# **Draft** Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements



City of San Gabriel 425 South Mission Drive San Gabriel, CA 91776 Contact: Greg de Vinck 626.308.2825



Prepared by:

#### **GPA Consulting**

617 South Olive Street Los Angeles, CA 90014 Contact: Catherine Saint 310.792.2690

June 2022

This page has been intentionally left blank.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introducti	Introduction1		
	1.1	Statutory Authority and Requirements1		
	1.2	Intent and Scope of this Document1		
	1.3	Terminology2		
	1.4	Organization of this Document3		
2.0	Project De	escription5		
	2.1	Project Title		
	2.2	Lead Agency Name and Address5		
	2.3	Contact Person5		
	2.4	Project Sponsor		
	2.5	Project Location5		
	2.6	Funding6		
	2.7	Zoning, Land Use and Applicable Plans6		
	2.8	Project Description6		
	2.9	Phasing and Construction18		
3.0	Environm	ental Factors Potentially Affected		
5.0				
4.0	Lead Ager	ncy Determination21		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation	ncy Determination21 n of Environmental Impacts23		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1	ncy Determination		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2	ncy Determination		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3	Aesthetics		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	Aesthetics		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5	Aesthetics		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6	Acy Determination    21      A of Environmental Impacts    23      Aesthetics    23      Agriculture and Forestry Resources    26      Air Quality    28      Biological Resources    35      Cultural Resources    41      Energy    44		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7	Acy Determination    21      A of Environmental Impacts    23      Aesthetics    23      Agriculture and Forestry Resources    26      Air Quality    28      Biological Resources    35      Cultural Resources    41      Energy    44      Geology and Soils    46		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8	Acy Determination21A of Environmental Impacts23Aesthetics23Agriculture and Forestry Resources26Air Quality28Biological Resources35Cultural Resources35Cultural Resources41Energy44Geology and Soils46Greenhouse Gas Emissions51		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5.9	Acy Determination21A of Environmental Impacts23Aesthetics23Agriculture and Forestry Resources26Air Quality28Biological Resources35Cultural Resources35Cultural Resources41Energy44Geology and Soils46Greenhouse Gas Emissions51Hazards and Hazardous Materials53		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5.9 5.10	Acy Determination21A of Environmental Impacts23Aesthetics23Agriculture and Forestry Resources26Air Quality28Biological Resources35Cultural Resources35Cultural Resources41Energy44Geology and Soils46Greenhouse Gas Emissions51Hazards and Hazardous Materials53Hydrology and Water Quality57		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5.9 5.10 5.11	Acy Determination21A of Environmental Impacts23Aesthetics23Agriculture and Forestry Resources26Air Quality28Biological Resources35Cultural Resources35Cultural Resources41Energy44Geology and Soils46Greenhouse Gas Emissions51Hazards and Hazardous Materials53Hydrology and Water Quality57Land Use and Planning61		
4.0 5.0	Lead Ager Evaluation 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 5.5 5.6 5.7 5.8 5.9 5.10 5.11 5.12	Acy Determination21A of Environmental Impacts23Aesthetics23Agriculture and Forestry Resources26Air Quality28Biological Resources35Cultural Resources35Cultural Resources41Energy44Geology and Soils46Greenhouse Gas Emissions51Hazards and Hazardous Materials53Hydrology and Water Quality57Land Use and Planning61Mineral Resources64		

5.14 Population and Housing	71
5.15 Public Services	72
5.16 Recreation	74
5.17 Transportation	75
5.18 Tribal Cultural Resources	80
5.19 Utilities and Service Systems	82
5.20 Wildfire	84
5.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	86
6.0 List of Preparers	89
7.0 List of Technical Studies	91
8.0 References	93
9.0 Attachments	97

