for a minimum of 16 replacement trees. Replacement trees shall be of a species determined by the Community Development Director and shall include a minimum of four 24-inch box trees and twelve 48-inch box trees. The replacement trees shall be included on landscape and irrigation plans for the Project, shall be planted in the natural areas of the Site, and shall be inrigated as required for establishment. The replacement trees shall be monitored in accordance with the policies outlined in the Tree Removal Permit, with a minimum of three years of quarterly monitoring.
- **MM BIO 912** Significant Tree Protection. Prior to the start of construction, the certified arborist shall determine that Tree Safety Zone for all Significant trees that the Project would encroached upon (Tree Nos. 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 44 and 45). Five-foot high chain link fencing shall be installed as protective fencing around the Tree Safety Zone. A Tree Protection Plan showing the proposed location of protective fencing shall be prepared for the review and approval by the Community Development Director prior to the issuance of a demolition, grubbing, or grading permit. Postholes for protective fencing shall be dug by hand to allow for avoidance of significant roots that may be encountered. If significant roots, as determined by the certified arborist, are encountered, the post hole shall be moved to avoid root severance. All protective fencing shall be verified by the Community Development Department prior to commencement of construction work and shall remain in place until the Community Development Department approves its removal. A warning sign of a minimum size of 8.5 x 11 inches clearly stating "Tree Safety Zone; This Fence Shall Not Be Removed" shall be prominently displayed on each protective fencing enclosure. All grubbing, demolition, digging, excavating, filling, grading, construction, or trenching within the Tree Safety Zone of Significant trees shall be monitored by the certified arborist. Equipment, materials, and vehicles shall not be stored, parked, or operated within the Tree Safety Zone of any Significant tree. Equipment with overhead exhaust shall not be paced in such a manner as to scorch overhanging branches or foliage. Alternative equipment may be required in such areas as deemed necessary by the certified arborist. Construction monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Community Development Department at appropriate intervals to be determined by those same agencies in the Tree Permit conditions of approval.
- MM BIO-1013 Maintenance and Fuel Modification Procedures. During maintenance of the debris basin, topography and drainage patterns around the Significant trees shall not be altered in a manner that causes water to pond around the base of the trees. If canopy pruning of Significant trees within 200 feet of the proposed

residences (Tree Nos. 5, 10, 19, 22, 27, 31, 44, and 45) is to be undertaken in accordance with fuel modification requirements, pruning shall be conducted between the most dormant months of July through September. Pruning shall be performed by a qualified ISA-Certified Arborist or ISA-Certified Tree Worker and in compliance with current ISA Pruning Guidelines, best management practices, and American National Standards Institute pruning standards. Leaf litter shall be allowed to accumulate naturally within the protected zone of all Significant trees.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? Less than Significant Impact. As detailed section IV.(d), the Project Site is located entirely within SEA No. 18 (San Dimas Canyon/San Antonio Wash), which is protected under the Los Angeles Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance. The Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance Implementation Guide outlines guidelines for developments within designated SEAs including minimum buffer distances between habitats and development. However, the Project proposes an annexation of the Project to the City, which does not have a Significant Ecological Areas ordinance or restrictions such as those outlined in the Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance Implementation Guide. The Resource Management Element of the City's General Plan contains the following policies with regard to habitat conservation:
 - **Policy 4.2** Protect and preserve our native plant communities and habitats.
 - **Policy 4.3** Protect and preserve our Southern Mixed Chaparral and Coastal Sage Scrub communities.
 - **Policy 4.4** Protect and preserve our Southern Oak Riparian Woodlands.
 - **Policy 4.5** Protect and preserve our other Riparian Habitats.
 - **Policy 4.6** Protect and preserve our Ruderal-Disturbed habitats.

As detailed in section *IV.(a) (Biological Resources)* above, the Project would directly impact a total of 8.47 acres of plant communities, including scrub, <u>riparian</u> oak forest, and disturbed communities. In addition, as detailed under section *IV.(b) (Biological Resources)* above, the Project would directly impact 706 linear feet of streambed under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Accordingly, the Project would conflict with a local habitat conservation plan. However, as detailed above, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 through Mitigation Measure Bio-10 would mitigate the potential impacts to habitats and species that live, nest, and/or migrate through these habitats. No additional impacts related to conflicts with a local habitat conservation plan, beyond those previously mitigated would occur as a result of the Project. As such, the Project's impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
v .	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA?				\boxtimes
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA?		\boxtimes		
C.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\square	

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA? **No Impact.**

A significant impact may occur if a project would adversely affect the significance of a historic resources on or off site. A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.

The Project Site is currently vacant land covered with mostly bare soil, grass, bushes, trees, and other native vegetation. The Project Site was formerly undeveloped as early as 1894, and consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site with an apparent barn or residential structure between 1928 and 1948. The Project Site has been vacant since at least 1972.²⁴ As such, implementation of the Project would not involve historic resources and, thus, not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of ahistorical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA. Accordingly, **no impact** to historical resources would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of CEQA? **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**

A records search for the Project Site was conducted by the South Coast Central Information Center. The search included a review of all recorded archaeological and built-environment resources as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest (SPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (SHL), the California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California State Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) listings were reviewed for the Project Site and a ¼-mile radius. The records search found that there are no points of historical interest, landmarks, registered historical resources, or built environmental resources on or near the Project Site. The records search did find 2 recorded archaeological resources

²⁴ Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, page i, Partner Engineering, Inc., February 2020 (Appendix D).

within a ½ mile radius of the Site. The records search found that two studies were previously prepared for the Project Site, including a study in 1979, and that there are no recorded archaeological resources on the Project Site. Due to the age of the previous study, the SCCIC recommended that a new study be prepared for the Project Site. Accordingly, to address this impact, mitigation measure **MM CR-1**, **Archaeological Resources Study** is required. As such, implementation of this measure would be reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

According to the City's General Plan Update Existing Conditions Report, analysis of potential impacts to archaeological resources for the General Plan area included a records search conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).²⁵ The records search, conducted by Cogstone on August 9, 2017, included a review of all recorded cultural resources (historic and prehistoric resources 50 years of age or older) and known cultural resources survey and excavation reports within on-half mile of the City of La Verne corporate boundaries (study area).²⁶ In addition to the SCCIC records search, a variety of other sources were consulted in February and March 2018, which included the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), California Historical Resources Inventory (CHRI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL) and California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI).

Results of the records search indicate that 83 previously recorded cultural resources are located within the study area. Of these 83 resources, seven are prehistoric archaeological sites, one is a prehistoric archaeological isolate, two are multicomponent archaeological sites, one is a historic archaeological site, 69 are historic resource, and two are historic districts. The nearest of the previously recorded prehistoric resources is found 0.35 miles northeast and 0.45 miles west of the Project Site.

Implementation of the Project would include ground disturbing activities, such as grading of the Site for the seven lot single family homes and a debris basin, new road and driveways. As such, the possibility exists that previously unknown archaeological artifacts may be present. To reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources that may be inadvertently discovered during construction, and significant impacts to these resources could occur. Accordingly, to address this impact, mitigation measure **MM CR-2**, **Archaeological Resources** is required. This measure requires avoidance if there is an inadvertent discovery until a significance determination can be made by a qualified archaeologist, and adherence to appropriate measures if the find is determined to be significant under CEQA. As such, implementation of this measure would be reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

²⁵ Existing Conditions Report, Appendix B, Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the City of La Verne General Plan Update, Prepared by Cogstone, City of La Verne, June 2018.

²⁶ The Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project Site is immediately adjacent to the City of La Verne's corporate boundary and is included within the City's Sphere of Influence.

Accordingly, impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

Mitigation Measures

- **MM CR-1 Archaeological Resources Study.** A qualified archaeological consultant shall be retained to survey the property for cultural resources prior to the approval of project plans. The report shall include consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission to identify if any additional traditional cultural properties or other sacred sites are known to be in the area.
- **MM CR-2** Archaeological Resources. In the event that archaeological resources (i.e., sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the Project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a gualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in Public Resources Code §21080.3.2, The archaeologist, the Project Applicant, the City of La Verne's Community Development Director or designee, and interested Native American tribal representative (i.e., those who have expressed an interest in the Project through the Assembly Bill 52 process) shall confer regarding the appropriate disposition of the discovered resource(s). Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the find is determined to be a unique archaeological resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the resource shall be recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines and/or agreed upon disposition of the resource(s).
- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known human remains within the Project Site. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human internment, or burial grounds sites are known to occur within the immediate Project Site area, there is always a possibility that human remains could be encountered during construction. Should human remains be encountered unexpectedly during grading or construction activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during Project construction, compliance with State laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (Public Resources Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials would be required. Therefore, through compliance to existing laws, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.
| | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Potentially
Significant
Unless Mit. | Less than
Significant
Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------|
| VI. ENERGY. Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | | | \boxtimes | |
| b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | | | \boxtimes | |

The following information summarized in this section of the IS/MND is based on *500 East Baseline Road Residential Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* prepared for the Project by Ganddini Group, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The *Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* is provided as *Appendix A* to this IS/MND.

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Information from the CalEEMod 2016.3.2 Daily and Annual Outputs contained in the Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis utilized for air quality and greenhouse gas analyses, were also utilized for this analysis. The CalEEMod outputs detail project related construction equipment, transportation energy demands, and facility energy demands.

Construction Energy Demands

The construction schedule is anticipated to occur between October 2021 and April 2023 and be completed in one phase. Staging of construction vehicles and equipment would occur onsite. The approximately eighteen-month schedule is relatively short and the project site is approximately 15.11 net acres.

Construction Equipment Electricity Usage Estimates

Electrical service would be provided by Southern California Edison. Based on the 2017 National Construction Estimator, the typical power cost per 1,000 square feet of building construction per month is estimated to be \$2.32. The Project plans to develop the site with seven single-family residential dwelling units. The total power cost of the on-site electricity usage during the construction of the Project is estimated to be approximately \$1,479.56.

Construction Equipment Fuel Estimates

Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of Project construction. Fuel consumed by construction equipment was evaluated with the following assumptions:

- Construction schedule of 18 months
- All construction equipment was assumed to run on diesel fuel
- Typical daily use of 8 hours, with some equipment operating from ~7 hours
- Aggregate fuel consumption rate for all equipment was estimated at 18.5 hp-hr/day.
- Diesel fuel would be the responsibility of the equipment operators/contractors and would be sources within the region.
- Project construction represents a "single-event" for diesel fuel demand and would not require on-going or permanent commitment of diesel fuel resources during long term operation.

Using the CalEEMod data input for the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses (Sections 2 and 4 of the Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis), the project's construction phase would consume electricity and fossil fuels as a single energy demand, that is, once construction is completed their use would cease. CARB's 2014 Emissions Factors Tables show that on average aggregate fuel consumption (gasoline and diesel fuel) would be approximately 18.5 hp-hr-gal. Project construction activities would consume an estimated 51,329 gallons of diesel fuel. As stated previously, project construction would represent a "single-event" diesel fuel demand and would not require on-going or permanent commitment of diesel fuel resources for this purpose.

Construction Worker Fuel Estimates

It is assumed that all construction worker trips are from light duty autos (LDA) along area roadways. With respect to estimated VMT, the construction worker trips would generate an estimated 1,016,564 VMT. Data regarding project related construction worker trips were based on CalEEMod 2016.3.2 model defaults.

Vehicle fuel efficiencies for construction workers were estimated in the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses using information generated using CARB's EMFAC model. An aggregate fuel efficiency of 28.57 miles per gallon (mpg) was used to calculate vehicle miles traveled for construction worker trips. An estimated 35,582 gallons of fuel would be consumed for construction worker trips.

Construction Vendor/Hauling Fuel Estimates

Vendor and hauling during building construction and architectural coating would consume fuel. With respect to estimated VMT, the vendor and hauling trips would generate an estimated 175,950 VMT. Data regarding project related construction worker trips were based on CalEEMod 2016.3.2 model defaults.

For the architectural coatings it is assumed that the contractors would be responsible for bringing coatings and equipment with them in their light duty vehicles. Therefore, vendors delivering construction material or hauling debris from the site during grading would use medium to heavy duty vehicles with an average fuel consumption of 8.5 mpg. An estimated 20,700 gallons of fuel would be consumed for vendor and hauling trips.

Construction Energy Efficiency/Conservation Measures

Construction equipment used over the approximately eighteen-month construction phase would conform to CARB regulations and California emissions standards and is evidence of related fuel efficiencies. There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than is used for comparable activities; or equipment that would not conform to current emissions standards (and related fuel efficiencies). Equipment employed in construction of the project would therefore not result in inefficient wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of fuel.

The Project would utilize construction contractors which practice compliance with applicable CARB regulation regarding retrofitting, repowering, or replacement of diesel off-road construction equipment. Additionally, CARB has adopted the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to limit heavy-duty diesel motor vehicle idling in order to reduce public exposure to diesel particulate matter and other Toxic Air Contaminants. Compliance with these measures would result in a more efficient use of construction-related energy and would minimize or eliminate wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. Idling restrictions and the use of newer engines and equipment would result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption.

Additionally, as required by California Code of Regulations Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than five minutes, thereby minimizing or eliminating unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. Enforcement of idling limitations is realized through periodic site inspections conducted by City building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints.

Operational Energy Demands

Energy consumption in support of or related to project operations would include transportation energy demands (energy consumed by employee and patron vehicles accessing the project site) and facilities energy demands (energy consumed by building operations and site maintenance activities).

Transportation Fuel Consumption

Using the CalEEMod output from the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses, it is assumed that an average trip for autos and light trucks was assumed to be 14.7 miles and 3- 4-axle trucks were assumed to travel an average of 8.7 miles. To present a worst-case scenario, it was assumed that vehicles would operate 365 days per year rather than the more likely 253 days (excluding weekends and up to 8 holidays). The estimated annual fuel consumption for all classes of vehicles from autos to heavy-heavy trucks.

The Project would generate 66 trips per day. The vehicle fleet mix was used from the CalEEMod output. An estimated 18,230 gallons of fuel would be consumed per year for the operation of the proposed project.

Facility Energy Demands (Electricity and Natural Gas)

Building operation and site maintenance (including landscape maintenance) would result in the consumption of electricity (provided by Southern California Edison) and natural gas (provided by Southern California Gas Company). The annual natural gas and electricity demands were provided per the CalEEMod output from the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses.

Energy use in buildings is divided into energy consumed by the built environment and energy consumed by uses that are independent of the construction of the building such as in plug-in appliances. In California, the California Building Standards Code Title 24 governs energy consumed by the built environment, mechanical systems, and some types of fixed lighting. Non-building energy use, or "plug-in" energy use can be further subdivided by specific end-use (refrigeration, cooking, appliances, etc.).

Conclusion

As supported by the preceding analyses, Project construction and operations would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. Further, the energy demands of the Project can be accommodated within the context of available resources and energy delivery systems. The Project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. The Project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservations goals within the State of California. Notwithstanding, the Project proposes residential uses and will not have any long-term effects on an energy provider's future energy development or future energy conservation strategies. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? Less than Significant Impact.

Regarding federal transportation regulations, the project site is located in an already developed area. Access to/from the project site is from existing roads. These roads are already in place so the project would not interfere with, nor otherwise obstruct intermodal transportation plans or projects that may be proposed pursuant to the ISTEA because SCAG is not planning for intermodal facilities in the project area.

Regarding the State's Energy Plan and compliance with Title 24 CCR energy efficiency standards, the applicant is required to comply with the California Green Building Standard Code requirements for energy efficient buildings and appliances as well as utility energy efficiency programs implemented by Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company. Regarding Pavley (AB 1493) regulations, an individual project does not have the ability to comply or conflict with these regulations because they are intended for agencies and their adoption of procedures and protocols for reporting and certifying GHG emission reductions from mobile sources.

Regarding the State's Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards, the project would be required to meet or exceed the energy standards established in the California Green Building Standards Code, Title 24, Part 11 (CALGreen). CalGreen Standards require that new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. As discussed in VIII.(b) below, the proposed project is consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan measures. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency regarding petroleum-based fuel. Accordingly, impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a.	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, 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, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)? 				
	(ii) strong seismic ground shaking?			\boxtimes	
	(iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes	
	(iv) landslides?			\bowtie	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				\boxtimes	
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			\boxtimes	
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the 1994 UBC, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			\boxtimes	
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				\boxtimes
f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		\boxtimes		

The following information utilized in this section of the Initial Study is based, in part, on the *Report* of Geotechnical Due Diligence Investigation, Proposed New Residential Development, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne Area, County of Los Angeles, California ("Geotech Report") prepared for the Project by Associated Soils Engineering, Inc., on December 8, 2014, and the Vertebrate

Paleontological Records Check for paleontological resources for the proposed Baseline Road SFR and Annex Project in the City of Laverne, Los Angeles County, project area, prepared for the Project by Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, February 24, 2020. These reports are incorporated by reference. These documents are provided as *Appendix C.1* and *Appendix C.2* to this IS/MND, respectively.

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - *i)* Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. Less Than Significant Impact.

The California Geological Survey (CGS) designates the zones extending approximately 200 to 500 feet from known active faults as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. The Project Site is not located in a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.²⁷ Nor is the Project within an area of regional faults recommended for further study. The principle source of seismic activity is movement along the northwest-trending regional faults such as the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Newport-Inglewood, and Whittier-Elsinore fault zones.²⁸ Accordingly, impacts from fault rupture would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? Less Than Significant Impact.

A project would normally have a significant geologic hazard impact if it would cause or accelerate geologic hazards which would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure or expose people to substantial risk of injury. For the purpose of this issue, a significant impact may occur if a project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to seismically-induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with locations in the Southern California region.

Southern California is a seismically active region likely to experience, on average, one earthquake of Magnitude 7.0, and 10 earthquakes of Magnitude 6.0 over a period of 10 years. Active faults are those faults that are considered likely to undergo renewed movement within a period of concern to humans. These include faults that are currently slipping, those that display earthquake activity, and those that have historical surface rupture. CGS defines active faults as those which have had surface displacement within Holocene times (about the last 11,000 years). Such displacement can be recognized by the existence of sharp cliffs in young alluvium, un-weathered terraces, and offset modern

 ²⁷ Report of Geotechnical Due Diligence Investigation, Proposed New Residential Development, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne Area, County of Los Angeles, California, Associated Soils Engineering, page 5. (Appendix C.1).

²⁸ Ibid., page 4. (Appendix C.1)

stream courses. Potentially active faults are those believed to have generated earthquakes during the Quaternary period, but prior to Holocene times.

Several active and potentially active fault zones could affect the Project Site. The principle source of seismic activity is movement along the northwest-trending regional faults such as the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Newport-Inglewood, and Whittier-Elsinore fault zones. The Project would be designed and constructed in conformance with the California Building Code (CBC) and locally adopted seismic-design-related measures. Further, the Project would be required to implement all design and construction recommendations in the final geotechnical evaluation prepared for the Project. Conformance with standard engineering practices and design criteria would reduce the effects of seismic ground shaking to **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Less Than Significant Impact.

Liquefaction is the loss of strength of cohesionless soils when the pore water pressure in the soil becomes equal to the confining pressure. Liquefaction generally occurs as a "quicksand" type of ground failure caused by strong ground shaking. The primary factors influencing liquefaction potential include groundwater, soil type, relative density of the sandy soils, confining pressure, and the intensity and duration of ground shaking. The Project Site is not within an area identified by CGS as having a potential for soil liquefaction when subject to a seismic event resembling the maximum probably earthquake.²⁹ Additionally, the Project Site is underlain by alluvial soils over hard bedrock and the historic high groundwater in the vicinity is greater than 150 feet, thus, the potential for liquefaction at the Project Site is very low.³⁰ Accordingly, impacts related to liquefaction would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

iv) Landslides? Less Than Significant Impact.

Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil, and deeper rotational or transitional movement of soil or rock. The natural slopes surrounding the proposed lots ascend to the north and east into the surrounding hills. The natural slopes consist of varying thickness of slopewash overlaying weathered bedrock, over massive, very hard quartz diorite bedrock. The Project Site is not within an area identified by CGS as having a potential for earthquake-induced landslides.³¹ There is no indication that recent landslides or unstable slope conditions exist on or adjacent to the Project Site that would otherwise result in an obvious landslide hazard to the proposed development or adjacent properties, and as such, the potential for earthquake-induced landslides in the future is considered low.³² Further, design parameters established by the most recent CBC would reduce any potential impacts.

²⁹ Ibid., page 7 (Appendix C.1).

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

Therefore, the Project impacts to landslides would be **less than signific**ant and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Less Than Significant Impact.

The contractor would be required to comply with standard engineering practices for erosion control. Further, the construction contractor would be required to implement standard dust control measures and construction site stormwater runoff control measures including the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (see 14.10, Hydrology and Water Quality). Conformance with such standards would reduce the potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil from the Project Site during the grading and construction phase.

Preparation of an erosion and sediment control plan would be required for the City's review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. The plan would outline methods to be implemented to control erosion from graded or cleared portions of the Project Site, including but not limited to use of straw bales, sandbags, soil binders, diversion fences, and/or desilting basins. The plan must be prepared in accordance with the City's grading ordinance, the City's water quality ordinance, and the latest National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and to the satisfaction of the City Water Quality Engineer. Project conformance with standard engineering practices, CBC requirements, and local engineering design regulations would ensure that Project impacts remain **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Less Than Significant Impact.

Please refer to sections *VII.(iii) (Geology/Soils) and VII.(iv) (Geology/Soils)* above for a discussion of potential impacts related to liquefaction and landslide, respectively. As detailed, impacts would be less than significant.

Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which large blocks of intact, non-liquefied soil move downslope on a liquefied soil layer. Lateral spreading is often a regional event. For lateral spreading to occur, a liquefiable soil zone must be laterally continuous and unconstrained to move along sloping ground. Due to the negligible potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading is not anticipated to have the potential to occur on-site. Therefore, Project impacts to lateral spreading would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Land subsidence is a gradual settling or sudden sinking of the earth's surface owing to subsurface movement of earth materials. Land subsidence is typically caused by compression of soft, geologically young sediments or activities related to fluid extraction (e.g., groundwater, petroleum, or natural gas). No water or oil extractions or similar practices that are typically associated with subsidence effects would occur under the Project. The Project Site is underlain by alluvial soils over hard dioritic bedrock and no soft compressible sediment that would be susceptible to subsidence was encountered during preparation of the Geotech Report. In addition, surface materials that are disrupted/displaced would be balanced and re-

compacted on-site during Project construction. Therefore, Project impacts to land subsidence would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Soil collapse occurs when sediment moisture content increases substantially, leading to the densification of the soil, which can lead to structural damage from cracking foundations, walls, and floors. Typical causes of soil collapse include infiltration resulting from poor surface drainage, irrigation water, or leaking pipes into low-density, silty sandy soil in semi-arid and arid climates that are not regularly subjected to saturation. The Project Site is underlain by alluvial soils over hard dioritic bedrock and no low-density sediment that would be susceptible to collapse was encountered during preparation of the Geotech Report. The Project would not be expected to cause or accelerate or exacerbate conditions at the Project Site related to soil collapse. Therefore, Project impacts to soil collapse would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Less Than Significant Impact.

Expansive soils generally result from specific clay minerals that expand when saturated and shrink when dry. Laboratory testing of representative on-site soil samples indicates a very low soil expansion potential.³³ Further, adherence to standard engineering practices contained within the most recent UBC would further reduce any risks. Therefore, impacts resulting from exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects of expansive soil would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? No Impact.

The Project does not include the implementation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project would be served by the existing public wastewater system. As such, **no impact** related to septic tanks would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

g) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**.

A significant impact could occur if grading or excavation activities associated with a project would disturb paleontological resources or unique geologic features which presently exist within a project site. Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of organisms from prehistoric environments found in geologic strata. These resources are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. These resources are found in geologic strata conducive to their preservation, typically sedimentary formations. Paleontological sites are those areas that show evidence of pre-human activity. Often, they are simply small outcroppings visible on the surface or sites encountered during

Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration

³³ *Ibid., page 11.*

grading. While the sites are important indications, it is the geologic formations that are the most important since they may contain important fossils. Potentially sensitive areas for the presence of paleontological resources are based on the underlying geologic formation. The potential for fossil occurrence depends on the rock type exposed at the surface in a given area.

Bedrock in the elevated terrain occupying most of the Project Site is composed of intrusive igneous rocks that do not contain recognizable vertebrate fossils. In the less elevated terrain in the southwestern portion of the Project Site surficial material consists of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the elevated terrain adjacent to the northeast. These younger Quaternary deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers, especially being relatively coarse so close to the source area but they may be underlain by older and possibly finer-grained deposits that do contain significant fossil vertebrate remains. Additionally, the closest vertebrate fossil locality in similar deposits is approximately 6.9 miles south-southeast of the Project Site near the intersection of the Pomona Freeway (State Route 60) and Chino Valley Freeway (State Route 71), which produced a specimen of bison.³⁴

Excavations in the igneous bedrock exposed in the elevated terrain of most of the Project Site would not uncover any recognizable vertebrate fossils. Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed in the southwestern portion of the Project Site (i.e., where the proposed lots would be concentrated) would not encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper excavations in those latter areas that extend down into older and possibly finer-grained Quaternary deposits, however, may uncover significant vertebrate fossils.³⁵ To reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources that may be inadvertently discovered during construction, mitigation measure **MM GEO 1** is required. This measure requires avoidance if there is an inadvertent discovery until a significance determination can be made by a qualified paleontologist, and adherence to appropriate measures if the find is determined to be significant under CEQA. Therefore, Project impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure

MM GEO 1: If paleontological resources are exposed during construction activities for the Project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find. The qualified paleontologist shall also monitor the remaining ground-disturbing activities. Depending upon the significance of the find, the paleontologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the find is determined to be a unique paleontological resource, then a mitigation program shall be developed and implemented in accordance with the provisions

³⁴ Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check, Vertebrate Paleontology Section, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, February 24, 2020. (Appendix C.2).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mit. Less than Significant Impact Impact ŝ VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or a. indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the \bowtie environment? Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted b. for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse \bowtie gases?

of CEQA as well as the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995).

The following information summarized in this section of the IS/MND is based on *500 East Baseline Road Residential Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* prepared for the Project by Ganddini Group, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The *Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* is provided as *Appendix A* to this IS/MND.

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is anticipated to generate GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, mobile sources, waste, water, and construction equipment. CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 was used to calculate the GHG emissions from the proposed project. The CalEEMod Annual Output for year 2023 is available in Appendix C of the Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis.

Background

The proposed project is anticipated to generate GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, mobile sources, waste, water, and construction equipment. Area sources include emissions from consumer products, landscape equipment and architectural coatings. Energy usage includes emissions from the generation of electricity and natural gas used on-site. Mobile sources include emissions from the additional vehicle miles generated from the proposed project. Waste includes the GHG emissions generated from the processing of waste from the proposed project as well as the GHG emissions from the waste once it is interred into a landfill. Water includes the water used for the interior of the building as well as for landscaping and is based on the GHG emissions associated with the energy used to transport and filter the water. The construction-related GHG emissions were also included in the analysis and were based on a 30 year amortization rate as recommended in the SCAQMD GHG Working Group meeting on November 19, 2009. Details on these sources and analysis methodology can be found in Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis.

Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Table 7, Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions, shows that the total for the Project's GHG emissions would be 167.66 MTCO2e per year. According to the thresholds of significance established above, a cumulative global climate change impact would occur if the GHG emissions created from the on-going operations of the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e per year for all land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the draft screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e per year for all land uses and operation of the proposed project would not create a significant cumulative impact to global climate change. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 7 Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions							
Category Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons/Year)							
	Bio-CO ² NonBio- CO ₂ CO ₂ CH ₄ N ₂ O (
Area Sources ¹	0.00	1.63	1.63	0.00	0.00	1.64	
Energy Usage ²	0.00	28.57	28.57	0.00	0.00	28.70	
Mobile Sources ³	0.00	92.65	92.65	0.00	0.00	92.77	
Waste ⁴	1.66	0.00	1.66	0.10	0.00	4.12	
Water ⁵	0.14	2.91	3.05	0.02	0.00	3.54	
Construction ⁶	0.00	36.76	36.76	0.01	0.00	36.89	
Total Emissions	1.81	162.53	164.34	0.12	0.00	167.66	
SCAQMD Draft Screening Threshold					3,000		
Exceeds Threshold?				No			
Notes:	Notes:						

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

(2) Energy usage consist of GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas usage.

(3) Mobile sources consist of GHG emissions from vehicles.

(4) Solid waste includes the CO2 and CH4 emissions created from the solid waste placed in landfills.

(5) Water includes GHG emissions from electricity used for transport of water and processing of wastewater.

(6) Construction GHG emissions CO2e based on a 30-year amortization rate.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 for Opening Year 2023

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? **Less Than Significant Impact**.

The Project would have the potential to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The City of La Verne does not currently have a Climate Action Plan; therefore, the Project has been compared to the goals of the CARB Scoping Plan.

Scoping Plan

Emission reductions in California alone would not be able to stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere. However, California's actions set an example

and drive progress towards a reduction in greenhouse gases elsewhere. If other states and countries were to follow California's emission reduction targets, this could avoid medium or higher ranges of global temperature increases. Thus, severe consequences of climate change could also be avoided.

The ARB Board approved a Climate Change Scoping Plan in December 2008. The Scoping Plan outlines the State's strategy to achieve the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions limit. The Scoping Plan "proposes a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions in California, improve our environment, reduce our dependence on oil, diversify our energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health" (California Air Resources Board 2008). The measures in the Scoping Plan have been in place since 2012.

This Scoping Plan calls for an "ambitious but achievable" reduction in California's greenhouse gas emissions, cutting approximately 30 percent from business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2020, or about 10 percent from today's levels. On a per-capita basis, that means reducing annual emissions of 14 tons of carbon dioxide for every man, woman and child in California down to about 10 tons per person by 2020.

In May 2014, CARB released its First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (CARB 2014). This Update identifies the next steps for California's leadership on climate change. While California continues on its path to meet the near-term 2020 greenhouse gas limit, it must also set a clear path toward long-term, deep GHG emission reductions. This report highlights California's success to date in reducing its GHG emissions and lays the foundation for establishing a broad framework for continued emission reductions beyond 2020, on the path to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

In November 2017, CARB release the 2017 Scoping Plan. This Scoping Plan incorporates, coordinates, and leverages many existing and ongoing efforts and identifies new policies and actions to accomplish the State's climate goals, and includes a description of a suite of specific actions to meet the State's 2030 GHG limit. In addition, Chapter 4 provides a broader description of the many actions and proposals being explored across the sectors, including the natural resources sector, to achieve the State's mid and long-term climate goals.

Guided by legislative direction, the actions identified in the 2017 Scoping Plan reduce overall GHG emissions in California and deliver policy signals that will continue to drive investment and certainty in a low carbon economy. The 2017 Scoping Plan builds upon the successful framework established by the Initial Scoping Plan and First Update, while identifying new, technologically feasible, and cost-effective strategies to ensure that California meets its GHG reduction targets in a way that promotes and rewards innovation, continues to foster economic growth, and delivers improvements to the environment and public health, including in disadvantaged communities. The Plan includes policies to require direct GHG reductions at some of the State's largest stationary sources and mobile sources. These policies include the use of lower GHG fuels, efficiency regulations, and the Cap-and Trade Program, which constrains and reduces emissions at covered sources.

As the latest, 2017 Scoping Plan builds upon previous versions, project consistency with applicable strategies of both the 2008 and 2017 Plan are assessed in **Table 8**, **Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures**. As shown in Table 8, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and would result in a less than significant impact.

2008 Scoping Plan Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Measure
California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards – Implement adopted standards and planned second phase of the program. Align zero- emission vehicle, alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology programs with long-term climate change goals.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Energy Efficiency – Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards; pursue additional efficiency including new technologies, policy, and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California.	Consistent. The proposed project will be compliant with the current Title 24 standards.
Low Carbon Fuel Standard – Develop and adopt the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Vehicle Efficiency Measures – Implement light-duty vehicle efficiency measures.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicles – Adopt medium and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency measures.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Green Building Strategy – Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings.	Consistent. The California Green Building Standards Code (proposed Part 11, Title 24) was adopted as part of the California Building Standards Code in the CCR. Part 11 establishes voluntary standards, that are mandatory in the 2019 edition of the Code, on planning and design for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants. The proposed project will be subject to these mandatory standards.
High Global Warming Potential Gases – Adopt measures to reduce high global warming potential gases.	Consistent. CARB identified five measures that reduce HFC emissions from vehicular and commercial refrigeration systems; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the measures) will comply with the strategy.

 Table 8

 Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures¹

2008 Scoping Plan Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Measure
Recycling and Waste – Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting, and commercial recycling. Move toward zero-waste.	Consistent. The state is currently developing a regulation to reduce methane emissions from municipal solid waste landfills. The proposed project will be required to comply with City programs, such as City's recycling and waste reduction program, which comply, with the 75 percent reduction required by 2020 per AB 341.
Water – Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.	Consistent. The proposed project will comply with all applicable City ordinances and CAL Green requirements.
2017 Scoping Plan Recommended Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Recommended Action
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Further increase GHG stringency on all light-duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean Car regulations.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: At least 1.5 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2025 and at least 4.2 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2030.	Consistent . These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Innovative Clean Transit: Transition to a suite of to-be- determined innovative clean transit options. Assumed 20 percent of new urban buses purchased beginning in 2018 will be zero emission buses with the penetration of zero-emission technology ramped up to 100 percent of new sales in 2030. Also, new natural gas buses, starting in 2018, and diesel buses, starting in 2020, meet the optional heavy- duty low-NOX standard.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Last Mile Delivery: New regulation that would result in the use of low NOX or cleaner engines and the deployment of increasing numbers of zero-emission trucks primarily for class 3-7 last mile delivery trucks in California. This measure assumes ZEVs comprise 2.5 percent of new Class 3–7 truck sales in local fleets starting in 2020, increasing to 10 percent in 2025 and remaining flat through 2030.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the proposed project (that are required to comply with the standards) will comply with the strategy.
Implement SB 350 by 2030: Establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction that will achieve a cumulative doubling of statewide energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas end uses by 2030.	Consistent. The proposed project will be compliant with the current Title 24 standards.
By 2019, develop regulations and programs to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383. Source: CARB Scoping Plan (2008 and 2017)	Consistent. The proposed project will be required to comply with City programs, such as City's recycling and waste reduction program, which comply, with the 75 percent reduction required by 2020 per AB 341.

	Table 8	
Project Consistency	y with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and	Measures ¹

The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Furthermore, the project would also comply with applicable Green Building Standards and City of La Verne's policies regarding sustainability (as dictated by the City's General Plan). Therefore, Project impacts to applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			\boxtimes	
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			\boxtimes	
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			\boxtimes	
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				\boxtimes
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes
f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			\square	

The following information utilized in this section of the Initial Study is based, in part, on the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 500 West Baseline Road, La Verne, California 91711* ("Site Assessment") prepared for the Project by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., on February 18, 2020, which is hereby incorporated by reference. This document is provided as *Appendix D* to this IS/MND.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Construction

Potentially hazardous materials such as fuel, paint products, lubricants, solvents, and cleaning products may be used and/or stored on site during construction of the Project. These materials are typical of materials delivered to construction sites. Due to the relatively small scale of proposed development under the Project (seven residential lots), only limited quantities of these materials are expected to be used during construction and, accordingly, they would not be considered hazardous to the public at large. Furthermore, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during construction is regulated by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the City of La Verne Fire Department, and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Best management practices (BMPs) for the proper handling, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be required in accordance with regulatory requirements and manufacturer recommendations (see section X. Hydrology and Water Quality, below). Additionally, the United States Department of Transportation Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials by truck and rail on State highways and rail lines, as described in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and implemented by Title 13 of the CCR. Therefore, Project impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operation

During Project operations, limited amounts of hazardous material would also be used for routine maintenance that are typical of residential land uses (e.g., paints, cleaning products, landscaping chemicals, heating/cooling system chemicals, etc.). These materials would be substantially similar to household chemicals and solvents already in general and wide use throughout the City and in the vicinity of the Project Site. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of any such hazardous substances would not be considered significant due to the anticipated small volume and/or low concentration of hazardous materials. Furthermore. as is the case during construction, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during project occupation will be regulated by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the City Fire Department, and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Additionally, transport of hazardous materials by truck and rail on State highways and rail lines will be regulated by the United States Department of Transportation Office of Hazardous Materials Safety as described above. These regulations inherently safeguard life and property from the hazards of fire/explosion arising from the storage, handling, and use of hazardous substances, materials, and devices, as well as hazardous conditions due to the use or occupancy of buildings. With adherence to regulations pertaining to the handling of hazardous materials, potential exposures of people or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? **Less than Significant Impact.**

As detailed above, adherence to applicable hazardous materials regulations for their use, storage, and disposal, the Project would not be expected to result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction or operation. However, during the short-term period of Project construction, there is the possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances should grading encounter contaminated soil or groundwater beneath the Project Site.

As previously mentioned, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Project Site was prepared (*Appendix D*). The purpose of a Site Assessment is to identify environmental conditions that would indicate the potential existence of contaminated soil, groundwater, or vapor in connection with the Project Site. The southern and southwestern portions of the Project Site were historically used for agricultural purposes (citrus orchard). There is a potential that agricultural related chemicals such as pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, may have been used and stored onsite. However, the Project Site has not contained agricultural uses for over 50 years and residual chemicals (if any were present) would have degraded with time. Furthermore, no evidence of stressed vegetation that would indicate the presence of residual agricultural chemicals was observed during the reconnaissance. Therefore, the Site Assessment concluded that the previous agricultural use of the Project Site did not represent an environmental concern for the Project.³⁶

Based on a Site reconnaissance as well as research and interviews with representatives of the public, property ownership, site manager, and regulatory agencies, the Site Assessment did not identify any environmental conditions at the Project Site or in the surrounding areas that would indicate contaminated soil, groundwater, or vapor at the Site.³⁷ Accordingly, the presence of contaminated soils or groundwater that could create a hazard to the public or environment if they were released into the environment when encountered during excavation and grading activities is not considered likely. Therefore, Project impacts related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Less Than Significant Impact.

No schools are located within 0.25-mile of the Project Site. The nearest school to the Site is the Lutheran High School (3960 Fruit Street), located approximately 0.45-mile to the southwest. Furthermore, as detailed in section *IX.(a)* (*Hazards and Hazardous Materials*) above, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during construction, operation, and occupation of the proposed residences would be regulated by the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the City Fire Department. The United States Department of Transportation Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe

³⁶ Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 500 West Baseline Road, La Verne, California 91711 ("Site Assessment") prepared for the Project, page 23, Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., February 18, 2020, (Appendix D).

³⁷ Ibid (Appendix D).

transportation of hazardous materials by truck and rail on State highways and rail lines. Therefore, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of a school. As such, Project impacts to an existing or proposed school would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? **No Impact.**

The Site Assessment prepared for the Project Site included a search of federal, state, county, and City environmental databases of hazardous materials sites compiles pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Project Site was not listed on any sites or facilities compiled by these databases. Therefore, **no impact** related to the Project Site's inclusion on lists of hazardous materials site would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? No Impact.

The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport to the Project Site is Brackett Field, a general aviation airport, located approximately 2.4 miles to the southwest. Therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area. Therefore, **no impacts** would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Less than Significant Impact.

The Project Site is located along Baseline Road and 700 feet north of SR 210, both of which are Los Angeles County-designated disaster routes.³⁸ Baseline Road is also an emergency evacuation route as designated by the City.³⁹

Construction and staging would occur entirely within the boundaries of the Project Site and accordingly, no road closures or lane re-routing would be required. Furthermore, the Project Site is currently vacant and no pass-through traffic, including emergency vehicle traffic, that would be affected by construction vehicles occurs. In addition, since first responders already patrol the Project vicinity and surrounding areas, compliance with California Vehicle Code 21806(A)(1), which requires all vehicles to yield to emergency vehicles, would minimize traffic delays and maintain emergency vehicle passage and access.

³⁸ Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Disaster Route Maps, City of La Verne, June 30, 2008, website: https://dpw.lacounty.gov/dsg/DisasterRoutes/map/La%20Verne.pdf.

³⁹ City of La Verne, Community Development Department, General Plan, adopted: December 7, 1998, Map PS-3, Emergency Evacuation Plan.

The Project does not propose any hazardous land uses or off-site improvements that would create elements or conditions that may potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with the adopted emergency response plan. The Project would be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities in accordance with applicable standards governing vehicular access, resulting in the provision of adequate vehicular access that would provide for adequate emergency access and evacuation. Project access and circulation design would be subject to review and approval by the City Fire and Police Departments, City Traffic Engineer, and Public Works Department during the City's precise plan review process. The fire chief may impose additional requirements to ensure protection of life and property, including, but not limited to, additional fire hydrants, increased turnaround ability, increased sprinkler density and coverage, and additional means of access/egress. Through compliance with Section 18.68.030 of the City Municipal Code,⁴⁰ Project impacts related to emergency access would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? Less Than Significant Impact.

The Project Site is current included in the State Responsibility Area,⁴¹ which designates the Site as within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Area.⁴² The Project proposes an annexation of the Site to the City. Accordingly, the fire protection services of Project Site would transfer to the La Verne Fire Department, which calculated the fire potential of the Project Site and vicinity as high.⁴³

Owners of the proposed residences would be required to maintain defensible space per regulation found in the City of La Verne Municipal Code, Chapter 18.68 HDOZ or the California Public Resources Code 4291 as applicable. Guidance for defensible space maintenance such as fuel treatment levels and vegetation management are provided in the City's Community Wildfire Protection Plan. The La Verne Fire Marshal is assigned responsibility for conducting a thorough review of this plan at 5-year intervals. In addition, the residences would contain automatic sprinklers pursuant to California Residential Building Code Section 313. Fire prevention in development within the City is addressed through compliance with state and local building codes. The Department of Community Development enforces compliance with building codes through extensive plan review prior to the issuance of building permits. The

⁴⁰ Pursuant to Section 18.68.030, traffic roadways shall be at least 20 feet wide and passable in all weather. Additionally, dead-end roads shall not exceed 700 feet in length when serving land zoned for residential uses having a density of more than four dwelling units per acre, and shall not end in turnarounds approved by the fire chief to accommodate the needs of fire apparatus.

⁴¹ California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, State Responsibility Area Viewer, available at: https://calfireforestry.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=73510b7d74ee410fbfd9e73725ddad04, accessed April 2020.

⁴² California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA Map, Los Angeles County, adopted: November 7, 2007, available at: <u>https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6705/fhszs_map19.pdf</u>, accessed: April 2020.

⁴³ City of La Verne, Community Wildfire Protection Plan, February 20, 2014, Figure 13: La Verne's Fire Hazard Rating Map.

Project would be required to implement all changes pertaining to fire safety proposed by the City and fire department during plan review. Residences built to modern fire resistant standards can reduce losses due to wildfire.⁴⁴ Accordingly, the Project would comply with current building codes as well as regulations regarding maintenance of defensible space and would not directly or indirectly expose people or structures to significant risk of loss involving wildland fires. Impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Х.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
а.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			\boxtimes	
b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			\boxtimes	
C.	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:				
	(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off- site?			\boxtimes	
	(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?			\boxtimes	
	(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
	(iv)impede or redirect flood flows?			\boxtimes	
d.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			\boxtimes	
e.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			\boxtimes	

The following information utilized in this section of the Initial Study is based, in part, on the *Hydrology Report for Tentative Tract No. 82011, 500 Baseline, Laverne, CA* ("Hydrology Report") prepared for the Project by Land Design Consultants, Inc., on February April 24,

⁴⁴ City of La Verne, Community Wildfire Protection Plan, February 20, 2014, page 24.

2019, which is hereby incorporated by reference. This document is provided as *Appendix E* to this IS/MND.

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Project Site is located within the Upper San Gabriel River Watershed. Only one waterbody within the City, San Jose Creek Reach 2, is listed under the Clean Water Act 303(d) as impaired and/or threatened by coliform bacteria.⁴⁵

Construction

In accordance with the Clean Water Act, construction involving over one acre of ground disturbance would be subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and must implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. The City regulates storm water discharge in accordance with the NPDES permit through Chapter 13.50 (Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control) of the City Municipal Code. The City is a co-permittee under the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) NPDES Permit No. CAS004001, as amended, also known as the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System or MS4 permit. Coverage under the City's MS4 permit includes submittal of a Notice of Intent (NOI) application to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the receipt of a Waste Discharge Identification Number from SWRCB, and the preparation of an SWPPP for construction discharges pursuant to the NPDES.

Clearing and grading activities may disturb vegetation and surface soils, potentially resulting in erosion and sedimentation. If left exposed and with no vegetative cover, soil could be subject to additional wind and water erosion. However, in accordance with the required SWPPP, during grading and construction, the Project would be required to use a series of best management practices to reduce erosion and sedimentation. These measures may include the use of gravel bags, silt fences, hay bales, check dams, hydroseed, and soil binders. The construction contractor would be required to operate and maintain these controls throughout the duration of onsite activities pursuant to City Municipal Code Section 13.50.150. Notification (standard condition **SC HYD-1**) and the creation/implementation of an SWPPP (standard condition **SC HYD-2**) would ensure all impacts related to erosion and sedimentation from demolition, grading, and construction activities would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operation

A Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Management Programs in Los Angeles County (SUSMP) would be required during operation of the Project because it would develop single family hillside residences and is located within an environmentally sensitive area. In accordance with SUSMP requirements, new

⁴⁵ California Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board, Final 2014/2016 California Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List and 305(b) Report) for Impaired Waterbodies.

development is required to meet or exceed pre-Project conditions for storm water discharge. The Project would be required to retain any additional runoff onsite and discharge it into the storm drain system at rates that do not exceed pre-Project conditions. To address potential water contaminants, SUSMPs include best management practices for source control, pollution prevention, site design, low impact development (LID) implementation, and structural treatment control. Various techniques may be implemented to mitigate potential impacts to storm water and groundwater. The City's Municipal Code defines and establishes requirements for the Project best management practices.⁴⁶ The SUSMP must be incorporated by reference or attached to the Project's SWPPP as the Post-Construction Management Plan, as identified in standard condition **SC HYD-3** and, thus, Project impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation would be required.

Standard Conditions

No mitigation is required; however, the following Standard Conditions (SC) are suggestions and subject to the approval by the City Engineer.

- **SC HYD-1** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit and/or grading permit, the project proponent shall file and obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in order to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit for discharge of surface runoff associated with construction activities. Evidence that this has been obtained (i.e., a copy of the Waste Discharger's Identification Number) shall be submitted to the City for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit. The NOI shall address the potential for an extended and discontinuous construction period based on funding availability. This condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Director of the City of La Verne Public Works Department and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.
- **SC HYD-2 SWPPP.** Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit and/or grading, the Project Applicant shall submit to and receive approval from the City of La Verne a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include a surface

⁴⁶ Section 13.50.150 of the City Municipal Code requires that all best management practices required as a condition of any approval for construction activity shall be maintained in full force and effect during the term of the Project, unless otherwise authorized by the authorized enforcement officer, the Community Development Director or designee or Building Official. BMPs are defined in Section 13.60.040 of the Municipal Code as, "... practices or physical devices or systems designed to prevent or reduce pollutant loading from storm water or non-storm water discharges to receiving waters, or designed to reduce the volume of storm water or non-storm water discharged to the receiving water" and in Section 13.50.010 as, "... storm water and urban runoff pollution control practices designed to reduce the pollutants contained in discharges to receiving waters or subsurface groundwaters." Section 13.60.110 of the City Municipal Code further states, "... a maintenance covenant is required for all projects on private property and shall be submitted to the city for review by the city engineer and designee, and if necessary, city attorney. The designers may select any combination of storm water BMPs which meet the performance standards provided in this section and identified in the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit No. R4-2012-0175 and any amendment, revision, or reissuance thereof. A formal maintenance plan shall be included in the maintenance covenant."

water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control onsite and offsite erosion during the entire construction period. In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural best management practices to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the Site. The SWPPP shall include inspection forms for routine monitoring of the Site during both the demolition and construction phases to ensure National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit compliance and that additional best management practices and erosion control measures will be documented in the SWPPP and utilized if necessary. The SWPPP shall address the potential for an extended and discontinuous demolition and construction period based on funding availability. The SWPPP shall be kept on Site for the entire duration of Project construction and shall be available to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) for inspection at any time. Best management practices to be implemented may include the following:

- Sediment discharges from the site may be controlled by the following: sandbags, silt fences, straw wattles and temporary basins (if deemed necessary), and other discharge control devices. The construction and condition of the best management practices shall be periodically inspected during demolition and construction, and repairs shall be made when necessary as required by the SWPPP.
- Materials that have the potential to contribute to non-visible pollutants to storm water shall not be placed in drainage ways and must be contained, elevated, and placed in temporary storage containment areas.
- All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, and other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to eliminate any discharge from the site. Stockpiles shall be surrounded by silt fences and covered with plastic tarps.
- The construction contractor shall be responsible for performing and documenting the application of best management practices identified in the SWPPP. Weekly inspections shall be performed on sandbag barriers and other sediment control measures called for in the SWPPP. Monthly reports and inspection logs shall be maintained by the contractor and reviewed by the City of La Verne and the representatives of the LARWQCB. In the event that it is not feasible to implement specific best management practices, the City of La Verne can determine that other best management practices will provide equivalent or superior treatment either on or off site.

This condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.

SC HYD-3 **SUSMP.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Management Programs in Los Angeles County (SUSMP) to the City of La Verne for review and approval. The Project shall implement project design features identified in the SUSMP. The SUSMP shall demonstrate that the proposed development plan includes best management practices for source control, pollution prevention, site design, low impact development (LID) implementation, and structural treatment control. Best Management Practices shall be designed and implemented to retain the Project Site's minimum design capture volume and hydromodification volume to ensure post-development storm water runoff volume or time of concentration does not exceed predevelopment storm water runoff. Periodic maintenance of any required bioretention basin and landscaped areas during Project occupancy and operation shall be in accordance with the schedule outlined in the SUSMP. This condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.

The Project would include rooftop downspouts that discharge storm water into vegetated swales and other permeable landscaped surfaces. Flows from the proposed residential lots and roadways would be directed into onsite vegetated bioretention areas and biofiltration systems to reduce pollutant loads and ensure post-development runoff volumes do not exceed pre-Project conditions.

Based on the above, implementation of the Project would not preclude City compliance with SWRCB treatment requirements. Pursuant to Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City's Municipal Code, the Project would be required to demonstrate adequate drainage systems, and would be conditioned to comply with applicable NPDES, SWPPP, and SUSMP requirements to ensure that water quality is maintained to federal, state, and local standards. Proper engineering design and construction in conformance with the requirements of the City, the intent of the NPDES Permit for Los Angeles County and the incorporated cities of Los Angeles County (MS4 permit), SWRCB treatment requirements, and Project-specific recommendations outlined in SUSMP are routine actions conditioned by the City. Adherence to Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code, the intent of the NPDES Permit for Los Angeles County and the incorporated cities of Los Angeles Permit for Los Angeles County and the intent of the NPDES Permit for Los Angeles County and the City. Adherence to Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code, the intent of the NPDES Permit for Los Angeles County and the incorporated cities of Los Angeles County (MS4 permit), and NPDES, SWPPP, and SUSMP (i.e., standard conditions **SC HYD-1** through **SC HYD-3**) would ensure impacts related to surface or groundwater quality or waste discharge remain **less than significant** and no mitigation would be required.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? Less Than Significant Impact.

The Project Site is currently outside the corporate boundaries of the City although within its Sphere of Influence.⁴⁷ Though the Project Site is outside the City's corporate boundaries, it's within the City's boundary area for water service.⁴⁸ Implementation of the Project would involve annexation into the City of La Verne. The proposed grading of approximately 5.59 acres (243,130 square feet) for the seven lot subdivision would be served by the City of La Verne's Department of Public Works, Water and Utility Division for water service.

As discussed in section XIX.(b)(Utilities and Service Systems) below, domestic water for the Project Site would be provided by the City of La Verne through a combination of groundwater and imported water. Groundwater is extracted from Six Basins⁴⁹ in accordance with the Six Basins Judgement, which defines adjudication for these basins to ensure safe operating yield and avoidance of groundwater over-extraction. The Six Basins Judgement is overseen by the Six Basins Watermaster. According to the Six Basins Judgement, the City has a right to 7.601 percent of the safe operating yield from the Canyon Basin, Upper Claremont Heights Basin, Lower Claremont Heights Basin, and Pomona Basin and "the right to produce as much groundwater as it may reasonably withdraw from the Two Basins Area on an annual basis so long as it does not substantially injure the rights of any other" parties identified in the Six Basins Judgement."⁵⁰ Imported water is purchased from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District, which pumps groundwater from the Six Basins and is also subject to the safe operating yield requirements of the Six Basins Judgement, and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which does not own or control groundwater basins itself, but collaborates with member agencies and groundwater basin managers within its service area to replenish local groundwater basins and sponsor various groundwater storage programs. including, cyclic storage programs, long-term replenishment storage programs, and contractual conjunctive use programs.

Based on the historic high groundwater level for the general vicinity (150 feet below the ground surface),⁵¹ the Project would not encounter groundwater and, accordingly, would not require temporary dewatering during construction nor permanent dewatering during operation. Furthermore, as discussed above, potable water would be supplied to the Project by the City of La Verne from existing entitlements and direct withdrawals of groundwater would not be required or proposed. The Project would also be required to comply with the water use reduction requirements of CalGreen, such as low-flow fixtures.

With regard to groundwater recharge, the 19.44-acre Project Site is currently entirely pervious and the Project would add approximately 1.67 acres of impervious surfaces in the form of single-family residences, roadways, driveways, and a debris basin. However, the Project Site

⁴⁷ City of La Verne Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Figure 1, Service Area Map, page 13, City of La. Verne, May 2016

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ The Six Basins are comprised of the Ganesha, Live Oak, Pomona, Lower Claremont Heights, Upper Claremont Heights, and Canyon Basin.