# List of Tables

Table 1 ROW and TCE Area Summary
Table 2 Air Quality Data Summary (2018-2020) 29
Table 3 Federal and State Attainment Status for South Coast Air Basin      30
Table 4 SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds      30
Table 5 SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds for a 1-Acre Site
Table 6 Regional Construction Emissions of Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)    32
Table 7 Localized Construction Emissions of Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)      32
Table 8 Tree Replacement Requirements
Table 9 Parcels in the Project Study Area 41
Table 10 Previously Recorded Resources 42
Table 11 Existing (Ambient) Short-Term Noise Level Measurements      66
Table 12 Construction Noise Level 1-hour Leq. 67
Table 13 Future Traffic Noise Levels 68
Table 14 Construction Vibration Damage Criteria 69
Table 15 Ground-borne Vibration Impact Criteria for General Assessment      69
Table 16 Street Classifications 75
Table 17 Levels of Service for Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Intersection      76
Table 18 Projects within Two Miles 87

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1 Regional Location	9
Figure 2 Project Location	11
Figure 3 Land Use Map	13
Figure 4 Project Layout	15
Figure 5 Project Study Area	17
Figure 6 Existing Conditions, Parking	79

## List of Acronyms

AASHTO	Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials		
AB	Assembly Bill		
ACBM	Asbestos Construction Building Materials		
ADT	Average Daily Traffic		
AM	Morning		
APE	Area of Potential Effects		
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number		
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan		
ARB	Air Resources Board		
AVM	Avoidance and Minimization Measure		
AW	Agricultural Watershed		
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District		
BERD	Built Environment Resources Directory		
bgs	Below Ground Surface		
BMP	Best Management Practices		
BSA	Biological Study Area		
BSC	Building Standards Commission		
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards		
CAC	Certified Asbestos Consultant		
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection		
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation		
CARB	California Air Resources Board		
CCR	California Code of Regulations		
C-CT	Commercial Center		
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife		
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model		
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act		
CESA	California Endangered Species Act		

CGS	California Geological Survey	
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database	
CNPS	California Native Plant Society	
CIP	Cast-in-place	
СО	Carbon Monoxide	
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide	
CO <sub>2</sub> e	Carbon Dioxide equivalent	
City	City of San Gabriel	
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources	
CWA	Clean Water Act	
dBA	A-weighted Decibels	
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height	
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control	
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Area	
FCAA	Federal Clean Air Act	
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act	
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program	
FTA	Federal Transit Association	
FOE	Finding of Effect	
General Plan	City of San Gabriel's Comprehensive General Plan	
GHG	Greenhouse Gas	
HBRRP	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program	
НСР	Habitat Conservation Plan	
ISA	Initial Site Assessment	
IS/MND	Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration	
LOS	Level of Service	
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard	

LARWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board		
LST	Local Significance Threshold		
MTCO <sub>2e</sub>	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent		
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act		
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority		
MIP	Mobility Improvement Project		
MM	Mitigation Measure		
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration		
MLD	Most Likely Descendant		
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone		
msl	Mean Sea Level		
MU-T	Mixed-Use Transit Oriented Development		
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards		
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission		
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act		
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places		
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service		
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen Dioxide		
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen Oxide		
NWIC	Northwest Information Center		
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone		
OHWM	Ordinary High-Water Mark		
Pb	Lead		
PM	Evening		
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Particulate Matter 2.5 Microns or Less in Diameter		
PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulate Matter 10 Microns or Less in Diameter		
ppb	Parts per Billion		
ppm	Parts per Million		
PPV	peak particle velocity		

РСВ	polychlorinated biphenyl
PRC	Public Resources Code
RN-C	Residential Neighborhood Conservation
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
ROW	Right-of-Way
RSP	Rock Slope Protection
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SNMP	Salt and Nutrient Management Plan
SB	Senate Bill
SRA	Source Receptor Area
SCAB	Southern California Air Basin
SCAQMD	Southern California Air Quality Management District
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SO <sub>x</sub>	Sulfur Oxide
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SIP	State Implementation Plan
Specific Plan	City of San Gabriel Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods Sustainability Plan
SR-710	State Route 710
SVP	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
ТАС	Toxic Air Contaminants
TCE	Temporary Construction Easement
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
US	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	United States Geological Survey

USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements

### 1.0 Introduction

The City of San Gabriel (City) proposes to implement focused traffic safety and operational improvements at the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection (Project area). Following a preliminary review of the proposed Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements (Project), the City has determined that it is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) evaluates the potentially significant environmental impacts associated with implementing the Project.

### **1.1** Statutory Authority and Requirements

The City, as the Lead Agency pursuant to CEQA, is required to undertake the preparation of an Initial Study to determine whether the proposed Project would have a significant environmental impact. The City has prepared this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) in accordance with the Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines) (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 et seq.). Although consultants assisted in the preparation of this IS/MND, all analysis, conclusions, findings, and determinations presented in the IS/MND represent the City, acting as the Lead Agency under CEQA. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the state and local CEQA Guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, is responsible for reviewing the potential environmental effects, and after consideration, approving or denying the Project.

### **1.2** Intent and Scope of this Document

The City, as the Lead Agency under CEQA, will consider the potential environmental impacts of Project activities when it considers whether to approve the Project. The IS/MND is an informational document to be used in the local planning and decision-making process. The IS/MND does not recommend approval or denial of the Project.

The IS/MND describes the Project and its environmental setting, including the Project area's existing conditions and applicable regulatory requirements. The IS/MND also evaluates potential environmental impacts from the Project on the following resources:

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

The Project incorporates measures to ensure there would be no significant impacts on the environment.

### 1.3 Terminology

Potential environmental impacts of the Project are classified and described within the CEQA Environmental Checklist under the following general headings:

**"No Impact"** applies where the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. For example, if the project area is not located in a fault rupture zone, then the item asking whether the project would result in or expose people to potential impacts involving fault rupture should be marked as "No Impact."

"Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the impact would occur, but the magnitude of the impact is considered insignificant or negligible. For example, a development which would only slightly increase the amount of surface water runoff generated at a project area would be considered to have a less than significant impact on surface water runoff.

"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." Incorporated mitigation measures should be outlined within the checklist and a discussion should be provided which explains how the measures reduce the impact to a less than significant level. This designation is appropriate for an MND, where all potentially significant issues have been analyzed and mitigation measures have been recommended that reduces all impacts to levels that are less than significant.

**"Potentially Significant Impact"** applies where the project has the potential to cause a significant and unmitigable environmental impact. If there are one or more items marked as "Potentially Significant Impact," an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

#### Thresholds of Significance

Thresholds of significance are identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance level standards for a particular environmental effect, non-compliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be significant by a Lead Agency and compliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be less than significant (CCR, Title 14 ["CEQA Guidelines"], §15064.7(a)). The City has not adopted specific thresholds of significance and instead relies upon the specific questions relating to the topical environmental factors listed in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to assist in the determination of whether an impact is potentially significant.

### **1.4** Organization of this Document

This IS/MND is organized into nine sections, as follows:

<u>Chapter 1, Introduction</u>: This section provides an overview of the Project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

<u>Chapter 2, Project Description</u>: This section provides a description of the Project location, Project background, and Project components.

<u>Chapter 3, Environmental Factors Potentially Affected</u>: This section presents the environmental checklist used to evaluate the Project's potential environmental effects. The checklist is based on the information provided in Appendix G of the state's CEQA Guidelines.

<u>Chapter 4, Lead Agency Determination</u>: This section provides the Lead Agency's recommended environmental documentation for the Project.

<u>Chapter 5, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts</u>: This section provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that could be affected by this Project. Any mitigation measures that would be implemented to ensure that potential adverse impacts of the Project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level are also included in this section.

<u>Chapter 6, List of Preparers</u>: This section provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of this report and key personnel consulted.

<u>Chapter 7, List of Technical Studies</u>: This section provides a list of the technical studies used during the preparation of this report.

<u>Chapter 8, References</u>: This section provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this report.