⁵⁰ City of La Verne Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, page 34, City of La Verne, May 2016

⁵¹ Report of Geotechnical Due Diligence Investigation, Proposed New Residential Development, 500 Baseline Road, La Verne Area, County of Los Angeles, California, Associated Soils Engineering, page 4. (Appendix C).

is not within a designated groundwater recharge area and the amount of new impervious surface would not exceed 9 percent of the total Site area. Furthermore, as required by SUSMP requirements and Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code and established in Standard Condition HYD-3 above, the Project would be required to implement best management practices that ensure that the volume and rate of stormwater discharge post-development does not exceed pre-development volume and rate. In accordance with these requirements, as detailed in section X.(a)(Hydrology and Water Quality) above, the Project would install vegetated bioretention areas within each lot and biofiltration systems to retain stormwater onsite and allow it to infiltrate.

Based on the above, the Project would not include direct withdrawals of groundwater and would receive potable water from service providers that are required to evaluate and adhere to safe yield withdrawal policies designed to prevent over-extraction of the groundwater basins they withdraw from. In addition, although the Project would increase the amount of impervious surface at the Site, the best management practices required by the Project's SUSMP and Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code would promote the retention and infiltration of stormwater onsite. Accordingly, Project impacts related to groundwater recharge would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction

Construction of the Project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the Site and would disturb vegetated surfaces, potentially exposing onsite soils to erosion and siltation. However, pursuant to standard condition **SC HYD-2** detailed under section X.(a) above, the Project would be required to prepare and receive approval from the City on a SWPPP prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The SWPPP is required to include a surface water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control onsite and offsite erosion during the entire construction period. In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural best management practices to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the Site.

Operation

Surface water flows in the northern portion of the Project Site (Area A) currently drain in a southwesterly direction to a channel along the western property line. Surface flows in the southern portion of the Site (Areas B and C) currently drain to the Caltrans channel along

Baseline Road adjacent to the southern boundary of the Site.⁵² The Project would not alter the drainage pattern of Area A. As part of the development in the southern portion of the Site, the Project would add approximately 1.67 acres of impervious surfaces and direct flow into a debris basin and catch basins which would direct the flows to existing Caltrans storm drains located within Baseline Road. However, as described in section X.(a) above, in accordance with standard condition **SC HYD-3**, the Project's SUSMP would include the installation of LID BMPs to capture and retain stormwater flow onsite and would be required to prevent any increase in stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. The installed BMP systems would consist of vegetated bioretention areas within each lot and biofiltration systems and would be designed with an internal bypass or overflow system, which would have no contact with exposed soils or erodible surfaces that would generate siltation if exposed to surface water runoff.

Although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site and increase the amount off impervious surface, implementation of standard conditions **SC HYD-2** and **SC HYD-3** would reduce the impacts. Therefore, Project impacts related to erosion or siltation would be **less than significant** with implementation of standard conditions **SC HYD-2** and **SC HYD-3** and no mitigation measures would be required.

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? Less Than Significant Impact.

As detailed in section *X*.(*c*)(*i*) (*Hydrology and Water Quality*) above, during construction of the Project, alteration of the existing onsite drainage pattern would occur from site preparation and grading, however, these changes would not result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff that could result in flooding due to stringent controls imposed under the NPDES Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs for the control of runoff pursuant to standard condition **SC HYD-2**.

Additionally, as also discussed in section *X*.(*c*)(*i*) (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site, the Project would be required to comply with the requirements of the NPDES permit and Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code, which result in and require a reduction of the volume of runoff from the Project Site when compared to existing conditions. Surface water flows in the northern portion of the Project Site (Area A) currently drain in a southwesterly direction to a channel along the western property line. Surface flows in the southern portion of the Site (Areas B and C) currently drain to the Caltrans channel along Baseline Road adjacent to the southern boundary of the Site.⁵³ The Project would not alter the drainage pattern of Area A. As part of the development in the southern portion of the Site, the Project would add approximately 1.67 acres of impervious surfaces and direct flow into a debris basin and catch basins which would direct the flows to existing Caltrans storm drains

 ⁵² Hydrology Report for Tentative Tract No. 82011, 500 Baseline, Laverne, CA ("Hydrology Report"), page 1 Land Design Consultants, Inc., February April 24, 2019, page 1 (Appendix E).
 ⁵² with the second s

⁵³ Ibid.

located within Baseline Road. However, as described in section X.(a) above, in accordance with standard condition SC HYD-3, the Project's SUSMP would include the installation of BMPs to capture and retain stormwater flow onsite and would be required to prevent any increase in stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. The installed BMP systems would consist of vegetated bioretention areas within each lot and biofiltration systems and would be designed with an internal bypass or overflow system that would prevent upstream (i.e., onsite) flooding during large storm events. Table 9, Existing and Proposed Drainage **Comparison**, shows a comparison of the pre- and post-peak flow rates for the Project Site.

Existing and Proposed Drainage Stormwater Runoff Comparison						
DrainagePre-ProjectPost-ProjectChange from Existing toAreaQ50 (cfs)Q50 (cfs)Condition (cfs)						
A	50.54	50.54	0.00			
В	132.92	118.73	(14.19)			
С	16.48	11.52	(4.96)			
Total	199.94	180.79	(19.15)			
Notes: cfs= cubic feet per second.						
Source: Hydrology Report, Tentative Tract No. 820001, 500 Baseline, La Verne						
Technical Report, Land Design Consultants, April 24, 2019 (Appendix E).						

Table 9

As shown in Table 9, although the Project would alter the drainage pattern of the Site and increase the amount of impervious surface, there would be a decrease in the volume and rate of surface runoff of 19.15 compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Project would not result in offsite flooding.

Although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site and increase the amount off impervious surface, implementation of standard conditions SC HYD-2 and SC **HYD-3** would reduce the impacts. Therefore, Project impacts related to onsite or offsite flooding would be less than significant with implementation of standard conditions SC HYD-2 and SC HYD-3 and no mitigation measures would be required.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? Less Than Significant Impact.

As detailed in section X.(c)(i) (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, during construction of the Project, alteration of the existing onsite drainage pattern would occur from site preparation and grading, however, these changes would not result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff that could exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems due to stringent controls imposed under the NPDES Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and BMPs for the control of runoff pursuant to standard condition SC HYD-2. The SWPPP would also detail BMPs to be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from construction activities.

Additionally, as also in section X.(c)(i) (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site, the Project would be required to comply with the requirements of the NPDES permit and Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code, which result in and require a reduction of the volume of runoff from the Project Site when compared to existing conditions. As shown in Table 9 in section X.(c)(ii) (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, in accordance with these reduction requirements stipulated in standard condition **SC HYD-3**, although the Project would alter the drainage pattern of the Site and increase the amount of impervious surface, there would be a decrease in the volume and rate of surface runoff of 19.15 compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, the existing stormwater drainage would have sufficient capacity to receive the Project's post-development runoff. The Project's vegetated bioretention areas within each lot and biofiltration systems would also promote infiltration of stormwater, preventing additional sources of polluted runoff from reaching the existing stormwater drainage. Periodic maintenance of these retention/infiltration systems would be required by the SUSMP.

Although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site and increase the amount off impervious surface, implementation of standard conditions **SC HYD-2** and **SC HYD-3** would reduce the impacts. Therefore, Project impacts related to stormwater drainage system would be **less than significant** with implementation of standard conditions **SC HYD-2** and **SC HYD-2** and **SC HYD-3** and no mitigation measures would be required.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows? Less Than Significant Impact.

As further detailed in below under section *X.(d) (Hydrology and Water Quality)* below, the Project Site would not be susceptible to flooding from streams, tsunamis, seiche, or inundation of nearby reservoirs and dams. However, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map, the Project Site is within Zone D – Other Areas, which is a designation for areas where flood hazards are undetermined but possible.⁵⁴

As previously discussed, the Project would alter the alter the drainage pattern of the southern portion of the Site, including through the addition of impervious surfaces. The Project does not propose any structures which would impede floodwater such as a dam or berm; however, the Project would include a debris basin (approximately 2.66 acres) in order to capture and convey stormwater flow to the existing offsite drainage system in a manner that does not result in downstream flooding. The Project would be required to comply with the flood hazard reductions requirements of the City's Municipal Code Section 15.40.150, Standards of construction and Section 15.40.160, Standards for subdivisions or other proposed new development under Article V, Provisions for Flood Hazard Reduction. These requirements are designed to ensure that, among other things, development and utilities are designed and constructed to resist flood damage and adequate drainage is provided. The City of La Verne has adopted by policy the 1991 Los Angeles County Department policy on levels of flood protection. This policy contains the Federal Flood Insurance Agency protection standard that

⁵⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Los Angeles County and Incorporated Areas, Panel 1725F, FEMA Map Number 06037C1725F, effective September 26, 2008.

require the finish floor elevation of proposed new dwellings be a minimum of 1 foot above the water surface elevation of a 100-year flood. With proper design and construction of Project structures and drainage, although the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site and increase the amount of impervious surface, the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, Project impacts related to flood flows would be **less than significant** and no mitigation would be required.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? **Less than Significant Impact.**

Four major streams drain from the San Gabriel Mountains and flow into La Verne: San Dimas Creek; Marshall Canyon Creek; Live Oak Creek; and Thompson Creek. However, there is no history of any significant flooding or damage caused by any of the main creeks in the City of La Verne,⁵⁵ and none cross through the Project Site. The Project Site is located over 30 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean and would, therefore, not be susceptible to tsunamis. No large, open bodies of water are located on or adjacent to the Project Site that would pose a seiche hazard at the Site In addition, the Project Site is located outside of the inundation area of Live Oak Reservoir, located approximately 0.75-mile to the northeast, and San Dimas Dam, located approximately 2.25 miles to the northwest.⁵⁶ However, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map, the Project Site is within Zone D – Other Areas, which is a designation for areas where flood hazards are undetermined but possible.⁵⁷

However, the Project proposes residential land uses, which do not represent the type of use that would otherwise degrade water quality (e.g., an industrial land use that would use or dispose of large amounts of hazardous materials or waste). Anticipated and potential pollutants generated by the Project would be limited to those typical of the proposed land uses and include pesticides, cleaning products, trash, and oil/grease. Hazardous materials required for maintenance and operation, such as cleaning and lubricating solutions, would be properly stored and handled as to avoid spilling contents in an area that may encounter flood water. Therefore, the Project would not risk release of pollutants due to inundation. Therefore, Project impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? Less than Significant Impact.

Water Quality Control Plans

Water quality control plans applicable to the Revised Project include the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board's (LARWQCB) *Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region:*

⁵⁵ City of La Verne, Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan for the City of La Verne California, adopted: November 24, 2004, as amended, page 8-4.

⁵⁶ California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams, California Dam Breach Inundation Interactive Maps, available at: <u>https://fmds.water.ca.gov/maps/damim/</u>, accessed on: April 2020.

⁵⁷ Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Los Angeles County and Incorporated Areas, Panel 1725F, FEMA Map Number 06037C1725F, effective September 26, 2008.

Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Basin Plan). Adopted by LARWQCB, the Basin Plan designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwaters, sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the State's anti-degradation policy, and describes implementation programs to protect all waters in the Los Angeles Region. In addition, the Basin Plan incorporates (by reference) all applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies and other pertinent water quality policies and regulations.

Construction and operation of the Project would involve activities that have the potential to conflict with the water quality goals in the Basin Plan through the spread of contaminants into surface or groundwater supplies. However, as previously detailed, construction of the Project is not expected to encounter groundwater and would prevent the spread of contaminants into surface water through adherence to applicable regulations and BMPs for the handling and storing of hazardous materials, and the requirements of the NPDES Permit, including implementation of an SWPPP for the prevention of erosion and spread of polluted runoff. These regulations and practices effectively control the potential stormwater pollution to surface water during construction. Furthermore, the proposed residential land uses do not represent the type of use that would have the ability to adversely affect water quality. Anticipated and potential pollutants generated by operation of the Project would be addressed through the implementation of approved SUSMP BMPs, such as vegetated bioretention areas within each lot and biofiltration systems. While development of new uses would increase the use of onsite hazardous materials (i.e., those typically used on residentially zoned properties such as pesticides, cleaning products, trash, and oil/grease), compliance with all applicable existing regulations at the Project Site regarding the handling, storage, and potentially required cleanup of hazardous materials would prevent the Project from affecting or expanding any potential areas of contamination, increasing the level of contamination, or causing regulatory water guality standards at an existing production well to be violated. In addition, operation of the Project is not expected to require direct groundwater extraction either through permanent dewatering or for water supply use.

Groundwater Management Plans

With regard to groundwater management plans, on September 16, 2014, the State of California signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Comprised of three bills, AB 1739, SB 1168, and SB 1319, the SGMA provides a framework for long-term sustainable groundwater management across California and requires governments and water agencies of high and medium priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. Under the roadmap laid out by the legislation, local and regional authorities in medium and high priority groundwater basins have formed Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) that will oversee the preparation and implementation of a local Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). Local stakeholders have until 2022 (in critically over drafted basins until 2020) to develop, prepare, and begin implementation of Groundwater Sustainability Plans. GSAs will have until 2042 (2040 in critically over drafted basins) to achieve groundwater sustainability.

The Project Site does not overlie a groundwater basin designated as critically over drafted.⁵⁸ and, as such, no GSA has been formed to develop a GSP for its management as of yet. The Project would receive its water from the City of La Verne through a combination of groundwater and imported water from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, all of which have programs in place to prevent overdrafting of the groundwater basins they withdraw from. Groundwater is extracted from Six Basins⁵⁹ in accordance with the Six Basins Judgement, which defines adjudication for these basins to ensure safe operating yield and avoidance of groundwater over-extraction. The Six Basins Judgement is overseen by the Six Basins Watermaster. Imported water is purchased from the Three Valleys Municipal Water District, which pumps groundwater from the Six Basins and is also subject to the safe operating yield requirements of the Six Basins Judgement, and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which does not own or control groundwater basins itself, but collaborates with member agencies and groundwater basin managers within its service area to replenish local groundwater basins and sponsor various groundwater storage programs, including, cyclic storage programs, long-term replenishment storage programs, and contractual conjunctive use programs.

Water suppliers are required to address water supply needs through preparation of an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which projects future water use demands and identifies water supplies to meet these demands and is updated every five years. As described in section *XIX.(b)* (Utilities and Service Systems) below, the Project's water demand would be within the projections of the UWMP and the Project would be required to implement water saving features to reduce the amount of water used by the Project in accordance with water conservation measures, including Title 20 and 24 of the California Administrative Code. Furthermore, as previously discussed, neither construction nor operation of the Project is anticipated to encounter groundwater, therefore, the extraction of groundwater would not be required. Additionally, as detailed in section *X.(b)* (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, although the Project would increase the amount of impervious surface at the Site, it would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge as the Site is not a designated recharge area and in accordance with the requirements of the SUSMP for LID design, the Project would be required to capture and infiltrate stormwater flows onsite.

Accordingly, based on the above, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, Project impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

⁵⁸ California Department of Water Resources, Bulletin 118, Critically Overdrafted Basins, Data Viewer Interactive Map, available at: <u>https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewer#boundaries</u>, accessed: April 2020.

⁵⁹ The Six Basins are comprised of the Ganesha, Live Oak, Pomona, Lower Claremont Heights, Upper Claremont Heights, and Canyon Basin.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a.	Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes
b.	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			\boxtimes	

a) Physically divide an established community? **No Impact.**

The Project Site is located to the east of existing residential development and west of Broken Spur Road. Residential uses are located to the east of Broken Spur Road and south of Baseline Road. The Project would not remove any access or physically divide an established community. The Project Site is located adjacent to existing developed areas (to the west, south, and east) and no streets or sidewalks would be permanently closed as a result of the development of the Project. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community. Thus, **no impact** would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Project Site is currently undeveloped. The Project proposes annexation of the approximately 19.44-acre site from Los Angeles County into the City of La Verne, subdivision of the Project Site into nine parcels, and construction of seven single-family residences, associated infrastructure, and a debris basin. Approximately, 5.59 acres of the parcel would be subdivided into seven lots, each containing a single-family dwelling unit and attached garage. An additional eighth lot would be designated as a debris basin (approximately 2.66 acres) and approximately 10.75 acres would be dedicated to open space. The lot sizes would vary from 10,091 to 152,123 square feet for the developed lots. The dwelling units would range in size from 4,563 square feet to 7,628 square feet. The Project would require a General Plan Amendment from Light Agriculture to Hillside Residential and a rezoning from A-1-15000 to PR3D – Planned Residential 3 D.U. per Acre Detached. Urban residential development designated by the City's General Plan as Hillside Residential and zoned PR3D is located immediately adjacent to the west and south across W. Baseline Road. Undeveloped areas to the northwest in the City are zoned as PR2D.

Land use plans, policies, and regulations in the City that include policies applicable to the Project include the 1998 City of La Verne General Plan and the City's Municipal Code. The City is in the process of updating its General Plan. Until a new General Plan is adopted, the 1998 General Plan is considered the applicable plan. An overview of each of these plans and regulations is provided below. However, not every policy or goal of these plans is intended to

mitigate or avoid environmental impacts. Where a policy is not intended to mitigate or avoid an environmental impact, consistency with that policy may not be relevant to an environmental impact analysis.

City of La Verne General Plan

The Project Site is subject to the development regulations and policies set forth in the City of La Verne General Plan. The General Plan sets forth goals, objectives, and programs to provide a guideline for day-to-day land use policies and to meet the existing and future needs and desires of the community, while integrating a range of state-mandated elements, including Land Use, Transportation, Resource Management, Noise, Cultural Resources, Community Facilities, Housing, Public Safety, Economic Development, and Community Design. Overall, the Land Use Element of the General Plan guides land use development at a local level. The City's 2014-2021 Housing Element is a part of the General Plan and establishes policies, procedures and incentives in its land use planning and development activities that result in the maintenance and expansion of the housing supply to adequately accommodate households currently living and expected to live in La Verne.

The General Plan includes policies related to smart growth and annexations. The Project would be consistent with these policies by being reviewed for environmental impacts and comply with the Annexation Chapter of the City's Municipal Code (Policy LU 1.1.e, 1.1.i, 1.1.k, 1.2.c, 1.2.f, and 1.2.h). The General Plan also includes policies related to Hillside Development. The Project would be consistent with policies protecting hillside development areas and trees by limiting development to the southern portion of the Project Site (Policies LU 2.1, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, and 5.2) and mapping and documenting trees on the Project Site and mitigating for tree loss (Policy LU 2.4). The Project would include remove up to 3.7 acres of vegetation in compliance with Los Angeles County Fire Department requirements and consistent with General Plan Policy LU 2.5.a, 2.5.b, 2.5.e, and 2.5.g). The Project would be consistent with policies related to neighborhood character by developing low-density, single-family residential uses that are compatible with the surrounding residential character (Policies LU 3.1, 3.2).

The Project would be consistent with the Housing Element Policy 4.1 which states that the City shall provide for a range of residential development types in the City, including low-density single-family homes. The City has a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) allocation of 562 housing units, including 233 units for above moderate-income households. The Project would assist the City with fulfilling this allocation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with General Plan policies.

City of La Verne Municipal Code

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-15000 by Los Angeles County. Residential development adjacent to the west of the Project Site is zoned PR3D. Residential development to the south across Baseline Road is zoned as PR3D, as well. Undeveloped areas to the northwest of the Site (within the City) are zoned as PR2D.

The Project would rezone the site to PR3D – Planned Residential 3 D.U. per Acre Detached (PR3D). Uses allowed in the general PR zone include residential uses and accessory buildings, churches, private schools, and institutions. Single-family residential development is governed by zoning requirements specifying lot area, dimensions, and setbacks. Lots zoned as PR3D must have a minimum of area of 10,000 square feet, be 80 feet in width, and 100 feet in depth. Minimum setbacks include 25 feet (front), 5 and 10 feet (interior side), 20 feet (street side), and 25 feet (rear). Building heights are limited to two stories and 30 feet. Lot coverage is limited to 35 percent of the total lot area. All Project Site lots are greater than 10,000 square feet in size.

Project plans are conceptual at this time; however, the City would review building plans prior to project approval to confirm that the proposed residences and associated development comply with setbacks, parking, and vehicle circulation requirements as required in the PR3D zone. As shown in Figures 7 through 13, the proposed residences would be two-story and 29 to 30 feet in height and would be consistent with the Zoning Code. Lot coverage would vary from approximately 3 percent to 30 percent and would be consistent with the Zoning Code.

Based on review of the City's General Plan, Housing Element, and Municipal Code, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\square
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\square

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? **No Impact.**

As the Project Site is within the City's Sphere of Influence, it is included within the General Plan planning area. As shown in the General Plan Update, the Project Site is classified as being within an area where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be evaluated.⁶⁰ Furthermore, as mapped by the California Department of Conservation, the Project Site is fully developed and no oil wells are present on the Project Site or proximate to the Project

⁶⁰ City of La Verne, General Plan Existing Conditions Report, Conservation and Natural Resources, Figure 5-10 – Mineral Resource Zones, June 2018.
Site.⁶¹ Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? **No Impact**.

The Project Site is not identified as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site on any City plans. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site and **no impact** would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	NOISE. Would the project:				
a.	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			\boxtimes	
b.	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\boxtimes	
C.	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes

The following information utilized in this section of the Initial Study is based on the *500 East Baseline Road Residential Project Noise Impact Analysis* (Noise Report) prepared for the Project by Ganddini Group, April 2020, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The Noise Report is provided as *Appendix F* to this IS/MND.

Project Construction Noise

Construction noise sources are regulated within the City of La Verne Municipal Code Section 8.20. Section 8.20.010 of the City's Municipal Code states that Ordinance No. 11,773 of the County of Los Angeles, known as the "noise control ordinance of the County of Los Angeles," is adopted by reference under the authority of Section 50022.9 of the California Government Code.

In Section 12.08.440 of the Los Angeles County Code, the City prohibits operating or causing the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, or demolition work between the weekday hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, or at any time on Sundays or holidays,

⁶¹ California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources-Well Finder, website: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#close, accessed April 2020.

such that the sound therefrom creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial real-property line (except for public-service utilities emergency work or by variance issued by the health officer). In addition, the City has both working hours and maximum noise levels that are allowable from both mobile and stationary equipment defined by land use, as shown in **Table 10**, **Construction Noise Standards**. Per Table 10, construction noise at single-family residential structures due to mobile equipment is not to exceed 75 dBA between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM. In compliance with the City of La Verne Municipal Code, it is assumed that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours.

Table 10

	Construction Noise Standards									
Allowable			All Residenti	al Structures						
Work	Single-Family		Multi-I	Family	Semi-Residential/Comm.					
Dates and	Mobile Stationary		Mobile Stationary Mobile Stationary		Mobile	Stationary				
times	Equipment	Equipment ²	Equipment	Equipment ²	Equipment	Equipment ²				
Daily, ³ 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM	75 dBA	60 dBA	80 dBA	65 dBA	85 dBA	70 dBA				
Daily, ⁴ 8:00 PM to 7:00	60 dBA	50 dBA	64 dBA	55 dBA	70 dBA	80 dBA				
AM										
Allowable Work Dates and Times	At Business Structures									
Daily, Anytime			85 0	JBA						
Anytime Image: Notes: Notes: (1) Represents maximum noise levels for nonscheduled, intermittent, short-term operation (less than 10 days). (2) Represents maximum noise levels for repetitively scheduled and relatively long-term operation (periods of 10 or more days). (3) Daily except for Sundays and legal holidays. (4) Daily and all day on Sundays and legal holidays. dBA = A weighted decibels										
Source: 500 East Base	Source: 500 East Baseline Road Residential Project Noise Impact Analysis, Ganddini, April 23, 2020									

Project Operational Noise (Permanent)

On-site operational noise is usually only evaluated for commercial and industrial projects. Quantitative analysis of on-site operational noise is typically not conducted for residential projects as they usually do not include stationary noise sources that could result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels resulting in violation of established standards. Therefore, the evaluation of project operational noise in this study is limited to the potential impacts associated with project generated vehicle traffic (off-site noise). Depending upon how many units are proposed and the existing noise environment, project generated vehicle trips could result in substantial increases in noise levels.

Per the City's General Plan and for purposes of this analysis, increases in noise levels associated with project generated vehicle traffic would be considered substantial if they cause an increase of 5 or more dB.

Vibration

As shown in **Table 11, Typical Human Reaction and Effect on Buildings Due to Groundborne Vibration** a peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.20 is the threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to normal dwellings. It is also the level at which groundborne vibration can become annoying.

Vibration Level Peak Particle Velocity (PPV)	Human Reaction	Effect on Buildings
0.0006-0.019 in/sec	Threshold of perception, possibility of intrusion	Vibrations unlikely to cause damage of any type
0.08 in/sec	Vibrations readily perceptible	Recommended upper level of vibration to which ruins and ancient monuments should be subjected
0.10 in/sec	Level at which continuous vibration begins to annoy people	Virtually no risk of "architectural" (i.e., not structural) damage to normal buildings
0.20 in/sec	Vibrations annoying to people in buildings	Threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to normal dwelling – houses with plastered walls and ceilings
0.4-0.6 in/sec	Vibrations considered unpleasant by people subjected to continuous vibrations and unacceptable to some people walking on bridges	Vibrations at a greater level than normally expected from traffic, but would cause "architectural" damage and possibly minor structural damage
Source: California Department of Tables 5 and 12, Septem	Transportation. Transportation and Consti ber 2013	ruction Vibration Guidance Manual, Chapter 6

Table 11
Typical Human Reaction and Effect on Buildings Due to Groundborne Vibration

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

The California Department of Transportation has published one of the seminal works for the analysis of ground-borne noise and vibration relating to transportation- and construction-induced vibrations and although the project is not subject to these regulations, it serves as useful tools to evaluate vibration impacts. These guidelines recommend that a standard of 0.2 inches per section (in/sec) PPV not be exceeded for the protection of normal residential buildings (California Department of Transportation, 2013). This is the appropriate threshold for construction related ground-borne vibration impacts.

City of La Verne General Plan

The City of La Verne has adopted a modified version of the State of California Noise Land Use Compatibility Matrix (see Table 12). This Matrix establishes standards for outdoor noise levels that are normally acceptable, conditionally acceptable, normally not acceptable, and clearly not acceptable for a variety of land uses. For example, for single-family residential uses, noise levels of up to 60 dBA CNEL are "normally acceptable" and noise levels of up to 70 dBA CNEL are "conditionally acceptable".