<u>Chapter 9, Attachments</u>: This section provides attachments referenced throughout this report.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

## 2.0 Project Description

### 2.1 Project Title

Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements

### 2.2 Lead Agency Name and Address

City of San Gabriel 425 South Mission Drive San Gabriel, CA 91776

### 2.3 Contact Person

Greg de Vinck Public Works Director gdevinck@sgch.org 626.308.2825

### 2.4 Project Sponsor

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Lourdes Kriste KristeL@metro.net 213.547.4363 One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012

### 2.5 Project Location

The Project area is approximately two acres and limited to the intersection of Del Mar Avenue and Valley Boulevard within the City of San Gabriel in the County of Los Angeles (Project area) (see **Figure 1**, Regional Location and **Figure 2**, Project Location). Cities adjacent to San Gabriel include the City of Alhambra to the west, City of San Marino to the north, Temple City to the east, and the City of Rosemead to the south. The Project is located along Valley Boulevard which runs east-west near the southern boundary of the Cities of San Gabriel and Alhambra.

According to the City of San Gabriel's Comprehensive General Plan (General Plan), the existing Valley Boulevard is a 4-Lane Street and is classified as a Secondary Arterial (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Del Mar Avenue is a 2-Lane Street north of the Project and 4-Lane Street south of the Project and is classified as a Secondary Arterial (City of San Gabriel, 2004). There are no medians on Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue leading up to the intersection. The Project is in an urbanized and developed area. Surrounding properties include a gas station, hotel, mixed-use development, and smaller commercial buildings. The southeast corner of the Project area consists of a the Hawaii Supermarket, a grocery store that is a major destination for residents and visitors from the region. A heavily patronized bus stop is located immediately east of the intersection. The abutting sidewalks are minimally landscaped and do not contain pedestrianoriented amenities. A Park-and-Ride facility is located approximately 900 feet from the intersection.

### 2.6 Funding

In 2008, Measure R was passed for transportation improvements in Los Angeles County. In 2017, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Board approved the reallocation of approximately \$730 million remaining Measure R Funds for the State Route 710 (SR-710) North Gap Closure Project to new Mobility Improvement Projects (MIP) to relieve congestion on local streets in the San Gabriel Valley subregion. The City is proposing improvements to three intersections: Valley Boulevard and New Avenue, Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard, and Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue. These improvements are part of the SR-710 North MIPs. The City is using this funding source to complete the engineering and environmental phases of the Project, with Metro as the acting administrative agency. Each intersection has independent utility; therefore, the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection is being analyzed in a separate environmental document for the purposes of CEQA.

### 2.7 Zoning, Land Use and Applicable Plans

The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes Mixed-Use Transit Oriented Development (MU-T), Commercial Center (C-CT), and Residential Neighborhood Conservation (R-NC). The General Plan land use designation for the Project area is Commercial Specific Plan, and the land use strategy for the Project area is Transit Oriented Development.

In 2004, the City adopted the City of San Gabriel Comprehensive General Plan (General Plan). The Project area is designated in the General Plan for Commercial Specific Plan land use (see Figure 3, Land Use Map) (City of San Gabriel, 2004). The General Plan describes this designation as "[applying] to two areas, which each have a distinct character and for which special land use and development strategies are needed to capitalize on the special advantages inherent in each of these areas. The designation signals the City's intent to develop Specific Plans for each of these areas, to define a land use planning program which will accomplish the City's special objectives for these areas" (City of San Gabriel, 2004). In 2006, the City adopted the Valley Vision: Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods Sustainability Plan (Specific Plan), amended in 2013. The Specific Plan provides a "road map of land use development, building and site design, transportation, infrastructure, and streetscape strategies that will be used to enable residents and businesses to more effectively meet the vital human needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by preserving ecosystems and natural resources" (City of San Gabriel, 2013). The land use strategy for the Project area and surrounding area is classified in the Specific Plan as Transit Oriented Development. The existing characteristics of Transit Oriented Development area are described as "largely underdeveloped and represent a key economic opportunity for re-use and development intensification" (City of San Gabriel, 2013).

### 2.8 **Project Description**

#### 2.8.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Project is to improve traffic safety, alleviate congestion, improve traffic flow and operational conditions, and improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility along Valley Boulevard at the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection.

#### 2.8.2 Need

The Project would address several identified operational deficiencies along Valley Boulevard. During the AM peak period, Valley Boulevard experiences heavy traffic volumes; the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection is currently operating at Level of Service (LOS) values of D and E during peak periods. A D value of LOS means speeds are lower than the free-flow speed, freedom to maneuver is noticeably limited, and minor incidents cause queuing. An E value of LOS means operation of the roadway is at capacity, vehicles are closely spaced, and there is extensive queuing at traffic signals and/or blockages.

#### 2.8.3 Proposed Improvements

Proposed intersection improvements would include lane reconfiguration along Valley Boulevard, intersection corner improvements, and removal of on-street parking spaces. Temporary construction easements and partial right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions are anticipated to accommodate the proposed improvements. The new lane configuration would include a new dedicated eastbound right-turn lane to accommodate the addition of auxiliary lanes on Valley Boulevard in both directions. The dedicated leftturn lanes on Valley Boulevard would be lengthened in both directions. Vegetation removal is required to accommodate the improvements at the southwest corner of the intersection, which include the installation of traffic signal poles and cabinets, a new curb return, and new driveways. Approximately 10 trees and eight plants would be removed at the southwest corner of the intersection. In addition, the Project would incorporate improvements to the northwest intersection corner planned by the hotel (The Jordan San Gabriel, Curio Collection by Hilton) adjacent to the Project area. The intersection improvements would include various areas of pavement rehabilitation within the limits of the pavement striping. Approximately 50 on-street parking spaces would be removed to accommodate the proposed improvements. Continental crosswalks composed of thick horizontal striping are proposed to increase visibility for pedestrians. The Project would include synchronizing traffic signals along the Valley Boulevard (see Figure 4, Project Layout).

#### Site Access

Construction of the Project would occur in two phases (see *Section 2.9 Phasing and Construction*). During the first phase of construction, the outside lanes of eastbound and westbound Valley Boulevard and southbound Del Mar Avenue would be closed during work hours (weekdays 7 AM to 7 PM). During the second phase of construction, the inside lanes of eastbound and westbound Valley Boulevard would be closed during work hours. Continuous access would be provided at all times (see **Attachment A**, Project Plans). No detour routes would be needed.

#### Utilities

The existing traffic signal cabinet, service cabinet, and traffic poles at the northwest intersection corner of the intersection would be removed and salvaged. The existing traffic poles at the northwest corner would be relocated to the southwest corner of the intersection. Signage at the southwest corner of the Project area would be relocated.

The southwest corner of the intersection along Valley Boulevard would be widened to 12 feet; therefore, a curb opening catch basin would be added at this location to handle the 50-year storm peak flow rates of the proposed improvements. In the proposed conditions, the southeast corner of the intersection at Del Mar Avenue and Valley Boulevard adjacent to a crown roadway section is now bound by the new southern curb line along Valley Boulevard directing the runoff to the proposed inlet. The proposed storm drain would also capture runoff at the southwest corner of the intersection and direct flows to the new

7

curb opening catch basin at this intersection (see Attachment A, Project Plans).

#### Right of Way

The existing roadway is within City ROW. The southwest intersection corner improvements would require partial ROW acquisition of approximately 860 square feet from an adjacent property (ARCO gas station), assessor's parcel number (APN) 5360-020-010 and 5360-020-028 (see **Figure 5**, Project Study Area). Continuous access to the ARCO gas station would be provided at all times. The Project would require temporary construction easement (TCE) for APN 5360-020-010. ROW and TCE information is summarized in **Table 1**.