CNEL (Decibels)									
L	Land Use 55 60 65 70 75 8					80			
Single/Multi F	amily Resid	dential	А	A	В	В	С	D	D
Mobile Home	Park		А	A	В	С	С	D	D
Motel, Hotel			А	A	В	В	С	С	D
School, Libra Nursing Hom	ary, Church, ie	Hospital,	А	А	В	С	С	D	D
Concert/Mee Amphitheater	ting Hall, A r	uditorium,	В	В	С	С	D	D	D
Indoor/Outdo Amusement	or Sports Park	Arena,	А	А	А	В	В	D	D
Playground,	Neighborhoo	od Park	А	Α	A	В	С	D	D
Golf Cours Cemetery	se, Riding	Stable,	А	А	А	А	В	С	С
Office/Profes	sional Buildi	ing	А	Α	А	В	В	С	D
Commercial Retail, Bank, Restaurant, Theater			А	А	А	А	В	В	С
Industrial, Utilities, Manufacturing, Wholesale, Service Station			А	А	А	А	В	В	В
Agriculture			А	Α	А	Α	Α	Α	Α
Acceptability									
A Normal:		Specified I involved a insulation	and use is re of norm requiremer	satisfacto nal convei nts	ry, based ι ntional con	ip the assist struction	umption th without ar	nat any bi ny specia	uildings I noise
B Conditio	onal:	New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements are made and needed noise insulation features in the design are determined. Conventional construction, with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice							
C Normall	y Not:	New cons	truction or	developm	nent should	generally	/ be disco	ouraged.	If new
		construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise reduction features included in the design.							
D Clearly	Not:	New const	ruction or o	developme	ent should	generally r	not be und	lertaken	
Source: City c	of La Verne G	eneral Plan	Table N-1, 1	1998					

 Table 12

 City of La Verne Noise/Land Use Compatibility Matrix

Additional City of La Verne General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures which apply to the proposed project are presented below.

Goal 1 Protect our community from excessive noise.

Policy 1.1 Maintain or reduce noise levels citywide.

Implementation Measures:

- a. Enforce the noise control ordinance to assure that all new development is consistent with the land use compatibility criteria, exterior and interior noise standards.
- b. Consider the noise of a proposed project in both absolute and relative terms. A proposed project will be considered to have a significant adverse impact on the environment if the expected noise increase exceeds 5 dB, even though it may not

exceed the standard in Table 2. Sound attenuation measures will be required as a condition of approval.

- c. Require stringent mitigation measures to limit construction noise for all new projects. Establish a graduated system of fines for violations that increase in severity with each offense.
- Goal 2 Protect our community from freeway noise.
- Policy 2.1 Prevent freeway noise from spilling into our neighborhoods.

Policy 2.2 Insulate our neighborhoods against freeway noise.

Implementation Measures:

- a. Encourage installation of double glazing, dense landscaping and other noise reduction measures by homeowners along the proposed freeway route. Require such measures in new construction. (Residential construction in areas with an average decibel level greater than 60 dB shall use sound attenuation measures that reduce interior noise levels to a maximum of 45 dB).
- b. Require that such measures be taken for all residential construction in the freeway noise impact area, (within 60dB noise level contour parameters), both for entirely new structures and for renovations, remodels and building additions.
- Goal 3 Protect our neighborhoods from increased traffic noise.

Policy 3.1 Prevent increase in traffic-related noise.

Implementation Measures:

b. Incorporate sound attenuation measures into building requirements for residential construction if noise increases are significant. These measures will be the same as those for freeway and railroad noise.

City of La Verne Municipal Code

Chapter 8.20 of the City's Municipal Code establishes the City's noise standards and regulations. Section 8.20.010 of the City's Municipal Code states that Ordinance No. 11,773 of the County of Los Angeles, known as the "noise control ordinance of the County of Los Angeles," is adopted by reference under the authority of Section 50022.9 of the California Government Code.

<u>Construction Noise Standards.</u> In accordance with Section 12.08.440 of the Los Angeles County Code as adopted by reference in the City of La Verne, the City prohibits operating or causing the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, or demolition work between the weekday hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, or at any time on Sundays or holidays, such that the sound therefrom creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial real-property line (except for public-service utilities emergency work or by variance issued by the

health officer). In addition, the City has both working hours and maximum noise levels that are allowable from both mobile and stationary equipment defined by land use, as shown in Table 10.

<u>Vibration</u>. In accordance with Section 12.08.560 of the Los Angeles County Code as adopted by reference in the City of La Verne, the City prohibits the operation or permitting the operation of any device that creates a vibration level above the vibration perception threshold of any individual at or beyond the property boundary of the source if on private property, or at 150 feet from the source if on a public space or public right-of-way. The perception threshold shall be a motion velocity of 0.01 in/sec over the range of 1 to 100 Hertz. This threshold only applies to groundborne vibrations from long-term operational activities. The City has not adopted any thresholds for construction-related groundborne vibration impacts.

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction-Related Impacts

The existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located to the west, northwest, southeast, east, south, and northeast of the portion of the project site that is to be developed may be affected by short-term noise impacts associated with construction noise. Construction noise would vary depending on the construction process, type of equipment involved, location of the construction site with respect to sensitive receptors, the schedule proposed to carry out each task (e.g., hours and days of the week) and the duration of the construction work.

The construction phases for the proposed project are anticipated to include: site preparation, grading, building construction, paving and architectural coating. A summary of noise level data for a variety of construction equipment compiled by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is presented in the Noise Report (see *Table 5, Appendix F*). Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings.

As discussed previously, construction noise associated with the proposed project was calculated utilizing methodology presented in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) together with several key construction parameters including: distance to each sensitive receiver, equipment usage, percent usage factor, and baseline parameters for the project site. Distances to receptors were based on the acoustical center of the project site. Construction noise levels were calculated for each phase. Worksheets are included in the Noise Report (see Appendix D, found within *Appendix F* to this IS/MND).

Noise monitoring locations are shown in **Figure 19**, **Noise Measurement Location Map**. Construction noise levels were compared to existing noise levels. NM1 was chosen to represent the residential property lines of properties to the south, NM2 was chosen to represent noise levels at the residential property lines of properties to the east and southeast, NM3 was chosen to represent noise levels at the residential property lines of property lines of properties to the east and southeast.



Legend → Noise Measurement Location NM 1 Source: Ganddini, April 2020. northeast, and NM4 was chosen to represent noise levels at the residential property lines of properties to the west and northwest of the portion of the project site that is to be developed. As shown in **Table 13, Construction Noise Levels**, modeled unmitigated construction noise levels when combined with existing measured noise levels could reach 70.4 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line adjacent to the west of the project site.

In accordance with Section 12.08.440 of the Los Angeles County Code as adopted by reference in the City of La Verne, the City prohibits construction between the weekday hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, or at any time on Sundays or holidays. The construction equipment associated with the proposed project is associated with intermittent, short-term operation, and therefore is considered to be mobile equipment. Construction noise at single-family residential structures due to mobile equipment is not to exceed 75 dBA between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM per Section 12.08.440 of the Los Angeles County Code as adopted by reference in the City of La Verne (see Table 10, above).

Therefore, Project construction is not anticipated to exceed the City noise standards at the surrounding single-family residential uses.

Further, with compliance with the City's Municipal Code, it is assumed that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours. Impacts related to construction noise would be reduced with adherence to the above Municipal Ordinances and implementation of the mitigation measure **MM NOI-1**. With implementation of **MM NOI-1**, impacts would be less than significant.

Phase	Location	Existing Ambient Noise Levels (Leq) ¹	Unmit. Constr. Noise Levels (Leq) ²	Comb. Noise Levels	Increase (dB)	Mitigated Existing Plus Constr. Noise Levels (Leq) ³	Mitigated Increase Ambient Noise Levels (Leq)
	East	60.7	65.2	66.5	5.8	61.8	1.1
	South	56.6	64.3	65.0	8.4	58.6	2.0
Site	Southeast	60.7	62.9	64.9	4.2	61.4	0.7
Preparation	West	54.2	66.8	67.0	12.8	58.7	4.5
	Northwest	54.2	62.7	63.3	9.1	56.5	2.3
	Northeast	48.0	54.5	55.4	7.4	49.6	1.6
	East	60.7	67.1	68.0	7.3	62.3	1.6
	South	56.6	66.2	66.7	10.1	59.4	2.8
Crading	Southeast	60.7	64.8	66.2	5.5	61.7	1.0
Grading	West	54.2	68.7	68.9	14.7	60.0	5.8
	Northwest	54.2	64.6	65.0	10.8	57.4	3.2
	Northeast	48.0	56.4	57.0	9.0	50.3	2.3
Building	East	60.7	68.7	69.3	8.6	62.8	2.1
Construction	South	56.6	67.8	68.1	11.5	60.3	3.7

Table 13

Phase	Location	Existing Ambient Noise Levels (Leq) ¹	Unmit. Constr. Noise Levels (Leq) ²	Comb. Noise Levels	Increase (dB)	Mitigated Existing Plus Constr. Noise Levels (Leq) ³	Mitigated Increase Ambient Noise Levels (Leq)
	Southeast	60.7	66.4	67.4	6.7	62.1	1.4
	West	54.2	70.3	70.4	16.2	61.3	7.1
	Northwest	54.2	66.2	66.5	12.3	58.3	4.1
	Northeast	48.0	58.0	58.4	10.4	51.0	3.0
	East	60.7	65.0	66.4	5.7	61.7	1.0
	South	56.6	64.1	64.8	8.2	58.5	1.9
Doving	Southeast	60.7	62.7	64.8	4.1	61.3	0.6
Faving	West	54.2	66.6	66.8	12.6	58.6	4.4
	Northwest	54.2	62.5	63.1	8.9	56.4	2.2
	Northeast	48.0	54.3	55.2	7.2	49.5	1.5
	East	60.7	57.6	62.4	1.7	60.9	0.2
	South	56.6	56.7	59.7	3.1	57.0	0.4
Architectural	Southeast	60.7	55.4	61.8	1.1	60.8	0.1
Coating	West	54.2	59.2	60.4	6.2	55.4	1.2
	Northwest	54.2	55.1	57.7	3.5	54.7	0.5
	Northeast	48.0	47.0	50.5	2.5	48.3	0.3

Table 13 Construction Noise Levels

Notes:

(1) Per measured existing ambient noise levels. NM3 used for receptors to the northeast, NM2 for receptors to the east and southeast, NM1 for receptors to the south, and NM4 for receptors to the west and northwest

(2) Construction noise worksheets are provided in Appendix D of the Noise Report (Appendix F of this IS/MND).
 (3) Assumes 10 dB reduction. This reduction can be verified by measuring on-site equipment or by special ordering

(3) Assumes 10 dB reduction. This reduction can be verified by measuring on-site equipment or by special ordering mufflers to meet reduction requirement, or by providing shielding/acoustic tent that provides a 20 dB reduction (See Appendix D of the Noise Report, Appendix F of this IS/MND).

Source:

500 East Baseline Road Residential Project, Noise Impact Analysis, City of La Verne, Ganddini, April 23, 2020

Mitigation Measure

- **MM NOI-1** In addition to adherence to the City of La Verne Municipal Code, which limits the construction hours of operation, the following measures are recommended to reduce construction noise emanating from the proposed project:
 - a. During all project site excavation and grading on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards.
 - b. The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
 - c. Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use.

- d. The contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
- e. Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors.

Operational Impacts

Existing and Existing Plus Project traffic noise was modeled utilizing project trip generation information obtained from the Trip Generation Analysis prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc and existing traffic volume counts provided by AimTD.

A worst-case project generated traffic noise level was modeled utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model - FHWA-RD-77-108. The modeling assumes that all project generated vehicle trips would pass the single-family detached residential neighborhoods along Baseline Road. During operation, the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 66 average daily trips with five (5) trips during the AM peak hour and seven (7) trips during the PM peak hour. Per data collected by AimTD, existing average daily traffic volumes on Baseline Road from Rodeo Lane to Japonica Avenue are approximately 9,658 vehicles per day. Traffic noise levels were calculated at the right-of-way from the centerline of the analyzed roadway. The modeling is theoretical and does not take into account any existing barriers, structures, and/or topographical features that may further reduce noise levels. Therefore, the levels are shown for comparative purposes only to show the difference between with and without project conditions. Roadway input parameters including average daily traffic (ADT) volumes, speeds, and vehicle distribution data is shown in the Noise Report (see *Table 7, Appendix F)*. The potential off-site noise impacts caused by an increase of traffic from operation of the proposed project on the nearby roadways were calculated for the following scenarios:

As shown in **Table 14, Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project** (dBA CNEL), the modeled Existing traffic noise level is 72.02 dBA CNEL at the right-of-way of the modeled roadway segment; and the modeled Existing Plus Project traffic noise level is 72.05 dBA CNEL at the right-of-way of the modeled roadway segment. The City's General Plan identifies a potentially substantial increase as any increase of five or more dB.

Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CNEL)									
		Distance	Modeled Noise Levels (dBA CNEL) ¹						
Roadway	Segment	from roadway centerline to right- of-way (feet) ¹	Existing Without Project	Existing Plus Project	Change in Noise Level	Exceeds Standards ³	3 dB or More Increase?		
Baseline Road	Rodeo Lane to Japonica Avenue	50	72.02	72.05	0.03	Yes	No		

Table 14	
Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CN	EL)

			Table	; 14						
Change	Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CNEL)									
		Distance		loise Levels	(dBA CNEL) ¹					
Roadway	Segment	from roadway centerline to right- of-way (feet) ¹	Existing Without Project	Existing Plus Project	Change in Noise Level	Exceeds Standards ³	3 dB or More Increase?			
Notes:										
(1) Exterior no.	ise levels calcı	ılated 5 feet ab	ove pad eleva	ation, perpend	licular to subje	ect roadway.				
(2) Distance fr	om the roadwa	y centerline to	the roadway I	ROW. ROW	distances wer	e estimated bas	ed on Google			
Earth and t	he information	provided for Ba	aseline Road	in the Existing	g Conditions F	Report for the Cit	ty of La			
Verne Gen	eral Plan Upda	te (June 2018)	Kabla atawalawa	I fan ainala fan		no side atist dural				
(3) Per the City (see Table	2 of the Noise	Report), Apper	able standard ndix F of this I	i for single-fan S/MND.	niiy detached	residential dwei	ling units			
-										

T.L.L. 44

Source:

500 East Baseline Road Residential Project, Noise Impact Analysis, City of La Verne, Ganddini, April 23, 2020

Table 14 shows that all modeled roadway segments are anticipated to change the noise a nominal amount (approximately 0.03 dBA CNEL). Therefore, a change in noise level would not be audible and would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? **Potentially** Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (construction) and Less Than Significant (operation).

Construction Impacts

There are several types of construction equipment that can cause vibration levels high enough to annoy persons in the vicinity and/or result in architectural or structural damage to nearby structures and improvements. A vibratory roller could generate up to 0.21 PPV at a distance of 25 feet; and operation of a large bulldozer (0.089 PPV) at a distance of 25 feet (two of the most vibratory pieces of construction equipment). Groundborne vibration at sensitive receptors associated with this equipment would drop off as the equipment moves away. For example, as the vibratory roller moves further than 100 feet from the sensitive receptors, the vibration associated with it would drop below 0.0026 PPV. It should be noted that these vibration levels are reference levels and may vary slightly depending upon soil type and specific usage of each piece of equipment.

Annoyance to Persons

The primary effect of perceptible vibration is often a concern. However, secondary effects, such as the rattling of a china cabinet, can also occur, even when vibration levels are well below perception. Any effect (primary perceptible vibration, secondary effects, or a combination of the two) can lead to annoyance. The degree to which a person is annoyed depends on the activity in which they are participating at the time of the disturbance. For example, someone sleeping or reading will be more sensitive than someone who is running on a treadmill. Reoccurring primary and secondary vibration effects often lead people to

believe that the vibration is damaging their home, although vibration levels are well below minimum thresholds for damage potential.

As shown above in Table 11, vibration can cause annoyance to persons in buildings at a PPV of 0.20. The closest off-site structures are the existing single-family residential dwelling units located approximately 25 feet west of the project site. Therefore, use of a bulldozer would not be considered annoying at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, an impact could occur if a vibratory roller or other similar vibratory equipment is utilized within one foot of the western property line of the proposed project, adjacent to existing residential structures.

Architectural Damage

Vibration generated by construction activity generally has the potential to damage structures. This damage could be structural damage, such as cracking of floor slabs, foundations, columns, beams, or wells, or cosmetic architectural damage, such as cracked plaster, stucco, or tile.

Table 11 identifies a PPV level of 0.2 as the threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to normal dwelling units. Use of a vibratory roller within 26 feet of existing structures could cause architectural damage. As stated above, existing residential dwelling units are located as close as approximately 25 feet to the west of the project site. Therefore, an impact could occur if a vibratory roller or other similar vibratory equipment is utilized within one foot of the western property line of the proposed project, adjacent to existing residential structures.

Project impacts related to construction vibration would be reduced with implementation of the mitigation measure **MM NOI-2**. Mitigation measure **MM NOI-2** limits the hours of construction and provides measures to reduce vibration by placing equipment away from noise sensitive receptors, shielding devices on equipment, etc. Therefore, Project Impacts to construction vibration would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

Mitigation Measure

- **MM NOI-2** In addition to adherence to the City of La Verne Municipal Code, which limits the construction hours of operation, the following measures are recommended to reduce construction vibration emanating from the proposed project:
 - a. During all project site excavation and grading on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards.
 - b. The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
 - c. Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use.
 - d. The contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.

- e. Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors.
- f. Caution should be utilized if a vibratory roller or other similar vibratory equipment is utilized within one foot of the western property line of the proposed project, adjacent to existing residential structures.

Operational Impacts

The Project does not include uses that are expected to generate measurable levels of groundborne vibration during operation of the Project. Therefore, the greatest regular source of Project-related ground-borne vibration would be from trucks making deliveries to the Project Site and garbage trucks picking-up Project-related refuse material. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be **less than significant** at nearby sensitive uses and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Project Site is located approximately 2.2 miles from Brackett Field Airport, a public general aviation airport in the City of La Verne. The Project Site is located within the Los Angeles Basin, in an area subject to regular over flights from jet and propeller aircraft. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	POPULATION & HOUSING. Would the project:				
а.	either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			\boxtimes	
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			\boxtimes	

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? Less Than Significant Impact.

Direct Growth

The Project would develop seven single-family residences on the Site. According to the Southern California Association of Government's *Local Profiles Report 2019* for the City of La Verne, there were approximately 12,147 housing units and 33,260 people in the City, resulting in an average household size of 2.7 persons per dwelling unit.⁶² Based on these rates, the Project's development of 7 residential units would generate approximately 19 residents.

Between 2000 and 2018, the total population of the City increased by 1,622 people to 33,260 people, an increase of 5.1 percent.⁶³ The total number of households increased by 634 units to 11,704 units, an increase of 5.7 percent.⁶⁴ The Project's increase of seven residential units and 19 residents would represent a 0.06 percent increase in housing supply and a 0.06 percent increase in population over the 2018 housing supply and population, which would be considered a negligible amount. Accordingly, impacts associated with the Project's direct population growth would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Indirect Growth

The Project would require the extension of roadways and other infrastructure to serve the Project (e.g., water facilities, sewer facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) into undeveloped areas. However, as described in section XIV.(a) above, the new roadways and infrastructure would only serve the Project and would not allow for access into additional undeveloped areas or support additional growth beyond that which is proposed under the Project would not be considerable. Accordingly, impacts associated with the Project's indirect population growth would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.**

The Project Site formerly consisted of agricultural development (citrus groves) along the southern portion of the Project Site, however, the Site has been vacant since at least 1972 and no housing previously existed or currently exists on the Site. Therefore, the Project would not displace existing people or housing. Thus, **no impact** would occur regarding displacing people or housing and no mitigation measures would be required.

⁶² Southern California Association of Governments, Local Profiles Report 2019, Profile of the City of La Verne, May 2019, page 3.

⁶³ Ibid., page 4.

⁶⁴ Ibid., page 9

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES . 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 any of the public services:				
	Fire Protection?			\boxtimes	
	Police Protection?			\boxtimes	
	Schools?			\boxtimes	
	Parks?			\boxtimes	
	Other public facilities?			\boxtimes	

Fire protection? Less Than Significant Impact.

Fire-protection services at the Project Site are provided by the La Verne Fire Department (LVFD). LVFD maintains three stations that serve of approximately 32,000 residents encompassing nine square miles. Total department staffing at the three stations includes 33 full time fire suppression employees consisting of three Battalion Chiefs, six Fire Captains, nine Fire Engineers and fifteen Firefighter/Paramedics working three alternating 48-hour shifts. In addition, the Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Marshal and Administrative Secretary work a conventional workweek, and 9 part time Administrative Officers, 24 Apprentice Firefighters and 30 Fire Explorers provide ancillary support to the Department.⁶⁵ The Project Site would be served primarily by Station No. 3 - located at 5100 Esperanza Drive, approximately 0.97 miles north of the Project Site, and secondarily by Station No. 2 - located at 4785 Wheeler Avenue, approximately 1.18 miles northeast of the Project Site.⁶⁶ Station No. 2 contains one Type I Pumper and houses one reserve Type III Pumper and one utility vehicle, and Station No. 3 contains one Paramedic Rescue Ambulance and house one reserve ambulance f.⁶⁷ As detailed in the City's General Plan, Public Safety Element, Policy 1.1(a), the City typically maintains a seven-minute response time to emergency calls. The Project would result in annexation of 19.44-acres of undeveloped land into the City of La Verne with approximately 5.59 acres (243,130 square feet) of the parcel into 7 subdivided lots, each containing a single family unit and an additional lot as a debris basin (approximately 2.66 acres), leaving 10.75 acres as dedicated open space. The Project would generate 19 new residents, representing

⁶⁵ La Verne Fire Department, Overview, website, <u>https://www.lavernefire.org/overview/</u>, accessed March 2020.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

a 0.06 percent increase in La Verne's population (as of 2018).⁶⁸ As the amount of enclosed space would increase, the Project could potentially increase demand on LVFD fire protection services.

The Project Site is located immediately adjacent to suburban development with existing single family homes that already served by the LVFD. The Project proposes grading of the site for family lots to be located primarily on the parcel immediately adjacent to existing single family homes along Rodeo Lane, as well as along Baseline Road. These lots would be accessed from a new street via Baseline Road and one lot from an existing street. Broken Spur Lane. Since first responders already patrol the Project vicinity and surrounding areas, compliance with California Vehicle Code 21806(A)(1), which requires all vehicles to yield to emergency vehicles would ensure implementation of the Project would not adversely affect travel time between the nearest fire station and the Project Site. The Project would comply with all applicable LVFD and La Verne Municipal Code fire-safety regulations, as well as those established by the California Fire Code, as adopted by the La Verne Municipal Code (Chapter 15.37), including those related to fire-protection systems (e.g., automatic sprinkler systems, life-safety alarm systems) in addition to 2019 CBC, which includes design features, such as ignition-resistant materials and fire sprinkler. Adherence to these regulations is anticipated to reduce the increase in demand for fire-protection services to levels where additional staff would not be required to accommodate the additional demand. Further, access to the Project Site would not be restricted and would be provided with direct access on Baseline Road as described above. Implementation of the Project is not anticipated to increase response times to the Project Site or surrounding vicinity. As discussed in section XVII.(a) (Transportation). below, the Project would not result in significant impacts at the nearby signalized study intersection. LVFD would be provided an opportunity to review and comment on all project development plans before the issuance of building permits. LVFD review would ensure adequate emergency access, fire hydrant availability, and compliance with all applicable codes.

Lastly, the City of La Verne collects fire service and development impact fees from all development projects proposed in the City. The Project would be required to pay the applicable development impact fees, which would be used to fund the capital costs associated with acquiring land for new fire stations, construction new fire stations, purchasing new fire equipment for such stations, and providing additional staff as needed to serve the community. Any future construction of new or expansion of existing fire protection facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review and site-specific mitigation as appropriate in order to ensure significant environmental impacts are avoided or mitigated. However, it is reasonable to conclude that implementation of the Baseline Road Single Family Residential and Annexation Project (seven single family lot subdivision) adjacent to an existing suburban setting without a substantial increase in City population and constructed in accordance with applicable policies and regulations which would not require new or physically altered fire

⁶⁸ Southern California Association of Government's Local Profiles Report 209, City of La Verne had 12,147 housing units and 33,260 people, resulting in an average household size of 2.7 persons per dwelling unit. For the Project, 7 units x 2.7 = 19 new residents.

protection facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to fire protection services and no mitigation measures would be required.

Police protection? Less Than Significant Impact.

Police protection is provided to the Project Site and the surrounding area by the City of La Verne Police Department (LVPD). The LVPD is located at 2061 Third Street, approximately 1.6 miles southwest of the Project Site. LVDPD has a total of 40 sworn officers and 18 professional staff members, a reserve force of up to 25 officers, a retired senior volunteer patrol program consisting of 35 members, and the LVPD maintains a Type 1 jail and state-of-the-art indoor shooting range.⁶⁹ The City monitors police staffing level as part of the annual budgeting process to ensure adequate police protection can continue even after new development projects are approved and constructed. Therefore, projections made by the LVPD and the City ensure that adequate police protection will be maintained as implementation of the Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project occurs.

LVPD comprises two major divisions for the prevention and suppression of crime, as well as a consolidated communications dispatch operation to serve as the first responder of emergency calls. The Project Site is immediately adjacent to a suburban area that already served by the LVPD. Since first responders already patrol the Project vicinity and surrounding areas, and the Project does not entail a substantial increase in City population, compliance with California Vehicle Code 21806(A)(1), which requires all vehicles to yield to emergency vehicles, would ensure implementation of the Project would not adversely affect the City's response time standard of 3.30 minutes.

Construction Impacts

Construction sites, if not properly managed, have the potential to attract criminal activity (such as trespassing, theft, and vandalism) and can become a distraction for local law enforcement from more pressing matters that require their attention. However, the Project would employ construction safety features including erecting temporary fencing along the periphery of the active construction areas to screen as much of the construction activity from view at the local street level and to deter trespassing, vandalism, short-cut attractions, potential criminal activity, and other nuisances. Therefore, potential impacts to police protection services during the construction of the Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Operational Impacts

Implementation of the Project could result in an increase of approximately 19 residents within the City, thereby generating a potential increase in the number of service calls from the Project

⁶⁹ La Verne Police Department, Overview, website: https://www.lvpd.org/#Department_Overviewaccessed: March 2020.

Site.⁷⁰ This increase in residents is not anticipated to increase demand for police protection services to levels where additional staff would be required to accommodate the additional demand. The Project would be designed and operated per applicable standards required by the City for new development with regard to public safety. The Project would be required to pay development impact fees used to fund capital costs associated with construction new public safety structures and purchasing equipment for new public safety structures. In addition, the City maintains mutual aid agreements with police agencies in the surrounding cities (e.g., San Dimas, Pomona, and Claremont) and the Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department, which allow for the services of nearby police departments to assist the LVPD during major emergencies. Payment of development impact fees commensurate with the increased demand for services in the City would offset any increase in demand for police services. Implementation of the Project is not anticipated to increase response times to the Project Site or surrounding vicinity. As discussed in section XVII.(a) (Transportation) below, the Project would not result in significant impacts the signalized study intersection. Lastly, pursuant to Chapter 18.16 (Development Overview), any future construction of new or expansion of existing police protection facilities would be subject to project-level environmental review and site-specific mitigation as appropriate in order to ensure significant environmental impacts are avoided or mitigated. However, it is reasonable to conclude that implementation of the Baseline Road Single Family Residential and Annexation Project (seven single family lot subdivision) adjacent to an existing suburban setting without a substantial increase in City population would not require new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, no new or expanded police station facilities would be required as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to policeprotection services and no mitigation measures would be required.

Schools? Less Than Significant Impact.

The Project Site is located within the Bonita Unified School District (BUSD), which eight elementary, two middle and two high schools plus a continuation high school and alternative school. The schools serving the Project Site include: La Verne Heights Elementary (K-5), located at 1550 Baseline Road; Ramona Middle School (6-8), located at 3490 Ramona Avenue; and Bonita High School (9-12), located at 3102 D Street. The proposed Baseline Road Single Family Residential and Annexation Project would include 7 residential lots that would incrementally increase the number of students in BUSD. The student generation factor for BUSD is 0.4 elementary student for every single-family residence, 0.1 middle school student for every single-family residence.⁷¹ Using these generation factors, the Project would generate a total of 4.9 students: 2.8 elementary, 0.7 middle school, and 1.4 high school students. The

⁷⁰ Southern California Association of Government's Local Profiles Report 2019, City of La Verne had 12,147 housing units and 33,260 people, resulting in an average household size of 2.7 persons per dwelling unit. For the Project, 7 units x 2.7 = 19 new residents.

⁷¹ Sage Canyon Residential Project TTM 71373, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, November 30, 2015.

students generated by the Project would represent an incremental increase in students served by BUSD schools.

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50) sets a maximum level of fees a developer may be required to pay to mitigate a project's impacts on school facilities. The maximum fees authorized under SB 50 apply to zone changes, general plan amendments, zoning permits and subdivisions. Development fees are required to be paid pursuant to development conditions of approval. Pursuant to SB 50, the payment of these school fee amounts provided for in Government Code Sections 65995, 65995.5, and 65995.7 would constitute full and complete mitigation for school facilities. That is to say, SB 50 states that the exclusive method of mitigating the impact of school facilities according to CEQA is to pay the maximum school fees and that such fees are "deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation" related to the adequacy of school facilities when considering approval or the establishment of conditions for the approval of a development project (Government Code 65996[a] and [b]).

Pursuant to State law, payment of the school fees established by the BUSD in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees, would, by law, mitigate the Project's indirect impacts on any schools. Therefore, the public schools servicing the Project Site can accommodate the future students generated by the Project. Therefore, impacts on the schools identified to serve the Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Parks? Less Than Significant Impact.

The La Verne Parks and Community Services Department manages all municipally owned and operated recreation and park facilities within the City, which totals 21 parks.⁷² The City is also within one mile of the Los Angeles County Frank G. Bonneli Regional Park. There are also three golf courses in or adjacent to La Verne. In general, residential development directly generates demand for recreation and parks facilities.

Operation of the Project could result in an on-site population of up to approximately 19 residents. The City's standard ratio of parks to population is 4.0 acres per 1,000 people as set forth in the La. Verne Parks Master Plan 2006.⁷³ In 2018, the City's population was approximately 33,260 residents.⁷⁴ Thus, based on the 2018 population, the City should be providing 133 acres of parkland. Currently, the City is providing 110 acres of parkland.⁷⁵ Based on the standard minimum parkland-to-population ratio provided in the City's Parks Master Plan 2006, the Project would generate a need for approximately 0.076 acre of public parkland. This increase in demand for new or expanded park facilities would be negligible. The Project would result in an increase in land use density on the Project Site and the City will require the payment of park, recreation and open space fees as part of development of

⁷² City of Laverne, Parks, website: <u>https://www.cityoflaverne.org/index.php/residents/parks</u>, accessed March 2020.

⁷³ City of La Verne Parks Master Plan 2006, page 81

⁷⁴ Southern California Association of Government's Local Profiles Report 2019, City of La Verne.

⁷⁵ City of Laverne, Parks, website: <u>https://www.cityoflaverne.org/index.php/residents/parks</u>, accessed March 2020.

the Project Site pursuant to City Municipal Code Chapter 3.20 (Parks and Recreation Charges). The amount of the fee would be equal to the new development's fair share of the costs of developing new parks, open space and recreation facilities, including the acquisition, design, and construction. Of the 19.44 acre Project Site, approximately10.75 acres would be dedicated to open space. Since this Project is an annexation, the City would be expanding the dedicated open space by 10.75 acres. Therefore, through the required payment of impact fees for park and recreational facilities and the addition of new dedicated open space for the City, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Other public facilities? Less Than Significant Impact.

Library services for the Project area are provided by the La Verne Library, located at 3640 D Street, approximately 0.75 acres to the southwest of the Project Site. The La Verne Library is part of the Los Angeles County Library system that serves over 3.4 million people living in unincorporated areas and to residents of the 49 of the 88 incorporated cities of Los Angeles County⁷⁶ Supplementing the 7.5 million volume book collection, the Library also offers magazines, newspapers, governmental publications and many specialized materials including online databases⁷⁷.

Although the increase of on-site population of up to approximately 19 residents that would occur with the development of the Project, thereby, potentially could increasing the demand for library materials. However, the increase in residential population would not result in a demand for new or expanded library facilities as these residents have direct access to the expansive Los Angeles County library collection and materials. Therefore, impacts to library facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	RECREATION. Would the project:				
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			\boxtimes	
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				\boxtimes

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

⁷⁶ County of Los Angeles Library, website: <u>https://lacountylibrary.org/library-locator/</u>, accessed March 2020.

⁷⁷ County of Los Angeles Library website: <u>https://lacountylibrary.org/aboutus/</u>, accessed March 2020.

As discussed in section *XV.(d) (Public Services)* above, the Project would increase demand for parks and recreational facilities in the Project area, and the City is currently not meeting the standard minimum parkland-to-population ratio provided in the La Verne Parks and Recreation Master Plan (i.e., 4 acres per 1,000 residents).⁷⁸ However, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level through the required payment of the impact fees and the Project would dedicate 10.75 acres of open space and, thus, expand the City's open space. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? **No Impact.**

The Project would provide approximately 10.75 acres of open space. Further, the Project's incremental demand would be negligible as discussed in section *XV.(d)* Public Services) above. The Project does not include, nor would it necessitate, a park or public recreational facility component, the construction of which could have an adverse environmental impact. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
x٧	/II. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			\boxtimes	
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion/management agency for designated roads or highways? ⁷⁹			\boxtimes	
C.	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
d.	Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	

The following information utilized in this section of the IS/MND is based on the *500 East Baseline Road Residential Trip Generation Analysis* (Traffic Study) prepared for the Project by Ganddini Group, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The Trip Generation Analysis is provided as *Appendix G* to this IS/MND.

⁷⁸ City of La Verne Parks Master Plan 2006, page 81.

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? **Less than Significant Impact.**

Baseline Road is an east-west major arterial generally serving the northern residential area of La Verne. There are two travel lanes in each direction, separated by a two-way left-turn median. There are sidewalks on both sides of the street and the posted speed is 40 miles per hour.

Baseline Road currently operates at an acceptable Level of Service per the City of La Verne General Plan Existing Conditions Report based on counts and analysis from November 2017. As shown in the Traffic Study (see Table 2-8 of *Appendix G*), Baseline Road roadway segment Level of Service A. As shown in the Traffic Study (see Table 2-9 of *Appendix G*), Baseline Road and Fruit Street intersection Level of Service A during the AM and PM peak hours.

Project Trip Generation

Table 15, Trip Generation Rates, shows the project trip generation rates shown obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition, 2017). Trip generation rates for the ITE Land Use "Single Family Housing - Detached" (Land Use Code 210) were utilized for weekday AM peak hour trips, PM peak hour trips, and daily trips for the proposed land use. The number of trips forecast to be generated by the proposed project is determined by multiplying the trip generation rates by the proposed land use quantity.

As shown in **Table 16, Project Trip Generation**, the Project is forecast to generate approximately 66 daily trips, including 5 trips during the AM peak hour and 7 trips during the PM peak hour.

Land Lloo	Seuree1	Source1	Sourcol	Sourcol	Sourcol	Linita ²	A	M Peak Ho	our	PM Pe	ak Hour		Daily
Lanu Ose	Source	Units	% In	% Out	Rate	% In	% Out	Rate	Rate				
Single-Family Detached Housing	ITE 210	DU	25%	75%	0.74	63%	37%	0.99	9.44				
 (1) Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017. (2) DU=Dwelling Unit 													

Table 15

	Tabl	e 16	
Project	Trip	Generation	1

Land Lloo	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity			AM			PM			
Lanu Use	Quantity	Units	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total					
Single-Family													
Detached	7	DU	1	4	5	4	3	7	66				
Housing													
(1) Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 10 th Edition, 2017.													
(2) DU=Dwelling Unit													

Criteria for The Preparation of Traffic Impact Analyses

The County of Los Angeles Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines (December 2013) states a traffic report is generally needed if a project generates over 500 trips per day or where the Department staff is concerned with possible adverse impacts on traffic.

As shown in Table 16, above, the project trip generation is forecast to generate 66 daily trips and further traffic analysis is typically not required based on the County of Los Angeles guidelines. Therefore, the Project can reasonably be presumed to result in a **less than significant impact** related to consistency with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and no mitigation would be required.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion/management agency for designated roads or highways? Less than Significant Impact.

California Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) directs the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for evaluating transportation impacts to provide alternatives to Level of Service that "promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses." In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the updated CEQA Guidelines package. The amended CEQA Guidelines, specifically Section 15064.3, recommend the use of Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) as the primary metric for the evaluation of transportation impacts associated with land use and transportation projects. Currently, agencies may opt-in to applying the updated CEQA guidelines for VMT analysis and implementation is required State-wide by July 1, 2020.

The updated CEQA Guidelines allow for lead agency discretion in establishing methodologies and thresholds provided there is substantial evidence to demonstrate that the established procedures promote the intended goals of the legislation. Where quantitative models or methods are unavailable, Section 15064.3 allows agencies to assess VMT qualitatively using factors such as availability of transit and proximity to other destinations. The Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (State of California, December 2018) ["Technical Advisory"] provides technical considerations regarding methodologies and thresholds with a focus on office, residential, and retail developments as these projects tend to have the greatest influence on VMT. Many jurisdictions are currently in the process of developing updated procedures for VMT analysis, however, few have fully implemented the new metric.

Project Assessment

The City of La Verne recently established VMT analysis procedures that are generally consistent with the guidance from the State's Technical Advisory. The City's guidelines provide the following potential screening criteria for certain land development projects that may be presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact:

- Retail projects up to 50,000 square feet in floor area.
- Small projects generating less than 110 trips per day.
- Residential and office projects located in areas with low-VMT, as define as 15 percent below the subarea VMT metrics for that area.
- Projects near transit stations or major transit stop.
- Residential projects with a high percentage of affordable housing.

Presumption of Less Than Significant VMT Impact for Small Projects

As noted in the Technical Advisory, CEQA Guidelines § 15301, subdivision (e)(2) provides a categorical exemption for existing facilities, including additions to existing structures of up to 10,000 square feet, so long as the project is in an area where public infrastructure is available to allow for maximum planned development and the project is not in an environmentally sensitive area. Typical project types for which trip generation increases relatively linearly with building footprint (i.e., general office building, single tenant office building, office park, and business park) generate or attract an additional 110-124 trips per 10,000 square feet. Therefore, absent substantial evidence otherwise, it is reasonable to conclude that the addition of 110 or fewer trips could be considered not to lead to a significant impact.

Consistent with State recommendations, the City of La Verne recommends that projects generating less than 110 daily trips may be screened out from VMT analysis.

The proposed development consists of an infill residential development that is forecast to generate 66 daily vehicle trips. Therefore, the Project can reasonably be presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact based on the City-established screening thresholds.

Conclusion

The Project is forecast to generate fewer than 500 daily trips or 50 peak hour trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Additionally, Baseline Road currently operates at Level of Service A in the project vicinity. Therefore, the Project is expected to result in a **less than significant** traffic impact and no mitigation would be required. The Project will result in a **less than significant** VMT impact based on the State-recommended screening thresholds and no mitigation would be required.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Less Than Significant Impact.

The Project includes roadway improvements to provide access from Baseline Road and Broken Spur Road. The access to the proposed dwelling units would be provided from two new paved roadway segments and paved driveways, including a 350-foot road extending north from Baseline Road and terminating in a cul-de-sac; a 200-foot road extending west from Broken Spur Road; and a 150-foot driveway parallel to Baseline Road and intersecting with the 350-foot road. The Project would also include a driveway leading to the debris basin to allow for maintenance.

The Project would be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities in accordance with applicable standards governing vehicular access. Demolition and construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures.

The Project would be subject to Community Development Director or designee review and approval prior to issuance of grading and building permits in accordance with Section 18.60.030 and Chapter 18.16 (Development Review) of the City Municipal Code to ensure a substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use would not occur. Therefore, Project impacts to geometric design features would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? Less than Significant Impact.

As discussed in section XVII. (*Transportation*) above, the Project would be required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities in accordance with applicable standards governing vehicular access. The Project would require construction activities that have the potential to require road closures or access limitations; however, the construction contractor would be required to implement traffic control measures that would ensure safe passage of vehicles in any construction zones and provide adequate emergency access.

All Project access and circulation design would be subject to review and approval by the City Fire and Police Departments, City Traffic Engineer, City Engineer, and Public Works Department during the City's review process (Chapter 18.16, Development Review). The fire chief may impose additional requirements to ensure protection of life and property, including, but not limited to additional fire hydrants, increased turnaround ability, increased sprinkler density and coverage, and additional means of access/egress. Through compliance with Section 18.68.030 of the City Municipal Code, 129 impacts related to emergency access would remain **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	 (i) 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), or 		\boxtimes		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(ii) 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.				

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) *Sacred Land File (SLF)* was completed for the 500 Baseline Road Single Family Residential and Annexation project. The SLF was prepared for the Project by the Native American Heritage Commission on February 26, 2020, which is hereby incorporated by reference. The results of the SLF are provided as *Appendix H* to this IS/MND.

Assembly Bill 52 ("AB 52"), signed into law on September 25, 2014, requires lead agencies to evaluate a project's potential to impact Tribal Cultural Resources ("TCR") and establishes a formal notification and, if requested, consultation process for California Native American Tribes as part of CEQA. TCR includes sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register or included in a local register of historical resources. AB 52 also gives lead agencies the discretion to determine, supported by substantial evidence, whether a resource qualifies as a TCR. Consultation is required upon request by a California Native American tribe that has previously requested that the City provide it with notice of such projects, and that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a project.

Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), signed into law on September 29, 2004, requires a City to consult with California Native American tribes for the purpose of preserving specified places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.995 of the Public Resources Code that are located within the city or county's jurisdiction prior to the adoption or amendment of a General Plan. Senate Bill (SB) 18 requires the Lead Agency (i.e., City of La Verne) to refer to the California Native American tribes specified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and to provide them with opportunities for consultation.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is 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)? Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

Please see response in section XVIII.(b) Tribal Cultural Resources below.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A 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)? Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

Under AB 52, if a lead agency determines that a project may cause a substantial adverse change to a TCR, the lead agency must consider measures to mitigate that impact. PRC Section 21074 provides a definition of a TCR. In brief, in order to be considered a TCR, a resource must be either: 1) listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, on the national, State, or local register of historic resources, or 2) a resource that the lead agency chooses, in its discretion supported by substantial evidence, to treat as a TCR. In the latter instance, the lead agency must determine that the resource meets the criteria for listing in the State register of historic resources or City Designated Cultural Resource. A TCR includes sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register or included in a local register of historical resources. A substantial adverse change to a TCR is a significant effect on the environment under CEQA In applying those criteria, a lead agency shall consider the value of the resource to the tribe.

AB 52 and SB 18 established a formal consultation process for California Native American Tribes to identify potential significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, as part of the CEQA environmental review process. As specified in AB 52 and SB 18, lead agencies must provide notice inviting consultation to California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if the Tribe has submitted a request in writing to be notified of proposed projects. In compliance with AB 52 and SB 18, an information letter was mailed to a total of seven Tribes known to have resources in the Project area on April 6, 2020 as part of the environmental review for the Project. These tribes include the following:

- Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation
- Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
- Gabrielino/Tongva Nation
- Gabrielino/Tongva Tribe
- Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians/Pauma & Yuma Reservation
- San Fernando Band of Mission Indians

On April 15, 2020, the City received a response from Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation). The response letter stated: "The above proposed project location is within our Ancestral Tribal Territory; therefore, our Tribal Government requests to schedule a consultation with you as the lead agency, to discuss the project and the surrounding location

in further detail." The City conducted tribal consultation with the Kizh Nation on November 19, 2020. The Kizh Nation agreed to the following mitigation measures and the City considers the consultation closed.

Mitigation Measures:

- MM TCR -1 The project applicant shall retain for the construction monitoring services of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh), who have expressed interest in consulting with the City pursuant to California Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1 and § 21080.3.2 and are listed under the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC's) Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. A Kizh monitor will be present on-site only during the construction phases that involve ground-disturbing activities. Ground-disturbing activities are defined as activities that include, but are not limited to: pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling and trenching within the project area. The Kizh monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that provide a description of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soils, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site Tribal monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities area completed, or when the Kizh representatives, in consultation with the City, have indicated that the site has a low potential for impact to Tribal Cultural Resources.
- **MM TCR-2** Upon discovery of any archaeological resource, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall ceased until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by the project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation (Kizh) monitor. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Kizh monitor shall coordinate with the landowner regarding the treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Kizh request reburial or preservation for educational purpose. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation occurs. If a discovery is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be a "historical resource" or "unique archaeological resources", a treatment plan shall be developed (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[f]) allowing for sufficient time and funding to identify and implement avoidance measures and/or appropriate mitigation.
- **MM TCR-3** For unique archaeological resources, preservation in place is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery extraction to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall, at the discretion of the landowner, be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest agreeing to accept in the materials. If no such institution agrees to accept the materials, they shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

MM TCR-4 Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98(d)(1)) defines Native American remains as "...an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness." Funerary objects, called "grave goods" shall be treated similarly according to this statute. These objects are those reasonably believed to have been placed with human remains either at the time of death; other items made exclusively for burial purposes; or contain human remains. The treatment of funerary objects shall be treated in the same manner as human remains.

Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) dictates that any discovery of human remains shall immediately be reported to the Los Angeles County Coroner, and excavation shall be halted until the Coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are those of a Native American, he or she, shall contact the NAHC and appropriate provisions of Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) shall be followed.

Upon discovery of human remains and/or associated grave goods, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh) monitor and/or archaeological monitor/ consultant shall immediately divert work a minimum of 150 feet and place an exclusion zone around the burial. The monitor/consultant(s) shall notify the Kizh Nation, the qualified lead archaeologist, and the construction manager who will call the Los Angeles County Coroner. The discovery shall be kept confidential and secure to prevent further disturbance.

Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the land owner shall arrange a designated site within the footprint of the project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or funerary objects. In cases where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains shall be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment to protect the remains. If this type of protection is not available, a 24-hour guard shall be posted outside of working hours. The Kizh monitor will make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. The Kizh monitor will work closely with the qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Kizh monitor, document shall be taken which includes at a minimum, detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Kizh monitor for data recovery purposes. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure complete recovery of all material.

Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred

objects and objects of cultural patrimony shall be removed to a secure container on site. These items shall be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Kizh monitor and the land owner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.

If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location shall be considered a cemetery, and a separate treatment plan shall be developed. Once complete, a final report of all activities shall be submitted to the Kizh Nation and the Native American Heritage Commission. The Kizh Nation does not authorize any scientific study or the utilization of invasive diagnostics on human remains.

MM TCR-5 Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction shall be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be taken. Principal personnel shall meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of ten years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified.

Upon publication of this Initial Study, no Native American Tribe other then Kizh Nation that was sent a letter on April 6, 2020 responded and request consultation with the City of La Verne regarding this Project Site. Adherence to Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-5 would ensure potential impacts to Native American resources are appropriately reduced to less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a.	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes	
b.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			\boxtimes	
C.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			\boxtimes	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			\boxtimes	
e.	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			\boxtimes	

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? Less than Significant Impact.

Water Facilities

The Project Site is currently outside the corporate boundaries of the City although within its Sphere of Influence.⁸⁰ Though the Project Site is outside the City's corporate boundaries, it's within the City's boundary area for water service.⁸¹ Implementation of the Project would involve annexation into the City of La Verne. The proposed seven lot subdivision would be served by the City of La Verne's Department of Public Works, Water and Utility Division for water service.

The Project would include the installation of new water lines in the Project Site's new road to serve Project lots 1 through 6 and connect to an existing water distribution line in Baseline Road. For lot 7, the project Applicant has proposed to located a new water meter and water line lateral from the project's proposed "A" Street up slope to the building. Project would require new fire hydrants. Furthermore, the demand and installation of new water supply lines and fire hydrants are evaluated and managed by the La Verne Department of Public Works, Water and Utility Division and Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD), respectively, under their own independent environmental analysis. As stated above, the Project would require construction of a new, on-site water distribution line to serve the Project. Impacts associated with the installation of water distribution lines would primarily involve trenching in order to place the water distribution line below surface and would be limited to on-site water distribution, and minor offsite work associated with connections to the public main lines in Baseline Road and Broken Spur Road. Prior to ground disturbance, Project contractors would coordinate with the La Verne Water and Utility Division of the Public Works Department to identify the locations and depth of all lines. The precise interconnection locations are determined at the precise plan stage, but they are expected to occur either on site or within existing utility service systems in areas already disturbed and developed with infrastructure. The City requires all line size modifications or interconnections to be designed in accordance with applicable provisions of the City Municipal Code and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Furthermore, La Verne Water and Utility Division would be notified in advance of

⁸⁰ City of La Verne Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Figure 1, Service Area Map, page 13, City of La. Verne, May 2016

⁸¹ Ibid.

proposed ground disturbance activities to avoid water lines and disruption of water service. Therefore, the construction of new water facilities would not cause significant environmental effects. Accordingly, impacts related to the construction of new water facilities would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Wastewater Facilities

Wastewater generated within the City of La Verne is collected in City sewers and discharged to a regional trunk sewer pipeline owned by Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts where it flows by gravity to either the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) or Pomona WRP.⁸² The San Jose WRP is located at 1965 Workman Mill Road, in unincorporated Los Angeles County, next to the City of Whittier. The San Jose WRP provides primary, secondary and tertiary treatment for 100 million gallons of wastewater per day (mgd) and serves a population of approximately one million.⁸³ The Pomona WRP provides primary, secondary and tertiary treatment for 15 mgd and serves a population of approximately 130,000.⁸⁴

The Project would include the installation of new sewer lines in the Project Site's new road to serve Project lots 1 through 6 and connect to an existing sewer line in Baseline Road. For lot 7, the project Applicant has proposed the lot's building pad be connected to the proposed sewer main that would be constructed within the project's proposed "A" Street. The precise interconnection locations are determined at the precise plan stage, but they are expected to occur either on site or within existing utility easements in areas already disturbed and developed with infrastructure. The City requires all line size modifications or interconnections to be designed in accordance with applicable provisions of the City Municipal Code and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. As of Fall 2019, the San Jose WRP had a capacity of 100 mgd and processed approximately 63.8 mgd with a surplus of approximately 36.2 mgd of wastewater treatment capacity.⁸⁵ The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts Loadings for Each Class of Land Use indicate a single family residence would generate approximately 260 gallons of wastewater per day.⁸⁶ The Project would generate approximately 1,820 gallons of wastewater per (gpd) or 0.0018 mgd.⁸⁷ The San Jose WRP has the capacity to accommodate the future flows from the Project's seven lot single-family subdivision. Therefore, the Project's estimated flow of 1.820 gpd would not require the construction of expansion of wastewater treatment facilities in which the construction would cause significant environmental effects.

⁸² Ibid., page 37.

⁸³ Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts website: <u>https://www.lacsd.org/services/wastewater/wwfacilities/joint_outfall_system_wrp/san_jose_creek.asp</u>, accessed Mach 2020.

⁸⁴ Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts website: <u>https://www.lacsd.org/services/wastewater/wwfacilities/joint_outfall_system_wrp/pomona.asp</u>, accessed March 2020.

⁸⁵ Brethren Hillcrest Homes Master Plan Update, Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, September 16, 2019.

⁸⁶ County of Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Table 1: Loadings for Each Class of Land Use, website: <u>https://www.lacsd.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=3531</u>, accessed, March 2020.

 $^{^{87}}$ 7 x 260 gallons per day = 1,820 gallons of wastewater per day.

Accordingly, impacts related to the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Stormwater Drainage Facilities

Refer to section X.(c)(iii) (Hydrology and Water Quality) above for a discussion of stormwater drainage facilities. As detailed there, the Project would alter the existing drainage patterns of the Site but would be required to comply with the requirements of the NPDES permit and Chapter 13.60 (Low Impact Development) of the City Municipal Code, which result in and require a reduction of the volume of runoff from the Project Site when compared to existing conditions. Although the Project would alter the drainage pattern of the Site and increase the amount of impervious surface, there would be a decrease in the volume and rate of surface runoff of 19.15 compared to existing conditions. Accordingly, the existing stormwater drainage would have sufficient capacity to receive the Project's post-development runoff. As such, stormwater runoff from the Project Site would not exceed the capacity of the existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and would not be expected to require the construction of new facilities. However, should the City determine improvements to the stormwater drainage system are necessary during the normal permit review process, the Applicant would be responsible for the improvements, and such improvements would be conducted as part of the \ Project either on-site or off-site within the right-of-way, and as such, any related construction activities would be temporary and of short duration. Therefore, the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Electric Power Facilities

The Southern California Edison SCE would supply the Project from the existing electrical system. However, the Project may require an on-site transformation facility and may require underground line extensions on public streets. All electrical facility installation and connection to the existing system would be done in coordination and under the approval of the SCE. Furthermore, the incorporation of the 2016 Title 24 standards into the Project would ensure that the Project would not result in the inefficient, unnecessary, or wasteful consumption of energy. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of expansion of electrical systems in which the construction would cause significant environmental effects. Accordingly, impacts related to the construction of new electrical connection systems would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Natural Gas Facilities

Southern California Gas Company (SoGC) would supply the Project from the existing natural gas facilities. However, the Project would require construction of new, on-site gas distribution lines to serve the new single family homes. Connection to existing natural gas facilities would be done in coordination with and under the supervision of SDG&E. Furthermore, the Project would comply with 2016 Title 24 energy conservation standards for insulation, glazing, lighting, shading, and water and space heating systems in all new construction. Therefore,

the construction of new natural Gas facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. Accordingly, Project impacts to natural gas facilities would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

Telecommunications Facilities

Construction-related activities, including grading and excavation, could encroach on telecommunication facilities. However, before construction begins, the Project Applicant would be required to coordinate with applicable regulatory agencies and telecommunication providers to locate and avoid or implement the orderly relocation of telecommunication facilities that need to be removed or relocated. Therefore, the relocation of new telecommunication facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. Accordingly, Project impacts to telecommunication facilities would be required.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? Less than Significant Impact.

As identified in section *XIX.(a) (Utilities and Service Systems)* above, the Project Site is currently outside the corporate boundaries of the City although within its Sphere of Influence.⁸⁸ Though the Project Site is outside the City's corporate boundaries, it's within the City's boundary area for water service.⁸⁹ Implementation of the Project would involve annexation into the City of La Verne. The proposed grading of approximately 5.59 acres (243,130 square feet) for the seven lot subdivision would be served by the City of La Verne's Department of Public Works, Water and Utility Division for water service.

The City's water domestic supply primarily comes from water purchased from the Three Valley Municipal Water District (TVMWD), a water wholesaler and one of 26 public agencies that comprise the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). The MWD imports water from two sources: the Colorado River (originating at Lake Havasu) and the State Water Project (originating at the Delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers). In addition, La Verne extracts groundwater from Six Basins in accordance with the Six Basins Judgment. The Six Basins include: 1) Canyon Basin; 2) Upper Claremont Heights Basin; 3) Lower Claremont Heights Basin; 4) Pomona Basin; 5) Live Oak Basin; and 6) Ganesha Basin. The Judgment ensures safe operating yield and avoids over-extraction of groundwater. According to the Six Basins Judgment, La Verne has an adjudicated right to 7.601 percent of the operating safe yield from Canyon Basin, Upper Claremont Heights, Lower Claremont Heights Basin. Per the Six Basins Judgment, La Verne also has "the right to produce as much groundwater as it may reasonably withdraw from the Two Basins Area on an annual basis so

⁸⁸ City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Figure 1, Service Area Map, page 13, City of La Verne, May 2016

⁸⁹ Ibid.

long as it does not substantially injure the rights of any other" parties identified in the Six Basins Judgment.90

As shown in Table 17, Actual Water Deliveries 2015 and Projected Water Deliveries Through 2035, water demand for La Verne's single-family residential uses totaled approximately 3,207 acre feet per year (AFY) in 2015 and is projected to reach 3,934 AFY in the year 2035. Overall water supply in the City is based on projections of the TVWMD and the adjudicated yield from the Six Basins. The City's supply and demand of water is detailed in Table 18, Normal Year Supply (2001) and Demand Comparison, Table 19, Single Dry Year (2001) Supply and Demand, and Table 20, Multiple Dry Year (2013-2015) Supply and Demand Comparison.

Table 17 Actual Water Deliveries 2015 and Projected Water Deliveries Through 2035										
	2015 (AFY)	2020 (AFY)	2025 (AFY)	2030 (AFY)	2035 (AFY)					
Single Family Residential	3,207	3,522	3,655	3,792	3,934					
Note: AFI = Acre Feet Per Year Source: City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urba Between 2010 and 2015, page 18 2035, page 19, City of La Verne M	n Water Manag 3, and Table 5, 4ay 2016	gement Plan, Ta Projected Wate	able 4, Actual V r Deliveries and	/ater Deliveries Losses betwee	and Losses en 2020 and					

Tab	le 18	
Supply (2001)	and Demand	Comparison

Normal Year Supply (2001) and Demand Comparison									
	2020	2025	2030	2035					
	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)					
Supply Totals	13,779	13,779	13,779	13,779					
Demand Totals	6,979	7,242	7,515	7,797					
Difference	6,800	6,537	6,264	5,982					
Note:									
AFI = Acre Feet Per Ye	ar								
Source:									
City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 27, Normal Year Supply (2001) and									
Demand Comparison, page 48, City of La Verne, May 2016									

Single Dry Year (2001) Supply and Demand							
	2020 (AFY)	2025 (AFY)	2030 (AFY)	2035 (AFY)			
Supply Totals	8.091	8,091	8,091	8,091			
Demand Totals	6,979	7,242	7,515	7,797			
Difference	1,112	849	576	294			
Note: AFI = Acre Feet Per Year Source:							

Table 19

⁹⁰ City of La Verne Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, page 34, City of La Verne, May 2016

Single Dry Year (2001) Supply and Demand							
	2020	2025	2030	2035			
	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)			
City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 28, Single dry Year (2001) and Demand							
Comparison, page 48, City of La Verne, May 2016							

Table 20

Multiple Dry Year (2013-2015) Supply and Demand Comparison							
		2020 (AFY)	2025 (AFY)	2030 (AFY)	2035 (AFY)		
First Year (2013)	Supply Totals	7,918	7,918	7,918	7,918		
	Demand Totals	6,979	7,242	7,515	7,797		
	Difference	939	676	404	122		
Second Year (2014)	Supply Totals	7,842	7,842	7,842	7,842		
	Demand Totals	6,979	7,242	7,515	7,797		
	Difference	863	600	328	46		
Third Year (2015)	Supply Totals	7,804	7,804	7,804	7,804		
	Demand Totals	6,979	7,242	7,515	7,797		
	Difference	825	562	290	8		
Note: AFI = Acre Feet Per Source: City of La Verne, Dr	Year aft 2015 Lirban Water Manao	iomont Plan, Tab	la 20. Multipla D	ny Voor (2013.)	2015) Supply		

Table 19Single Dry Year (2001) Supply and Demand

City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 29, Multiple Dry Year (2013-2015) Supply and Demand Comparison, page 49, City of La Verne, May 2016

As indicated in Tables 18, 19 and 20, water supplies are expected to be adequate to meet normal, single dray year and multiple dry year demand conditions through the UWMP's 2035 planning horizon. However, projected water supplies by the year 2035 under multiple dry years are marginally adequate to support demand, but purchase of imported water from the MWD is designed to ensure the projected demand would continue to be adequate.

Implementation of the Project on the Project Site would increase the City's (and Sphere of Influence area) population by 19 persons which is more than currently considered for the site based on existing land use designation. However, this increase is not considered substantial nor cumulatively overburdening of the community infrastructure and service capacity. Based on historic per capita water demand of 264 gpd,⁹¹ the Project would generate an annual demand of approximately 5.567 AFY.⁹²

As detailed in Tables 18, 19, and 20, La Verne would have sufficient water supply to support the Project anticipated water demand under a worst case scenario under the TVMWD and the adjudicated yield from the Six Basins with the exception of a third multiple dry year of drought in the year 2035. In the event that additional supplies would be needed, TVMWD can purchase water from MWD, whose water surplus substantially exceeds the demand

April 2021

⁹¹ City of La Verne, Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 14, City of La Verne, May 2016

 $^{^{92}}$ 264 gpd x 19 residents = 5,016 gallons multiply by 365/yr divided by 328,851/AF = 5.567 AFY.
anticipated by the Project, as indicated in Table 21, Average Year Supply and Demand Comparison, Table 22, Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison, and Table 23, Multiple Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison.

Table 21

Average Year Supply and Demand Comparison							
	2020 (AFY)	2025 (AFY)	2030 (AFY)	2035 (AFY)			
Supply Totals	3,448,000	3,550,000	3,658,000	3,788,000			
Demand Totals	1,860,000	1,918,000	1,959,000	2,008,00			
Difference	1,588,000	1,632,000	1,699,000	1,780,000			
Note: AFI = Acre Feet Per Ye Source: Draft 2015 Urban Wate June 2016	ar r Management Plan, Tab	ole 2-6, Average Year, j	page 2-17, Metropo	litan Water District,			

Table 22 Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison							
	2020 (AFY)	2025 (AFY)	2030 (AFY)	2035 (AFY)			
Supply Totals	2,584,000	2,686,000	2,775,000	2,905,000			
Demand Totals	2,005,000	2,066,000	2,108,000	2,160,000			
Difference	579,000	620,000	667,000	745,000			
Difference 579,000 620,000 667,000 745,000 Note: AFI = Acre Feet Per Year Source: Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 2-4, Single Dry-Year, page 2-15, Metropolitan Water District, June 2016							

1								
	2020	2025	2030	2035				
	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)				
Supply Totals	2,584,000	2,686,000	2,775,000	2,905,000				
Demand Totals	2,005,000	2,066,000	2,108,000	2,160,000				
Difference	579,000	620,000	667,000	745,000				
Note:								
AFI = Acre Feet Per Ye	ar							
Source:								
Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 2-4, Single Dry-Year, page 2-15, Metropolitan Water District,								
June 2016								

Table 23							
Multiple Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison							
2020 2025 2030 2035							
	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)	(AFY)			
Supply Totals	2,103,000	2,154,000	2,190,000	2,242,000			
Demand Totals	2,001,000	2,118,000	2,171,000	2,216,000			
Difference	102,000	36,000	19,000	26,000			
Note:							
AFI = Acre Feet Per Ye	ar						
Source:							
Draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, Table 2-5, Multiple Dry-Year, page 2-15, Metropolitan Water							
District, June 2016				-			

Through the combination of imported water from TVMWD and MWD and local groundwater extracted from Six Basins in accordance with the Six Basins Judgment, the City of La Verne would have sufficient water supplies to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would not require construction of new water facilities or expansion of water facilities, as capacity would be available to support the annexed Project Site and Project. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? **Less than Significant Impact.**

As stated in section *XIX.(a) (Utilities and Service Systems)* above, the sewage flow from operation of the Project would ultimately be conveyed to San Jose Creek WTP (or Pomona WTP), which has sufficient capacity for the Project. Therefore, Project impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Less than Significant Impact.

Waste Management Inc., provides waste collection services to residential and commercial uses in the City. Landfill availability is limited by several factors, including: (1) restrictions to accepting waste generated only within a particular landfill's jurisdiction and/or watershed boundary, (2) tonnage permit limitations, (3) types of waste, and (4) operational constraints. Planning to serve long-term disposal needs is constantly being conducted at the regional level (e.g., siting new landfills within the County and transporting waste outside the region).

The nearest land fill to the Project Site is the Azusa Land Reclamation County Landfill located at 1211 West Gladstone Street, in the City of Azusa. This facility includes 266 disposal acres, with a maximum permitted throughput of 8,000 tons per day, a maximum capacity of approximately 80.57 million cubic yards, and an estimated closure date of January 2045.⁹³

Construction of the Project would generate construction waste. Construction of the Project building is estimated to generate a total of approximately 77 tons of solid waste.⁹⁴ This forecasted solid waste generation is a conservative estimate as it assumes no reductions in solid waste generation would occur due to recycling. The construction and demolition waste would be delivered to certified construction and demolition waste processors where it would be recycled as feasible. Moreover, the Countywide Integrated Management Plan 2018 Annual Report concludes that there is current capacity of 163.4 million tons available throughout the County for the disposal of inert waste.⁹⁵ Therefore, the Project-generated construction waste of 77 tons would represent a very small percentage of the inert waste disposal capacity in the region.

During operation, the Project would generate solid waste that is typical of a single family residential use and would be consistent with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations regarding proper disposal. Based on a solid waste generation facto of 0.66 per

⁹³ Facility Site Summary Details: Azusa Land Reclamation Co. Landfill. CalRecycle website: <u>https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/19-AA-0013/</u>, accessed, March 2020.

⁹⁴ A construction waste generation rate of 4.44 pounds per square foot for residential construction was used. 35.430 square feet of residential construction multiplied by 4.44 pounds is 157,309 pounds (77 tons). Source: USEPA Report Construction and Demolition Materials Amount, Table 2-1, Summary of Residential Construction Job Site C & D Materials Survey, Average Generation Factor in the United States, 2003.

⁹⁵ Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan 2018 Annual Report, March 2020.

year per residential dwelling unit,⁹⁶ the Project would generate approximately 4.62 tons of additional solid waste per year.⁹⁷ AB 939 was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in the State to the maximum extent feasible. Specifically, AB 939 required cities and counties to identify an implementation schedule to divert 50 percent of the total waste stream from landfill disposal by 2000. AB 939 also required each city and county to promote source reduction, recycling, and safe disposal or transformation. All solid wastegenerating activities within the City, including the Project, would continue to be subject to the requirements set forth in AB 939. Therefore, it is assumed that the Project would divert 50 percent of its solid waste generated, thereby diverting this waste from landfills. Nonetheless, it is conservatively assumed that all 4.62 pounds per day of the Project's solid waste would be disposed of at regional landfills. The Azusa Land Reclamation County Landfill's permitted daily intake of 12,100 tons per day would have capacity to accept the daily operational waste generated by the Project under the existing permitted amount. Therefore, the Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state and local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Accordingly, Project impacts related to solid waste and solid waste reduction goals would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? Less than Significant Impact.

The Project would generate solid waste that is typical of a residential project, and would be required to be consistent with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding proper disposal. Additionally, the amount of solid waste that would be generated by the Project would be further reduced through source reduction and recycling programs (as required by AB 939 and AB 341). Therefore, Project impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX.	WILDFIRE . If located in or near state responsibilities areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:				
а.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
b.	Due to slope, prevailing wildfire risks, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire?				\boxtimes

 ⁹⁶ For consistency, the 0.66 generation factor was used in two other City of La Verne environmental documents: Hillcrest Master Plan Initial Study, 2019; and University of La Verne Facilities Master Plan Update EIR, 2016.
 ⁹⁷ For consistency, the 0.66 generation factor was used in two other City of La Verne Facilities Master Plan Update EIR, 2016.

 $^{^{97}}$ 7 dwelling units x 0.66 tons per unit per year = 4.62 tons of solid waste per year.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
C.	Require the installation or maintenance of associate 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?				\boxtimes
d.	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?		\boxtimes		

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Less Than Significant Impact.

The State Responsibility Area (SRA) is the area in the State where the State of California has the primary financial responsibility for the prevention and suppression of wildland fires. The SRA is comprised of over 31 million acres across the entire State to which the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) provides a basic level of wildland fire prevention and protection services. Lands in the SRA are based on vegetative cover and natural resource values. As a result of the Oakland Hills Fire of 1991, AB 337 was passed in 1992 requiring CAL FIRE to work with local governments to identify high fire hazard severity zones within local responsibility areas throughout each county in the State.

The Project Site is located in an undeveloped location immediately adjacent to the City of La Verne's suburban, residential area. The Project Site includes elevations of over 1,400 feet above mean sea level (amsl), the area in which the single family lots would be located is relatively flat with elevation varying approximately 1,205 amsl to 1,345 amsl. The Project Site is located in the State responsibility area.⁹⁸ Additionally, the Project Site is located in a very high fire hazard severity zone.⁹⁹ Furthermore, The City's General Plan Public Safety Element indicates that the Project Site is located in a very high fire hazard severity zone, and thus, having a potential risk for wildfire to occur.¹⁰⁰

As discussed in section XV. (Public Services/Fire) above, neither construction nor operation of the Project would impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan. Access for emergency service providers and evacuation routes would be maintained during construction and operation of the Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicle circulation routes and patterns, or impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way. The Project does not propose any hazardous land uses or off-site improvements that would

⁹⁸ California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, State Responsibility Area Viewer, available at: http://www.fire.ca.gov/firepreventionfee/sraviewer, accessed March 2019.

⁹⁹ California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map – Los Angeles County Viewer, available at: <u>https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6705/fhszs_map19.pdf</u>, accessed March 2019.

create elements or conditions that may potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with the adopted emergency response plan.

Construction of new homes in this area, designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, would incrementally increase the need for fire protection services, and the Project would have one access point for six lots with a long cul-de-sac for access to Baseline Road and one long driveway from Broken Spur Road for the seventh residential lot. However, access to all of these lots would be from a main roadway, Baseline Road. Further, first responders already patrol the Project vicinity and surrounding areas, compliance with California Vehicle Code 21806(A)(1) which requires all vehicles to yield to emergency vehicles would ensure implementation of the Project Site. Thus, the Project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Due to slope, prevailing wildfire risks, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire? **Less Than Significant Impact**.

The Project Site includes elevations of over 1,400 feet above mean sea level (amsl), however, the area in which the single family lots would be located is relatively flat with elevation varying approximately 1,205 amsl to 1,345 amsl. Implementation of the Project would not alter surrounding slopes within or near the Project Site.

Design and construction of the Project would be built in accordance with the 2019 CBC, which includes design features such as, ignition-resistant materials and incorporation of fire sprinklers, would minimize any risk of exposure of persons or property to wildfires. Adjacent wildlands to the north and east would potentially pose a wildfire threat for residents of the Project, so the Project would be required to comply with the requirements of Chapter 15.37 of the City Municipal Code: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Regulations. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant would be required to submit fuel modification plans to the City. The Project would be subject to special building standards, such as 2019 CBC and City Municipal Code, Chapter 15.37, which would reduce fire hazards to residents. Accordingly, adherence to these regulations, Project occupants exposure to wildfire risks and pollutant concentrations from a wildfire would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associate 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? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The Project Site is currently undeveloped and implementation of the Project would require the installation of a new road, driveways, water lines, wastewater facilities, electrical, gas and telecommunication facilities. The Project would include construction of a debris basin. Impacts associated with construction of these infrastructure facilities would be temporary but not ongoing. Nevertheless, the Project Site is located immediately adjacent to suburban development with existing single family homes that already served by the LVFD. The Project

proposes grading of the site for family lots to be located primarily on the parcel immediately adjacent to existing single family homes along Rodeo Lane, as well as along Baseline Road. These lots would be accessed from a new street via Baseline Road and one lot from an existing street, Broken Spur Lane. Since first responders already patrol the Project vicinity and surrounding areas, compliance with California Vehicle Code 21806(A)(1), which requires all vehicles to yield to emergency vehicles would ensure implementation of the Project would not adversely affect travel time between the nearest fire station and the Project Site. The infrastructure improvements would be contained within the Project Site with the exception of the Project's infrastructure would not exacerbate fire risk or result in ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant** and no mitigation measures would be required.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? **Less Than Significant**.

As discussed above, the Project Site is located in the State responsibility area and in a very high fire hazard severity zone. The Project Site is located in an undeveloped location immediately adjacent to the City of La Verne's suburban, residential area. The Project Site includes elevations of over 1,400 feet above mean sea level (amsl), the area in which the single family lots would be located is relatively flat with elevation varying approximately 1,205 amsl to 1,345 amsl.

As in section *X.(c)(ii)* (Hydrology and Water Quality) above, the proposed seven single-family lots would be developed in the southern portion of the Site. Surface water flows in the northern portion of the Project Site (Area A) currently drain in a southwesterly direction to a channel along the western property line. Surface flows in the southern portion of the Site (Areas B and C) currently drain to the Caltrans channel along Baseline Road adjacent to the southern boundary of the Site. The Project would not alter the drainage pattern of Area A. However, as a result of Project implementation, the Project would add approximately 1.67 acres of impervious surfaces and direct flow into a debris basin and catch basins which would direct the flows to existing Caltrans channel along Baseline Road. Further Standard Condition HYD-3 would require installation of LID BMPs to capture and retain stormwater flow and would not increase stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the Project would not cause downslope or downstream flooding.

The seven single family lots would be developed on the flatter portions of the Project Site with an elevation of varying approximately 1,205 amsl to 1,345 amsl. Implementation of the Project would not be altering slopes in which conditions would be altered resulting in potential landslides or providing slope instability post fire conditions. Therefore, the Project's the potential to expose people or structures to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides would be low. Accordingly, the Project's impact with regard to flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage change within State responsibility areas or very high fire hazard severity zones would **be less than significant** with implementation of standard condition **SD HYD-3**.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mit.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Would the project:				
a.	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to decrease 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 major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b.	Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means the project's incremental effects are considerable when compared to the past, present, and future effects of other projects)?			\boxtimes	
C.	Does the project have environmental effects which will have substantial adverse effects on human beings, directly or indirectly?			\boxtimes	

a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to decrease 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 major periods of California history or prehistory? Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The Project would alter the existing undeveloped conditions of the approximately 19.44-acre Site through grading activities to accommodate the proposed single family residential development. Specifically, approximately 5.59 acres (243,130 square feet) of the parcel would be subdivided into seven lots, each containing a single-family dwelling unit and attached garage; an additional 8th lot would be designated as a debris basin (approximately 2.66 acres), and a 9th lot comprising approximately 10.75 acres would be dedicated to open space. Access to the proposed dwelling units would be provided from two new paved roadway segments and paved driveways totaling 1.1-acre, including, a 350-foot road extending north from Baseline Road and terminating in a cul-de-sac; a 200-foot road extending west from Broken Spur Road; a 150-foot driveway parallel to Baseline Road and intersecting with the 350-foot road; and a driveway leading to the debris basin.

Construction activities would include grading and other Site preparation work, dwelling unit construction, installation of associated utilities, and construction and paving of roadway segments and driveways. Grading and soil stabilization would occur at the location of the proposed dwelling units, the slopes surrounding the dwelling units, and in the locations of the proposed roadway segments and driveways for a total of 3.6 acres, including the location of the proposed debris basin. In accordance with the fuel modification requirements of the City of La Verne and Los Angeles County Fire Departments, vegetation within 200 feet of buildings (a total of 3.7 acres would be removed).

A significant impact could occur only if a project would have an identified potentially significant impact for any of the above issues, as discussed in the preceding sections. The Project is located in an urbanized area of La Verne with single-family residential neighborhood immediately west of the Site along Rodeo Lane.

As discussed in section *IV Biological Resources*, the Project Site is undeveloped and implementation of the Project would directly impact a total of 8.47 acres of plant communities (4.73 acres of direct development impacts and 3.74 acres of fuel modification impact). Based on the results of the focused rare plant survey of the Project Site, no rare or protected plants occur in the plant community areas that would be impacted by the development or fuel modification activities of the Project. However, based on the animal inventory and field reconnaissance conducted at the Site, a total of 14 special status animals are likely to occur within the habitats identified at the Project Site, including four reptiles, four mammals, and six birds, including the Coastal California Gnatcatcher, which is federally listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-1**, **Preconstruction Surveys** is required to identify and relocate any reptiles or mammals from vegetation to be cleared immediately prior to its removal during initial site preparation.

Numerous birds have the potential to nest on the Project Site and these species and their nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-2** requires a nesting bird survey be conducted within any vegetation to be removed and within a 500-foot buffer should construction activities occur between March 1 and August 31. Mitigation measure **MM BIO-3** requires that a specific survey to determine the presence or absence of coastal California gnatcatchers be conducted within 30 days of the start of construction.

In addition, development and fuel modification activities associated with the Project would permanently remove 1.24 acres of coast prickly pear scrub, which serves as habitat for coastal cactus wren. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-4**, **Coast Prickly Pear Nesting Habitat Avoidance**, is provided that requires the preservation of coast prickly pear habitat to the extent possible.

The Project would directly impact 706 linear feet of streambed and 1.49 acres of canyon live oak forest, which has the same characteristics as the Canyon Live Oak Ravine Forest designated as a sensitive natural community by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-5 Streambed Alteration Agreement**, is provided that the Project obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to contain reasonable measures necessary to protect resources and reduce the Project's impacts to Drainages 2 and 3 and the canyon live oak forest to less than significant levels.

The Project Site is located within the urban-wildlife interface. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-6**, **Nighttime Lighting** is provided which requires Project lighting to be directed away from native habitat and prevented from spilling onto adjacent areas. Prevention of light spillover onto native habitats would reduce impacts from night lighting to less than significant levels.

In addition, the Project Site contains numerous trees. There are no Heritage trees located on or adjacent to the Project Site, however, there are 119 Significant trees located on and 1 Significant tree located adjacent to the Project Site. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-***7*, **Dead Tree Removal**, is provided which requires that trees identified as dead are verified as dead and properly marked and their removal monitored. In addition to the dead trees, four additional Significant coast live oak trees (Tree Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49) would be removed as part of grading and development of the Project. The removal of Significant trees is considered a significant impact. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-8**, **Significant Tree Removal**, is provided that requires adequate replacement and monitoring of these Significant trees to be removed.

The remaining 85 Significant trees would be subject to protective measures. Compliance with the applicable policies of the City Municipal Code protecting Significant trees is codified in standard condition **SC BIO-1** and requires construction plans to be reviewed by the City to ensure protection of Significant trees on site.

Construction activities would encroach on the canopies and root zones of 20 Significant trees. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-9**, **Significant Tree Protection**, is provided that requires a certified arborist determine that Tree Safety Zone for all Significant trees that would be encroached provide protective fencing around Significant trees.

During operation of the Project, maintenance of the debris basin and fuel modification activities associated with fire protection requirements could result in changes to the existing grade, alteration of the water table/site drainage, and pruning of Significant tree canopies within 200 feet of proposed residences (Tree Nos. 5, 10, 19, 22, 27, 31, 44, and 45), all of which can have detrimental effects on the health or structure of the tree. Accordingly, mitigation measure **MM BIO-10, Maintenance and Fuel Modification Procedures,** is provided requiring pruning of Significant trees be done by a certified arborist in compliance with ISA Pruning Guidelines, best management practices and American National Standards Institute pruning standards.

Implementation of mitigation measures **MM BIO-1** through **MM BIO-1**0 would reduce potentially significant impacts to biological resources. These measures are designed to reduce impacts to plant communities, special status animals and habitats, nesting birds (California Gnatcatcher and Coast Prickly Pear habitat), as well as resources in streambeds, wildlife connectivity and impacts to significant trees.

As discussed in subsection *V Cultural Resources*, implementation of the Project would include ground disturbing activities, such as grading of the Site for the seven lot single family homes and a debris basin, new road and driveways. As such, the possibility exists that previously unknown archaeological artifacts may be present. To reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources that may be inadvertently discovered during construction, and significant impacts to these resources could occur. Accordingly, to address this impact, mitigation measure **MM CR-1**, Archaeological Resources is required. This measure requires avoidance if there is an inadvertent discovery until a significance determination can be made by a qualified archaeologist, and adherence to appropriate measures if the find is determined

to be significant under CEQA. As such, implementation of this measure would be reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant.

As discussed in section XVIII Tribal Cultural Resources. In compliance with AB 52 and SB 18. an information letter was mailed to a total of seven Tribes known to have resources in the Project area on April 6, 2020 as part of the environmental review for the Project. On April 15, 2020, the City received a response from Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation). To be conservative, this Initial Study included mitigation measure MM TCR-1 to include on-site Tribal monitoring during construction phases. Mitigation measure MM TCR-2 was provided to assess the discovery of any archaeological resources found on site during construction and to be assessed by a qualified archaeologist and the Tribal monitor of the resources origin and coordinate treatment of the found resource(s). For unique archaeological resources found, mitigation measure **MM TCR-3** is provided to identify the preferred manner of treatment of those resources. Upon discovery of human remains and/or associated grave goods, mitigation measure **MM TCR-4** is provided in which these resources are discovered, the Tribe monitor and/or archaeological monitor/ consultant be involved to protect the resource on site and determine appropriate protection and recovery measures. Finally, mitigation measure **MM TCR-5** is provided to ensure that archaeological and Native American monitoring, if needed, would be consistent with current professional standards. Implementation of these measures would reduce these impacts to these resources to less than significant levels.

b) Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means the project's incremental effects are considerable when compared to the past, present, and future effects of other projects)? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Because construction impacts such as noise, dust, exhaust emissions, construction traffic, utility connections on adjacent streets, etc., are temporary and highly localized, a potential for significant cumulative construction impacts is rare, unless other pending projects nearby are expected to be under construction at the same time. At this time, no construction projects are known or planned within 500 feet of the proposed seven residential lots and the Project's debris basin. The Project's temporary construction emissions were evaluated with respect to SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds, which were established as a way to determine when an individual project's emissions could result in cumulatively considerable effects on air quality. As discussed in section *III Air Quality*, the Project's construction emissions would be below all regional significance thresholds and would not be cumulatively considerable. The Project would not have cumulatively considerable construction-related impacts.

Noise impacts associated with construction activities are regulated by the City's noise ordinance. The proposed Project and any proposed or planned development project would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Noise Ordinance, which prohibits operating or causing the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, or demolition work between the weekday hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, or at any time on Sundays or holidays, such that the sound therefrom creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial real-property line (except for public-service utilities emergency work or by variance issued by the health officer). Therefore, the Project's

contribution to noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the Project would not have cumulatively considerable noise construction (or operation) related impacts.

Projects involving direct and permanent site alterations such as clearance of existing landscape elements, earthmoving, and site preparation are highly localized, rarely affecting any other land resources off site. Consequently, impacts involving removal of natural vegetation wildlife habitat is normally limited to the site itself, unless the range of a sensitive species becomes more severely limited and the sustainability of that species becomes imperiled. The biological assessment conducted for this Project (see subsection *IV Biological Resources*) determined that implementation of the Project would have potentially significant impacts associated with plant and animal wildlife, including nesting birds, special status animals, significant trees, and Project Site drainage courses. However, implementation of mitigation measures MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-10 would reduce these impacts to **less than significant** (see *XXI Mandatory Findings of Significance (a)*, above). The Project's biological resources impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Demand for water and sewer services, parkland, recreation resources and public services, as well as the added vehicle traffic, would burden public facilities off-site that already serve other land uses and are intended to serve future growth, including the Project. Thus, one project's incremental demand impact may be relatively minor but could be sufficient to exceed the service capacity of a community scale facility or result in significant traffic congestion, which would be considered a cumulatively significant impact. In the assessments of its impacts involving water and sewer services, schools, parkland, recreation and public services, the Project's impacts were determined to be less than significant on a project level. No capacity deficiencies or other potentially significant impacts to the affected systems have been identified. The City's existing long-range planning and project-level review programs adequately address potential cumulative impacts due to ongoing growth in the City of La Verne.

In the analysis of traffic impacts for this Initial Study (see subsection *XVII Transportation*), the Project is forecast to generate approximately 66 daily trips, including 5 trips during the AM peak hour and 7 trips during the PM peak hour. The County of Los Angeles Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines (December 2013) states a traffic report is generally needed if a project generates over 500 trips per day or where the Department staff is concerned with possible adverse impacts on traffic. Additionally, Baseline Road currently operates at Level of Service A in the project vicinity. Therefore, the Project is expected to result in a **less than significant** traffic impact and no mitigation would be required. Also, the City of La Verne has not established VMT analysis procedures at this time; therefore, the project-related VMT impact has been assessed qualitatively based on guidance from the State's Technical Advisory and review of VMT policies established by early adopters. The Project's estimated 66 daily vehicle trips falls below the State's screening criteria of 110 trips per day for small projects. Therefore, the Project can reasonably be presumed to result in a **less than significant** VMT impact based on the State-recommended screening thresholds.

c) Have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? **Less Than Significant Impact.**

In general, impacts to human beings are associated with air quality, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality and noise impacts. As discussed in *III Air Quality*, the South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Implementation of the Project would not contribute significant amounts of air pollutant emissions on either a short-term or long term basis. Adherence to SCSQAMD dust control measures will further reduce short-term construction air quality impacts and no project-specific mitigation is required.

As discussed in subsections *IX* Hazards and Hazardous Materials, *X* Hydrology and Water *Quality*, and *XVII* Transportation, of this IS/MND, the Project would not expose persons to hazardous materials, or wastes, flooding or transportation hazards. Section *VII* Geology and Soils explains that residents and visitors to the Project could be exposed to strong seismic earth shaking due to the potential for earthquakes in Southern California. The soils and geologic conditions on the site would be alleviated through required compliance with the California Building Code. Construction plans would be subject to review by the City for compliance with the most current edition of the CBC at the time of construction. Thus, the Project would not result in adverse effects on human beings from geotechnical considerations.

The Project construction is not anticipated to exceed the City noise standards at the surrounding single-family residential uses. Further, with compliance with the City's Municipal Code, it is assumed that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours. Impacts related to construction noise would be reduced with adherence to the above Municipal Ordinances and implementation of the mitigation measure **MM NOI-1** which directs use of noise shielding devices, stationary equipment be situated away from noise sensitive receptors, etc. With implementation of **MM NOI-1**, impacts would be less than significant.

Existing residential dwelling units are located as close as approximately 25 feet to the west of the Project Site. Therefore, an impact could occur if a vibratory roller or other similar vibratory equipment is utilized within one foot of the western property line of the proposed project, adjacent to existing residential structures. Project impacts related to construction vibration would be reduced with implementation of the mitigation measure **MM NOI-2** which limits the hours of construction and provides measures to reduce vibration by placing equipment away from noise sensitive receptors, shielding devices on equipment, etc. Therefore, Project Impacts to construction vibration would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

Therefore, the Project would not create environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

16. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for use in implementing mitigation for the **Baseline Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project**.

The program has been prepared in compliance with State law and the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for the project by the City of La Verne (City).

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires adoption of a reporting or monitoring program for those measures placed on a project to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resource Code Section 21081.6). The law states the reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. The monitoring program contains the following elements:

- 1) The mitigation measures are recorded with the action and procedure necessary to ensure compliance. In some instances, one action may be used to verify implementation of several mitigation measures.
- A procedure for compliance and verification has been outlined for each action necessary. This procedure designates who will take action, what action will be taken and when, and to whom and when compliance will be reported.
- 3) The program has been designed to be flexible. As monitoring progresses, changes to compliance procedures may be necessary based upon recommendations by those responsible for the program. As changes are made, new monitoring compliance procedures and records will be developed and incorporated into the program.

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program includes mitigation identified in the MND.

Mitigation Monitoring and Responsibilities

As the Lead Agency, the City is responsible for ensuring full compliance with the mitigation measures adopted for the proposed project. The City will monitor and report on all mitigation activities. Mitigation measures will be implemented at different stages of development throughout the project site. In this regard, the responsibilities for implementation have been assigned to the Applicant, Contractor, or a combination thereof. If during the course of project implementation, any of the mitigation measures identified herein cannot be successfully implemented, the City shall be immediately informed, and the City will then inform any affected responsible agencies. The City, in conjunction with any affected responsible agencies, will then determine if modification to the project is required and/or whether alternative mitigation is appropriate.

Standard Conditions

Standard Conditions are presented in instances where the proposed project would not create a significant impact but would be required to adhere to regulatory requirements in order to ensure impacts do not become significant. Standard Conditions outline compliance with various federal, State, and/or local acts, laws, rules, regulations, municipal codes, etc.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakł	noury
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
	Bio	ological Resource	<u>S</u>		<u>.</u>
MM BIO-1 Preconstruction Surveys . Prior to removal of native plant communities, a preconstruction survey for reptiles and mammals shall be conducted to identify protected species and remove them from the development site. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and any reptiles or mammals relocated shall be moved or directed to an area that is at least 100 feet from any future impacts. The survey shall be timed to occur immediately prior to the removal of vegetation during initial site preparation prior to construction.	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits. Immediately prior to the removal of vegetation during initial site preparation prior to construction	Evidence to the City: The required pro- construction surveys of reptiles and mammals have been completed		Withhold grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order
MM BIO-1 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement and Riparian and Scrub Habitat Replacement. a. The project applicant must provide notification to CDFW pursuant Fish and Game Code, section 1600 et seq. to determine whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. The application requires an online submittal at CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program website 1 Environmental Information Management System (EPIMS)	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to issuance of construction or grading permits	Evidence to the City: <u>1) A Streambed Alteration</u> <u>Agreement from the</u> <u>California Department of</u> <u>Fish and Wildlife</u> <u>2) The LSA should include a</u> <u>hydrology report</u> <u>3) A mitigation plan to be</u> <u>submitted to CDFW and</u> <u>to the City</u> <u>4) Evidence that mitigation</u> <u>lands have been acquired</u> <u>as stipulated in the MM</u> <u>BIO-1</u>		Withhold construction permit /or issuance of a stop work order

Pr	oject Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
P	oject			Deter	A	
		Posponsiblo		Date:		Sanctions for
	Mitigation Measure No /Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
	Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
	Permitting Portal. LSA Notification should			5) Evidence of the creation		
	occur prior to the City's issuance of a			of a conservation		
	grading permit.			easement as stipulated in		
	<u></u>			MM BIO-1		
<u>b.</u>	The LSA Notification should include a					
	hydrology report to evaluate whether					
	altering streams within the Project's					
	development, grading, and fuel					
	modification zones could impair headwater					
	streams, and should include a scour					
	analysis to demonstrate that stream banks					
	and streambed would not erode as a result					
	of impacts downstream. The hydrology					
	report should also include a hydrological					
	evaluation of the 200, 100, 50, 25, 10, 5,					
	and 2-year frequency storm event for					
	existing and proposed conditions.					
<u>C.</u>	Recommended mitigation for the impacts					
	to streams and coast live oak riparian					
	forest should include replacement of					
	habitat up to 5:1 for the permanent impacts					
	from development and 3:1 for impacts from					
	fuel modification that would not result in the					
	loss of habitat but would result in the					
	alteration of the understory habitat.					
4	Recommended mitigation for the impacts					
<u>u.</u>	to coast prickly poor corub and lourd					
	to coast prickly pear scrup and laurer					
	sumac scrud naditats should include					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fa	nily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			5.4	A	
	Describle		Date:	April 2021	Constitute for
Mitigation Massure No. (Implementing	Responsible	Timing of		Varified	Sanctions for
	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
replacing habitat at no less than 1:1 for al	Monitoring	vermeation	Method of Vermication	Date/Initials	Compliance
temporary and permanent impacts	-				
temporary and permanent impacts.					
e. Mitigation lands should be acquired					
immediately adjacent to the Project's					
10.75-acres of dedicated open space and					
preserve in perpetuity as one contiguous					
parcel if possible. Mitigation lands should					
be located away from the Project's fue					
modification zone. If additional acres are					
not available for purchase that support					
suitable replacement habitats, it is					
recommended that mitigation lands be					
acquired that expand the footprint of the					
Marshall Canyon Conservation Corridor	•				
and enhance wildlife habitat, corridors, and					
diversity. It is recommended that the City					
consider coordinating with the La Verne					
Land Conservancy to identify and select					
appropriate mitigation lands that suppor					
streams and coast live oak forest, as wel					
as coast prickly pear and laurel sumac					
scrub habitats.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
t. Mitigation lands should be protected in					
dedicated to a local land conservation easement					
other appropriate entity that has been	-				
approved to hold and manage mitigation					
lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094					
(2012), Assembly Bill 1094 amended					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
Government Code sections 65965-65968. Under Government Code section 65967(c), the lead agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the qualifications of a governmental entity, special district, or nonprofit organization to effectively manage and steward land, water, or natural resources on mitigation lands it approves. An appropriate non- wasting endowment should be provided for the long-term management of mitigation lands. A mitigation plan should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values in perpetuity from direct and indirect negative impacts. Issues that should be addressed include, but are not limited to, restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, and increased human intrusion. A conservation easement and endowment funds should be fully acquired, established, transferred, or otherwise executed prior to the City's issuance of a grading permit.					
MM BIO-2 Phased Rare Plant Surveys and Impact Mitigation. . a. Grading and vegetation removal on the steep slopes with dense vegetation in the . coast live oak forest and laurel sumac . shrubland should be conducted in a . systematic and phased manner that would . allow a botanist to survey the area for rare .	<u>Community</u> <u>Development</u> <u>Director or</u> <u>designee</u>	Prior to issuance of construction permits	<u>Evidence to the City:</u> <u>1) Evidence of</u> <u>communications have</u> <u>been made to CDFW</u> <u>and/or USFWS</u> <u>2) A rare plant mitigation</u> <u>plan prepared by a</u> <u>qualified botanist and</u>		<u>Issuance of</u> <u>stop work</u> <u>order</u>

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Dete	A	
	Deenensible		Date:	April 2021	Sanationa for
Mitigation Measure No /Implementing	for	Timing of		Varified	Sanctions for
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
plants before proceeding with complete	monitoring	Vermouteri	submitted to the City's	Dato, initialo	Compliance
grading or vegetation clearing down to			Community Development		
bare ground. Special consideration should			Department.		
be given to areas that were previously					
inaccessible that could become accessible					
during grading and vegetation removal					
activities. This includes areas of steep					
terrain, dense vegetation, and dense					
poison oak.					
b. If rare plants are found, all work in the					
immediate area should stop under the					
direction of a qualified botanist. Depending					
on the species, work may not resume until					
the proper notifications have been made to					
CDFW and/or USFWS and/or a qualified					
botanist prepares and submits a rare plant					
mitigation plan to the City in order to					
mitigate for impacts to rare plants.					
c. If a CESA- or ESA-listed threatened or					
endangered plant species is detected, the					
City should fully avoid impacts and notify					
CDFW and/or USFWS. A qualified					
biologist should develop a robust					
avoidance plan. The plan should include					
effective, specific, enforceable, and					
feasible measures. If CRPR 1, 2, 3, and 4					
species are detected, CDFW recommends					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Deter	Amril 2024	
	Posponsiblo		Date:		Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No /Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
the City fully avoid impacts and notify					
CDFW of CRPR 1 and 2 species.					
d. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a					
species protected by CESA to be					
significant without mitigation under CEQA.					
As to CESA, take of any endangered,					
threatened, candidate species that results					
from the project is prohibited, except as					
authorized by State law (Fish & G. Code,					
<u>§§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §</u>					
786.9). Consequently, if the project, project					
construction, or any project-related activity					
for the duration of the project will result in					
a take of a species designated as					
endangered or threatened, or a candidate					
for listing under CESA, CDFW					
recommends the City seek appropriate					
take authorization under CESA prior to					
implementing/continuing the project.					
Appropriate authorization from CDFW may					
include an Incidental Take Permit or a					
Consistency Determination in certain					
circumstances, among other options [Fish					
<u>& G. Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b)</u>					
and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged,					
as significant modification to a project and					
mitigation measures may be required to					
obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the					
Fish and Game Code, effective January					

Ρ	roject Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
P	roject			Data	April 2021	
		Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
	Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
	Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
	<u>1998, may require that CDFW issue a</u>					
	separate CEQA document for the issuance					
	of an ITP unless the project CEQA					
	document addresses all project impacts to					
	CESA-listed species and specifies a					
	mitigation monitoring and reporting					
	program that will meet the requirements of					
	an ITP. For these reasons, biological					
	mitigation monitoring and reporting					
	proposals should be of sufficient detail and					
	resolution to satisfy the requirements for a					
	<u>CESA ITP.</u>					
	If the project cannot feasibly avoid impacts					
<u>c</u> .	to CPPP species and babitat, either during					
	to CRER species and habitat, either during					
	project activities of over the line of the					
	project, the City should compensate for the					
	habitat at a ratio comparable to the					
	project's level of impacts. Mitigation ratios					
	should increase with impacts to a CPPP 2					
	should increase with impacts to a CRFR 2					
	impacts to a CPPP 1 species					
	impacts to a CIVERY Especies.					
f.	If the project proposes to set aside					
	replacement habitat to be protected in					
	perpetuity, mitigation lands should be in					
	the same watershed as the project site and					
	contains the rare plant species and habitat					
	impacted. Replacement habitat should					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	nily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Data	April 2021	
	Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
have similar vegetation composition,					
density, coverage, and species richness					
and abundance as the habitat impacted.					
MM BIO-3 Reptile and Mammal	<u>Community</u>	Prior to	Evidence to City:		Withhold
Surveys and Protection/Relocation	<u>Development</u>	issuance of			issuance of
Plan.	Director or	construction	1) Copies of handling		construction or
a Pursuant to the California Code of	designee	permits	Agreement issued by		<u>grading</u>
Regulations Title 14 Section 650 the			CDFW		or stop work
City/qualified biologist must obtain			2) Copy of a Scientific		order
appropriate handling permits to capture.			Collecting Permit issued		
temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife			by CDFW		
to avoid harm or mortality in connection			3) Focused surveys for SSC		
with project construction and activities.			from ground-breaking		
Please visit CDFW's Scientific Collection			activities have been		
Permits webpage2 for information. An LSA			completed		
Agreement may provide similar take or			4) Daily biological monitoring		
possession of species as described in the			during any activities		
conditions of the agreement (see			clearing or modification of		
Mitigation measure MM BIO-1).			natural habitat have been		
			completed		
b. CDFW has the authority to issue permits			5) A summary report of		
for the take or possession of wildlife,			SSC surveys prepared by		
including mammals; birds, nests, and			<u>qualified biologist to the</u>		
eggs; reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants;			6) Oualified Biologist to		
and invertebrates (Fish & G. Code, §§			prepare a worker		
2019 a Scientific Collecting Derry this			environmental awareness		
zoro, a Scientific Collecting Permit is			training program		
wildlife recourses as required by			7) A formal report sent to		
wildlife resources, as required by			CDFW and to the City		

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project				A	
	Deeneneible		Date:	April 2021	Sonotiono for
Mitigation Measure No /Implementing	for	Timing of		Varified	Sanctions for Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
environmental documents, permits, or	litering	Terneuter	within three calendar days	Dutorinitiaio	Compliance
other legal authorizations: and, to capture.			of an incident of an		
temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife			incident involving and/or		
to avoid harm or mortality in connection			finding of a special-status		
with otherwise lawful activities (Cal. Code			mammal		
Regs., tit. 14, § 650).					
<u></u>					
c. The City should retain a qualified					
biologist(s) with experience surveying for					
or is familiar with the life history of each of					
the following species: southern California					
legless lizard, California glossy snake,					
orange-throated whiptail, coast whiptail,					
<u>coast horned lizard, San Diego desert</u>					
woodrat, and San Diego black-tailed					
jackrabbit. The qualified biologist should					
conduct focused surveys for Species of					
Special Concern (SSC) and suitable					
habitat no more than one month from the					
start of any ground-disturbing activities or					
vegetation removal where there may be					
impacts to SSC. In addition, the qualified					
biologist should conduct daily biological					
monitoring during any activities involving					
vegetation clearing or modification of					
natural habitat. Positive detections of SSC					
and suitable habitat at the detection					
location should be mapped and					
photographed. The qualified biologist					
should provide a summary report of SSC					

Pr	oject Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Pr	oject			Data	April 2021	
		Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
	Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
	Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
	surveys to the City prior to implementing					
	any project-related ground-disturbing					
	activities and vegetation removal.					
	<u>Depending on the survey results, a</u>					
	qualified biologist should develop species-					
	specific mitigation measures for					
	implementation during the project.					
Ь	The City in consultation with a qualified					
<u>u.</u>	hiologist should prepare a worker					
	environmental awareness training The					
	qualified biologist should communicate to					
	workers that upon encounter with a SSC					
	(e.g., during construction or equipment					
	inspections), work must stop, a qualified					
	biologist must be notified and work may					
	only resume once a qualified biologist has					
	determined that it is safe to do so.					
<u>e.</u>	If any SSC are harmed during relocation or					
	a dead or injured animal is found, work in					
	the immediate area should stop					
	immediately, the qualified biologist should					
	be notified, and dead or injured wildlife					
	documented. A formal report should be					
	sent to CDFW and the City within three					
	calendar days of the incident or finding.					
	Work in the immediate area may only					
	resume once the proper notifications have					
	been made and additional mitigation					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	oury
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action measures have been identified to prevent additional injury or death.	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM BIO-24 Nesting Bird and Raptor Surveys. Construction should be timed to occur between September 1 – January 31 to avoid impacts to nesting birds. If the Project occurs between March January 1 – August 31, a nesting bird and raptor survey shall be conducted within the area where project activities will occur were vegetation will be removed and a surrounding 500-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and shall be timed to occur no more than 72-hours prior to removal of vegetation project activities (i.e., staging, mobilization, excavation, grading). If active bird nests are identified they shall be avoided by a 300-foot buffer for raptors and other special-status species. No work buffers may be reduced at the discretion of a monitoring biologist, however, if the buffer is reduced the biologist shall must monitor the nest during all work activities that occur within the reduced buffer area. The no-work buffer may be removed when the nest is determined to no longer be active or the young have left the nest, as determined by a qualified biologist.	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits. Within 72 hours prior to the removal of vegetation project activities (i.e., staging, mobilization, excavation, grading) during initial site preparation prior to construction	Evidence to the City: The required pre- construction surveys of nesting birds have been completed between March <u>January</u> 1 and August 31 (if project construction is to occur within that timeframe)		Withhold grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order
MM BIO-5 White-Tailed Kite Focused Surveys and Nest Avoidance	<u>Community</u> <u>Development</u> <u>Director or</u> <u>designee</u>	Prior to the issuance of grading permit	Evidence to City: <u>1) The required pre-</u> <u>construction surveys of</u>		<u>Withhold</u> grading permit

Pr	oject Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Pr	oject			Date:	April 2021	
		Responsible				Sanctions for
	Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
	Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
<u>a.</u>	To avoid impacts to nesting white-tailed			white-tailed kite birds and		
	kites it is recommended that a qualified			nests have been		
	biologist with knowledge of white-tailed kite			completed 3 days prior to		
	life history and survey experience conduct			disturbing activities		
	a thorough survey of all suitable nesting			(including staging and		
	habitat with the project impact areas plus a			mobilization)		
	<u>500-foot buffer (as access allows).</u>			2) Avoidance Plan prepared		
	Surveys should be completed no more			by a qualified biologist if		
	than 3 days prior to beginning any project-			construction to occur		
	related ground-disturbing activities			Detween January 1 and		
	(including staging and mobilization) or			August 51		
	vegetation removal. Positive detections					
	should be reported to CDFW prior to the					
	any project-related ground-disturbing					
	activities or vegetation removal.					
b.	If white-tailed kite nests are detected, no					
	project-related construction and activities					
	should occur from January 1 through					
	August 31. If Project construction and					
	activities must occur between January 1					
	through August 31, the City, in consultation					
	with a qualified biologist, develop a robust					
	avoidance plan to specifically avoid					
	impacts to white-tailed kite. The plan					
	should include effective, specific,					
	enforceable, and feasible measures. A					
	minimum 1,000-foot no-disturbance buffer					
	should be implemented around each					
1	white-tailed kite nest. No project related					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Deter	Amril 2024	
	Responsible		Date:		Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
construction and activities should occur					•
within the protected area while occupied by					
white-tailed kite nests and nestlings. An					
avoidance plan should be developed prior					
to beginning any project-related ground-					
disturbing activities or vegetation removal.					
MM BIO-36 Coastal California Gnatcatcher	Community	Prior to the	Evidence to the City:		Withhold
Preconstruction Protocol Survey and ESA	Development	issuance of			demolition or
<u>Compliance</u> . A biologist holding the	Director or	demolition or	The required pre-		grading permit
appropriate survey permits shall conduct a	designee	grading permits.	construction surveys of		and /or
single preconstruction presence/absence		prior to the	hoon completed		stop work
determine if the species occurs on the parcel		removal of	1) Gnatcatcher permit and		order
The survey shall include the use of callback		vegetation	survey completed per		order
tapes to entice any local birds to vocalize at the		during initial site	stipulation of MM BIO-6		
location. The survey shall be timed to occur		preparation prior	(subsection b)		
within 30 days of the proposed construction. If		to construction	2) Consultation with		
coastal California gnatcatcher is identified			USFWS completed if		
within the impact areas consultation with the			Gnatcatchers are found		
United States Fish and Wildlife Survey			<u>on Project Site</u>		
regarding potential impacts shall be completed					
prior to starting the Project. If the species is					
achuring a procentruction posting bird or					
terrestrial animal survey the Project shall seek					
consultation prior to starting the work.					
a. The City should retain a qualified biologist					
with a gnatcatcher survey permit. The					
qualified biologist should survey the project					
site to determine presence/absence of					
gnatcatcher. The qualified biologist should					

Pr	oject Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Pr	oject			Data	April 2021	
		Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
	Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
	Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
	conduct surveys according to USFWS					
	Coastal California Gnatcatcher (Polioptila					
	californica californica) Presence/Absence.					
h	Survey Guidelines (LISEWS 1997) The					
<u>v.</u>	survey protocol requires a minimum of six					
	surveys conducted at least one week apart					
	from March 15 through lune 30 and a					
	minimum of nine surveys at least two					
	weeks apart from July 1 through March 14					
	The protocol should be followed for all					
	The protocol should be followed for all					
	the USEWS in writing (USEWS 1997)					
	CDEW recommends anatestation surveys					
	be conducted and USEWS notified (nor					
	protocol quidance) prior to the Citu's					
	protocol guidance) prior to the City's					
	issuance of a grading permit.					
c.	Take under the ESA is more broadly					
	defined than CESA; take under ESA also					
	includes significant habitat modification or					
	degradation that could result in death or					
	injury to a listed species by interfering with					
	essential behavioral patterns such as					
	breeding, foraging, or nesting. If coastal					
	California gnatcatcher is found to occur on					
	the habitat on the project site, consultation					
	with the USFWS, in order to comply with					
	ESA, is advised well in advance of any					
	ground-disturbing activities and/or					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Date	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action vegetation removal that may impact gnatcatcher.	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
 MM BIO-7 Crotch's Bumble Bee Surveys and Avoidance Due to suitable habitat within the project site, within one year prior to grading and/or vegetation removal, a qualified entomologist familiar with the species behavior and life history should conduct surveys to determine the presence/absence of Crotch's bumble bee. Surveys should be conducted during flying season when the species is most likely to be detected above ground, between March 1 to September 1 (Thorp et al. 1983). Survey results, including negative findings, should be submitted to the City prior to implementing project- related ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal where there may be impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. At minimum, a survey report should provide the following: A description and map of the survey area, focusing on areas that could provide suitable habitat for Crotch's bumble bee; 	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permit	 Evidence to City: 1) Crotch's bumble bee survey to be conducted during flying season (as detailed in MM BIO-7) by a qualified entomologist and to be completed prior to one year before grading and/or vegetation removal occurs 2) If species detected, an avoidance plan to be prepared and submitted to City. A qualified entomologist shall coordinate with CDFW to obtain handling permits and submit the avoidance plan. 		Withhold grading permit

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Data	April 2021	
	Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
ii. Field survey conditions that should					
include name(s) of qualified					
entomologist(s) and brief					
qualifications, date and time of survey,					
survey duration, general weather					
conditions, survey goals, and species					
searched;					
iii. Map(s) showing the location of					
nests/colonies: and.					
iv. A description of physical (e.g., soil,					
moisture, slope) and biological (e.g.,					
plant composition) conditions where					
each nest/colony is found. A sufficient					
description of biological conditions,					
primarily impacted habitat, should					
include native plant composition (e.g.,					
density, cover, and abundance) within					
impacted habitat (e.g., species list					
separated by vegetation class;					
density, cover, and abundance of each					
<u>species).</u>					
b. If Crotch's bumble bee is detected, the Citv					
in consultation with a qualified					
entomologist should develop a plan to fully					
avoid impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. The					
plan should include effective, specific,					
enforceable, and feasible measures. An					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakł	noury
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
 <u>avoidance plan should be submitted to the</u> <u>City prior to implementing project-related</u> <u>ground-disturbing activities and/or</u> <u>vegetation removal where there may be</u> <u>impacts to Crotch's bumble bee.</u> <u>c. If Crotch's bumble bee is detected and if</u> <u>impacts to Crotch's bumble bee cannot be</u> <u>feasibly avoided during project</u> <u>construction and activities, the</u> <u>City/qualified entomologist should</u> <u>coordinate with CDFW to obtain</u> <u>appropriate handling permits for incidental</u> <u>take of Crotch's bumble bee and provide</u> <u>appropriate mitigation for impacts to</u> <u>Crotch's bumble bee habitat. CDFW</u> <u>recommends the City mitigate for impacts</u> <u>to Crotch's bumble bee habitat at a ratio</u> <u>comparable to the project's level of</u> <u>impacts.</u> 					
MM BIO-8FocusedBatSurveysandRoosting Site Protectiona.a.Whereproject-relatedimplementation,construction,andactivitieswouldoccurnearpotentialroostinghabitatforbats,suchastablesuchastabletablesurveyswithin theseareastablebufferasaccessallows)toidentify	<u>Community</u> <u>Development</u> <u>Director or</u> <u>designee</u>	Prior to the issuance of grading permit and during grading / tree removal activities	<u>1) A pre-construction</u> <u>focused bat surveys to</u> <u>be conducted by a</u> <u>qualified bat specialist</u> <u>in areas of potential</u> <u>roosting bat habitat</u> <u>areas and to be</u> <u>completed prior to</u> <u>ground disturbing or</u>		<u>Withhold</u> <u>grading permit</u> <u>and /or</u> <u>issuance of a</u> <u>stop work</u> <u>order</u>

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Data	A	
	Deeneneible		Date:	April 2021	Sonations for
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	Timing of		Varified	Sanctions for
	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
potential habitat that could provide davtime	Montoring	Vermoution	vegetation removal	Dutorinitialo	Compliance
and/or nighttime roost sites, and any			activities		
maternity roosts. Surveys should be			2) A qualified bat specialist		
conducted using acoustic recognition			prepare a construction /		
technology to maximize detection of bats			demolition awareness		
A discussion of survey results including			regarding tree removal		
negative findings should be provided to the			containing potential		
City Depending on the survey results a			3) If maternity bats		
qualified bat specialist should discuss			detected, work to be		
notentially significant effects of the project			completed between		
on bats and include species specific			October 1 and February		
mitigation measures to reduce impacts to			<u>28</u>		
helow a level of significance (CEOA			4) Pre-construction survey		
Guidelines & 15125) Surveys reporting			to identify trees that		
and preparation of robust mitigation			disturbed due to project		
measures by a qualified bat specialist			grading and		
cheuld be completed and submitted to the			construction and		
City prior to any project related ground			protocols be completed		
disturbing activities or vegetation removal			as detailed in MM BIO-8		
disturbing activities of vegetation removal			<u>(sub section d)</u>		
at or near locations of roosting habitat for					
Dats.					
b. If bats are not detected, but the bat					
specialist determines that roosting bats					
may be present at any time of year and					
could roost in trees at a given location,					
during tree removal, trees should be					
pushed down using heavy machinery					
rather than felling with chainsaw. To					
ensure the optimum warning for any					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		
		Data	April 2021	
Responsible		Date.		Sanctions for
for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
	ily Residential Responsible for Monitoring	Responsible for Monitoring Timing of Verification	ily Residential and Annexation Applicant: Date: Responsible for Monitoring Timing of Verification Method of Verification	illy Residential and Annexation Applicant: Ramzy Fakh Date: April 2021 Responsible for Monitoring Timing of Verification Verified Date/Initials

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury			
Project			Deter	A	
	Posponsible		Date:		Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No /Implementing	for	Timing of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
the detection of bats. Each tree identified	g				
as potentially supporting an active					
maternity roost should be closely					
inspected by the bat specialist no more					
than 7 days prior to tree disturbance to					
determine the presence or absence of					
roost bats more precisely. If maternity					
roosts are detected, trees/structures					
determined to be maternity roosts should					
be left in place until the end of the					
maternity season. Work should not occur					
within 100 feet of or directly under or					
adjacent to an active roost. Work should					
also not occur between 30 minutes before					
subset and 30 minutes after sunrise.					
MM-BIO-4 Coast Prickly Pear Nesting	Community	Prior to	Evidence to the City:		Withhold
Habitat Avoidance. The densest areas of	Development	construction and	The design from the second from the		construction
coast prickly pear shall be preserved to the	Director or	during annual	The densest areas of coat		permit, grading
extent that is possible. Fuel modification shall pot remove the grass of dense castus where	uesignee	(if during	Cactus Wron Nost (as		issuance of a
coastal cactus wren has been observed		nesting season	identified on Figure 5 in the		stop work
nesting in the past. In addition, areas of dense		protocols of MM	Biological Assessment		order
cactus north of that nest shall also be		BIO-1 to be	report, prepared by South		
preserved to the extent that is possible. These		adhered)	Environmental, July 2019,)		
dense cactus areas shall be tlagged and			have been flagged by a		
markey as environmentally sensitive prior to			on the Project Site as area		
near these areas. However, work that may			to be preserved		
affect an active nest (including installation or					
removal of fencing) shall be avoided until the					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury			
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action nest is no longer active per the guidance in Mitigation Measure BIO-1.	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM BIO-5StreambedAlterationAgreement.AStreambedAlterationAgreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be received prior to initiating construction of the Project.	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to issuance of construction permits	Evidence to the City: A Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife		Withhold construction permit /or issuance of aa stop work order
 MM BIO 9 Lighting, Fencing, and No Rodenticide a. Any lighting constructed for the project should be directed away from native habitats and should be shielded from spilling onto adjacent areas. b. Due to the location of the project site, it is recommended that any fencing used during and after the project be constructed with materials that are not harmful to wildlife. Prohibited materials should include, but are not limited to, spikes, glass, razor, or barbed wire. Use of chain link and steel stake fence should be avoided or minimized as this type of fencing can injure wildlife or create barriers to wildlife dispersal. All hollow posts and pipes should be capped to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. These structures mimic the natural cavities preferred by various bird species and other 	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading and construction permits	 Evidence to City: 1) A lighting and fencing plan to be prepared and submitted to City's Community Development Department. 2) Property owner awareness regarding prohibition of the use of Rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides brochure to be prepared by Project Applicant and submitted to City's Community Development Department 		

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant:	Ramzy Fakhoury		
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
wildlife for shelter, nesting, and roosting. Raptor's talons can become entrapped within the bolt holes of metal fence stakes resulting in mortality. Metal fence stakes used on the project site should be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to avoid this hazard. A qualified biologist should move any wildlife out of harm's way so that no wildlife is enclosed inside any work zone or otherwise impacted by fence installation. The City should install the fence in a manner that excludes any wildlife from entering the work zone (i.e., embedded fence such that wildlife cannot enter from under the fence). Fences should not have any slack that may cause wildlife entanglement.					
<u>c. The project should use permeable</u> <u>fencing such as that recommended by</u> <u>the CDFW.¹⁰¹</u>					
<u>d. Rodenticides and second-generation</u> <u>anticoagulant rodenticides be</u> <u>prohibited during and after the project.</u> <u>The City should provide property</u> <u>owners and residents with pertinent</u> context, research, and data to inform					

¹⁰¹ <u>Https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FlleHandler.ashx?DocumentID=134713&inline</u>

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury			
Project		Date: April 2021			
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action property owners why rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides area prohibited due to their harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM BIO 7<u>10</u> Dead Tree Removal . Prior to the issuance of a demolition or grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a certified arborist to verify and mark as dead, all trees identified as dead by the Tree Report (Tree Nos. 9, 28, 30, 42, 92, 105, 106, 111, 114, 117, and 118). Documentation of the verification and marking shall be provided to the Applicant, the construction contractor, and the City Community Development Department. Removal of the dead trees shall be monitored by the arborist.	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permit	Evidence to the City: Photo documentation by a certified arborist verifying dead trees, marked as such in photos of the trees as identified in the Tree Report (Tree Nos. 9, 28, 30, 42, 92, 105, 106, 111, 114, 117, and 118), prepared by Carlberg Associates, August 2018		Withhold demolition or grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order
MM BIO 8<u>11</u>Significant Tree Removal . Prior to the issuance of a demolition or grading permit, the Project shall obtain a Tree Removal Permit from the City of La Verne for the four Significant trees to be removed (Tree Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49). The trees to be removed shall be replaced at a ratio of 4:1, for a minimum of 16 replacement trees. Replacement trees shall be of a species determined by the Community Development Director and shall include a minimum of four 24-inch box trees and twelve 48-inch box trees. The replacement trees shall be included on landscape and irrigation plans for the Project shall be planted in the natural	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permit and prior to issuance of Tree Removal Permit	Evidence to the City: Final Landscape Plan with delineation on the plan identification of the four Significant trees to be removed, replacement ratio of 4:1 with identification of 16 replacement trees authorized by Community Development Director (with minimum of 24-inch and 48- inch box trees).		Withhold demolition or grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order
Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Faki	noury
--	---	---	---	---------------------------	--
Project			Date	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action areas of the Site, and shall be irrigated as required for establishment. The replacement trees shall be monitored in accordance with the policies outlined in the Tree Removal Permit, with a minimum of three years of quarterly	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification Monitored in accordance with policies outlined on the Tree Removal Permit including irrigation plans of replacement trees	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM BIO 912 Significant Tree Protection . Prior to the start of construction, the certified arborist shall determine that Tree Safety Zone for all Significant trees that the Project would encroached upon (Tree Nos. 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 44 and 45). Five-foot high chain link fencing shall be installed as protective fencing around the Tree Safety Zone. A Tree Protection Plan showing the proposed location of protective fencing shall be prepared for the review and approval by the Community Development Director prior to the issuance of a demolition, grubbing, or grading permit. Postholes for protective fencing shall be dug by hand to allow for avoidance of significant roots that may be encountered. If significant roots, as determined by the certified arborist, are encountered, the post hole shall be moved to avoid root severance. All protective fencing shall be verified by the Community Development Directive fencing shall be used by the Community prior to commencement of construction work and shall remain in place until the Community Development Department approves its removal. A warning sign of a minimum size of 8.5 x 11 inches clearly stating "Tree Safety	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to issuance of grading permit	Evidence to the City: Tree Protection Plan to be reviewed and authorized by the Community Development Director or designee Construction monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Community Development Department at appropriate intervals to be determined by in the Tree Permit conditions of approval		Withhold grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
Zone; This Fence Shall Not Be Removed" shall be prominently displayed on each protective fencing enclosure. All grubbing, demolition, digging, excavating, filling, grading, construction, or trenching within the Tree Safety Zone of Significant trees shall be monitored by the certified arborist. Equipment, materials, and vehicles shall not be stored, parked, or operated within the Tree Safety Zone of any Significant tree. Equipment with overhead exhaust shall not be paced in such a manner as to scorch overhanging branches or foliage. Alternative equipment may be required in such areas as deemed necessary by the certified arborist. Construction monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Community Development Department at appropriate intervals to be determined by those same agencies in the Tree Permit conditions of approval.					
MM BIO-1013 Maintenance and Fuel Modification Procedures. During maintenance of the debris basin, topography and drainage patterns around the Significant trees shall not be altered in a manner that causes water to pond around the base of the trees. If canopy pruning of Significant trees within 200 feet of the proposed residences (Tree Nos. 5, 10, 19, 22, 27, 31, 44, and 45) is to be undertaken in accordance with fuel modification requirements, pruning shall be conducted between the most dormant months of July through September. Pruning shall be	Community Development Director or designee	During maintenance of the debris basin and Fuel Modification	Evidence to the City: A work order and / or receipt of sale of work provided and completed by ISA-Certified Arborist or ISA-Certified Tree Worker		Issuance of a stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action performed by a qualified ISA-Certified Arborist or ISA-Certified Tree Worker and in	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
compliance with current ISA Pruning Guidelines, best management practices, and American National Standards Institute pruning standards. Leaf litter shall be allowed to accumulate naturally within the protected zone of all Significant trees.					
	C	ultural Resources	1	1	T
MM CR-1 Archaeological Resources Study. A qualified archaeological consultant shall be retained to survey the property for cultural resources prior to the approval of project plans. The report shall include consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission to identify if any additional traditional cultural properties or other sacred sites are known to be in the area.	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to grading permit approval	Evidence to City: Preparation of an archaeological resource study by a Registered Professional Archaeologist.		Withhold grading permit
MM CR-2 Archaeological Resources. In the event that archaeological resources (i.e., sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the Project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in Public Resources Code §21080.3.2, The archaeologist, the Project Applicant, the City of La Verne's Community Development Director or designee, and interested Native American	Community Development Director or designee	During grading or any other ground disturbing activities	 Evidence to City: 1) A qualified archaeological monitor has been retained to be present during all grading and other significant ground disturbing 2) Interested Native American trial representatives have been engaged as applicable 		Issuance of a stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		oury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action tribal representative (i.e., those who have expressed an interest in the Project through the Assembly Bill 52 process) shall confer regarding the appropriate disposition of the discovered resource(s). Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the find is determined to be a unique archaeological resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the resource shall be recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines and/or agreed upon disposition of the resource(s).	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	 Method of Verification 3) Appropriate buffer areas have been established as applicable 4) Resource recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines and/or agreed upon disposition of the resource. 	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
	G	eology and Soils			
MM GEO 1: If paleontological resources are exposed during construction activities for the Project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find. The qualified paleontologist shall also monitor the remaining ground-disturbing activities. Depending upon the significance of the find, the paleontologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the find is determined to be a unique paleontological resource, then a mitigation program shall be developed and implemented in accordance with the provisions of CEQA as well as the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995).	Community Development Director or designee	During grading or any other ground disturbing activities	 Evidence to City: 1)A qualified paleontological monitor has been retained to be present during all grading and other significant ground disturbing 2)Interested Native American trial representatives have been engaged as applicable 3)Appropriate buffer areas have been established as applicable 4)Resource recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines and/or agreed 		Issuance of a stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification upon disposition of the resource.	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
		Noise	I	1	I
 NOI-1 In addition to adherence to the City of La Verne Municipal Code, which limits the construction hours of operation, the following measures are recommended to reduce construction noise emanating from the proposed project: a. During all project site excavation and grading on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards. b. The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site. c. Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use. d. The contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. e. Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors. 	City Building Official and Community Development Director, or designee	During grading and construction	Evidence to the City: Construction equipment is in proper working order; stationary construction equipment is staged as far away as possible from sensitive receptors; equipment shut off and not left idle when not in use; Jackhammers construction pneumatic equipment and all other stationary sources shielded and directed away from sensitive receptors		Issuance of a stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fan	nily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakł	noury
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	· Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
 NOI-2 In addition to adherence to the City of La Verne Municipal Code, which limits the construction hours of operation, the following measures are recommended to reduce construction vibration emanating from the proposed project: a. During all project site excavation and grading on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards. b. The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site. c. Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use. d. The contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. e. Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors. f. Caution should be utilized if a vibratory roller or other similar vibratory equipment is utilized within one foot of the western property line of the proposed project, adjacent to existing residential structures. 	City Building Official and Community Development Director, or designee	During grading and construction	Evidence to the City: Construction equipment is in proper working order; stationary construction equipment is staged as far away as possible from sensitive receptors; equipment shut off and not left idle when not in use; Jackhammers construction pneumatic equipment and all other stationary sources shielded and directed away from sensitive cureceptors		Issuance of a stop work

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification Tribal Cultural	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM TCR -1 The project applicant shall retain for the construction monitoring services of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh), who have expresses interest in consulting with the City pursuant to California Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1 and § 21080.3.2 and are listed under the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC's) Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. A Kizh monitor will be present on-site only during the construction phases that involve ground-disturbing activities. Ground- disturbing activities are defined as activities that include, but are not limited to: pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling and trenching within the project area. The Kizh monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that provide a description of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soils, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site Tribal monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities area completed, or when the Kizh representatives, in consultation with the City, have indicated that the site has a low potential for impact to Tribal Cultural Resources.	Community Development Director designee	During ground disturbing activities	Evidence to the City: A Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation monitor has been retained to be present during all ground-disturbing activities		Issuance of stop work order
MM TCR-2 Upon discovery of any archaeological resource, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall ceased until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by the	Community Development Director designee	During ground disturbing activities	Evidence to the City: 1)A qualified archaeologist monitor has been retained to be present during all		Issuance of stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Kizh) monitor. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Kizh monitor shall coordinate with the landowner regarding the treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Kizh request reburial or preservation for educational purpose. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation occurs. If a discovery is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be a "historical resource" or "unique archaeological resources", a treatment plan shall be developed (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[f]) allowing for sufficient time and funding to identify and implement avoidance measures and/or appropriate mitigation.			ground-disturbing activities 2)Appropriate buffer areas have been established as applicable 3)Coordination between Kizh monitor and landowner		
MM TCR-3 For unique archaeological resources, preservation in place is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery extraction to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall, at the discretion of the landowner, be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest agreeing to accept in the materials. If no such institution agrees to accept the materials, they shall be offered to a	Community Development Director designee	During ground disturbing activities	 Evidence to the City: 1)Resource(s) recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Forms as appropriate 2)Interested parties confer regarding the appropriate disposition of the discovered resource(s). 3)Submittal of required evaluation and report by a qualified archaeologist to the City 		Issuance of stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
MM TCR-4 Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98(d)(1)) defines Native American remains as "an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness." Funerary objects, called "grave goods" shall be treated similarly according to this statute. These objects are those reasonably believed to have been placed with human remains either at the time of death; other items made exclusively for burial purposes; or contain human remains. The treatment of funerary objects shall be treated in the same manner as human remains. Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) dictates that any discovery of human remains shall immediately be reported to the Los Angeles County Coroner, and excavation shall be halted until the Coroner has determined the nature of the remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are those of a Native American, he or she, shall contact the NAHC and appropriate provisions of Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) shall be followed.	Community Development Director designee	During ground disturbing activities	 Evidence to the City: 1)Appropriate buffer areas have been established as applicable 2) County coroner is notified in accordance with State law 3) Resource(s) recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 Form as appropriate 4) Interested parties confer regarding the appropriate disposition of the discovered resource(s). 5) Treatment plan is prepared as appropriate 6) Submittal of required evaluation and report by a qualified archaeologist to the City, Kizh Nation, and the Native American Heritage Commission 		Issuance of stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	noury
Project			Data	A	
	D		Date:	April 2021	
	Responsible	T :			Sanctions for
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing	for	I iming of		Verified	Non-
Action	Monitoring	Verification	Method of Verification	Date/Initials	Compliance
and place an exclusion zone around the burial.					
Nation the gualified load erchangelagist and					
the construction manager who will call the Lea					
Angeles County Coroner. The discovery shell					
he kept confidential and accure to provent					
further disturbance					
Prior to the continuation of around disturbing					
activities the land owner shall arrange a					
designated site within the footprint of the					
project for the respectful reburial of the human					
remains and/or funerary objects. In cases					
where discovered human remains cannot be					
fully documented and recovered on the same					
day, the remains shall be covered with muslin					
cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by					
heavy equipment to protect the remains. If this					
type of protection is not available, a 24-hour					
guard shall be posted outside of working hours.					
The Kizh monitor will make every effort to					
recommend diverting the project and keeping					
the remains in situ and protected. If the project					
cannot be diverted, it may be determined that					
burials will be removed. The Kizh monitor will					
work closely with the qualified archaeologist to					
ensure that the excavation is treated carefully,					
ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is					
approved by the Kizh monitor, document shall					
descriptive notes and exetches. Additional					
types of documentation shall be approved by					
the Kizh monitor for data recovery purposes					
Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation		Applicant: Ramzy Fakhoury		noury	
Project			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action means as necessary to ensure complete recovery of all material.	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony shall be removed to a secure container on site. These items shall be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Kizh monitor and the land owner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.					
If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location shall be considered a cemetery, and a separate treatment plan shall be developed. Once complete, a final report of all activities shall be submitted to the Kizh Nation and the Native American Heritage Commission. The Kizh Nation does not authorize any scientific study or the utilization of invasive diagnostics on human remains.					
MM TCR-5 Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction shall be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains	Community Development Director designee	During ground disturbing activities	Evidence to the City:1) A qualified archaeologist monitor has been retained to be present		Issuance of stop work order

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Fam Project	ily Residential	and Annexation	Applicant:	Ramzy Fakh	oury
			Date:	April 2021	
Mitigation Measure No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
and associated funerary objects shall be taken. Principal personnel shall meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of ten years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified =			 during all ground- disturbing activities 2) Appropriate buffer areas have been established as applicable 3) Coordination between Kizh monitor and landowner 		

STANDARD CONDITIONS

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project			Applicant: Date:	Ramzy Fakhoury April 2020	
Standard Condition No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
	Biologica	al Resources	T	ſ	
 SC BIO-1 Any Significant trees that would not be removed by the Project, shall be subject to preservation and protective measures, to include (but not be limited to): No grading, construction, or construction-related activities shall occur within the safety zone (i.e., the area within the dripline of a tree and extending therefrom either to a point of at least five feet outside the dripline or to a point 15 feet from the trunk, whichever distance is greater) of a significant tree as defined by Chapter 18.78 (Preservation, Protection, and Removal of Trees) of the La Verne Municipal Code, including, but not limited to, storage of materials, grade changes, or attachment of wires to or around tree trunks, stems, or limbs. 	Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	Evidence to the City: Establishment of appropriate buffer around safety zone of any Significant Tree		Withhold grading permit and /or issuance of a stop work order
• No structure shall be located within the safety zone or within a six-foot radius of the trunk perimeter, whichever is greater, of any significant tree. A tree with a caliper of 30 inches or more shall require additional space as determined by the city landscape architectural consultant or parks director.					
• Significant trees shall be shielded from damage during construction by chain link and steel stake fence enclosing the entire safety zone area. All exposed roots shall be inside the fence barrier, which shall have a minimum height of four feet measured from grade. In all cases where a fence barrier is to be used around a protected tree, the					

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM BASELINE ROAD SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND ANNEXATION PROJECT

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project			Applicant: Date:	Ramzy Fakhoury	
Standard Condition No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
 fence barrier shall be installed prior to commencement of any development on the site and shall remain in place throughout the construction period. Branches that could be injured by vehicles or that 					
interfere with construction shall be pruned to the satisfaction of the city landscape architectural consultant or designee.					
This standard condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Director or designee.					
	Hydrology a	nd Water Quality			
SC HYD-1 Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit and/or grading permit, the project proponent shall file and obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in order to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit for discharge of surface runoff associated with construction activities. Evidence that this has been obtained (i.e., a copy of the Waste Discharger's Identification Number) shall be submitted to the City for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit. The NOI shall address the potential for an extended and discontinuous construction shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.	Public Works Department and /or the Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits.	Evidence to the City: Evidence of filing of the Notice of Intent with the Regional Water Quality Control Board via submittal of a copy of the Waste Discharger's identification Number to the City		Withhold grading permit

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project			Applicant:	Ramzy Fakhoury	
			Date:	April 2020	
Standard Condition No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
 SC HYD-2 SWPPP. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit and/or grading, the Project Applicant shall submit to and receive approval from the City of La Verne a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include a surface water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control onsite and offsite erosion during the entire construction period. In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural best management practices to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the Site. The SWPPP shall include inspection forms for routine monitoring of the Site during both the demolition and construction phases to ensure National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit compliance and that additional best management practices and erosion control measures will be documented in the SWPPP and utilized if necessary. The SWPPP shall address the potential for an extended and discontinuous demolition and construction and shall be availability. The SWPPP shall be kept on Site for the entire duration of Project construction and shall be available to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) for inspection at any time. Best management practices to be implemented may include the following: Sediment discharges from the site may be controlled by the following: sandbags, silt fences, straw wattles and temporary basins (if deemed necessary), and other discharge control devices. The construction and condition of the best management practices shall be periodically 	Public Works Department and /or the Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits.	Evidence to the City: Submittal to the City of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)		Withhold grading permit and / or issuance of a stop work order

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM BASELINE ROAD SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND ANNEXATION PROJECT

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project			Applicant: Date:	Ramzy Fakhoury April 2020	
Standard Condition No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
inspected during demolition and construction, and repairs shall be made when necessary as required by the SWPPP.					
• Materials that have the potential to contribute to non-visible pollutants to storm water shall not be placed in drainage ways and must be contained, elevated, and placed in temporary storage containment areas.					
• All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, and other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to eliminate any discharge from the site. Stockpiles shall be surrounded by silt fences and covered with plastic tarps.					
 The construction contractor shall be responsible for performing and documenting the application of best management practices identified in the SWPPP. Weekly inspections shall be performed on sandbag barriers and other sediment control measures called for in the SWPPP. Monthly reports and inspection logs shall be maintained by the contractor and reviewed by the City of La Verne and the representatives of the LARWQCB. In the event that it is not feasible to implement specific best management practices, the City of La Verne can determine that other best management practices will provide equivalent or superior treatment either on or off site. 					
This condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.					

Project Name: Baseline Road Single-Family Residential and Annexation Project		Applicant:	Ramzy Fakhoury		
Standard Condition No./Implementing Action	Responsible for Monitoring	Timing of Verification	Method of Verification	Verified Date/Initials	Sanctions for Non- Compliance
SC HYD-3 SUSMP. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Management Programs in Los Angeles County (SUSMP) to the City of La Verne for review and approval. The Project shall implement project design features identified in the SUSMP. The SUSMP shall demonstrate that the proposed development plan includes best management practices for source control, pollution prevention, site design, low impact development (LID) implementation, and structural treatment control. Best Management Practices shall be designed and implemented to retain the Project Site's minimum design capture volume and hydromodification volume to ensure post-development storm water runoff. Periodic maintenance of any required bioretention basin and landscaped areas during Project occupancy and operation shall be in accordance with the schedule outlined in the SUSMP. This condition shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Director of the City of La Verne Public Works Department and the Community Development Director or designee, as appropriate.	Public Works Department and /or the Community Development Director or designee	Prior to the issuance of grading permits.	Evidence to the City: Submittal to City of a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Management Programs in Los Angeles County (SUSMP)		Withhold grading permit and / or issuance of a stop work order