Accessor Parcel Number	Owner	Land Use Category	ROW Area (Square Feet)	TCE Area (Square Feet)
5360-020-010 and 5360- 020-028	Damavand Inc.	Commercial	860	1630
Total Area	-	-	860	1630

#### Table 1 ROW and TCE Area Summary





FIGURE 1. REGIONAL LOCATION Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements This page has been intentionally left blank.





FIGURE 2. PROJECT LOCATION Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements This page has been intentionally left blank.





FIGURE 3. GENERAL PLAN LAND USE Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements This page has been intentionally left blank.





FIGURE 4. PROJECT LAYOUT Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements This page has been intentionally left blank.





FIGURE 5. PROJECT STUDY AREA Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements

### 2.9 Phasing and Construction

Project construction is anticipated to start in January 2024 and would last approximately 18 months, ending in June 2025. Construction of the Project would occur in two phases; both phases would last nine months consecutively. Construction hours of operation would be limited to weekdays from 7 AM to 7 PM. The phases of construction for the Project are as follows:

#### Phase 1:

- Grinding and overlay on the east and westbound lanes of Valley Boulevard
- Widening the eastbound lane of Valley Boulevard
- Driveway, sidewalk, and curb ramp construction near the southwest corner of the intersection
- Driveway and sidewalk construction south of Valley Boulevard near the ARCO gas station

#### Phase 2

• Grinding and asphalt overlay on the inside east and westbound lanes of Valley Boulevard

Proposed construction activities would include grinding and asphalt overlay (69,950 square feet), paving the widened eastbound lane on Valley Boulevard (1,750 square feet), and restriping to accommodate the new lane reconfiguration. The total area paved would be 71,700 square feet. The traffic signal poles at the northwest corner of the intersection would be relocated to the southwest corner, requiring the drilling of piles to secure their foundations (see **Attachment A**, Project Plans). Piles used for one of the traffic signal pole foundations would be 2.5 feet in diameter and drilled to 7.5 feet in depth. For the second traffic signal foundation, piles would be 3.5 feet in diameter and drilled to 13 feet in depth. Approximately 5,400 square feet of the Project area would be graded. There would be approximately 1,000 cubic yards of export and 1,000 cubic yards of import.

Equipment used would be at the contractor's discretion and may deviate from the following list. Equipment likely to be used would include a jackhammer with a compressor, full size and mini front-end loader with backhoe, cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) drill rig, concrete mixer, asphalt paver and roller, dump truck(s), pick-up truck(s), asphalt slurry seal truck, bucket truck and crane, flat bed tractor trailer, traffic control equipment truck, and a sweeper. Equipment would be similar in both phases of the Project.

### **3.0** Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This document incorporates the Environmental Checklist Form from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Environmental factors checked contain at least one impact that has been determined to be a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

This page has been intentionally left blank

### 4.0 Lead Agency Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the 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 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 Project, nothing further is required.

Signature:	
Title:	Director of Public Works
Printed Name:	Greg de Vinck
Agency:	City of San Gabriel Department of Public Works
Date:	

This page has been intentionally left blank

### 5.0 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

### 5.1 Aesthetics

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21099, would the Project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				$\boxtimes$
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				$\boxtimes$

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Visual Impact Assessment Memorandum that was prepared for the Project (GPA Consulting, 2022a).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

#### a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**No Impact.** According to the General Plan, the Project area is not within or adjacent to a scenic vista (City of San Gabriel, 2004). The San Gabriel Foothills are the closest scenic vista, located approximately seven miles north of the Project area. Views from this scenic vista would not be impacted by implementation of the Project. In addition, proposed design elements would not obstruct or impact existing views from the roadway (GPA Consulting, 2022a). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on scenic vistas.

# b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**No Impact.** The Project area is not part of the State Highway System and is not designated as a state scenic highway. The closest officially designated state scenic highway is State Route 2 approximately eight miles northwest of the Project area (California Department of Transportation, 2018). There are no views of the Project area from State Route 2 due to intervening topography, structures, and vegetation. In addition,

the closest scenic corridor is located approximately 0.5 mile north of the Project area but is not visible from the Project area. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on a state scenic highway.

c. Would the project, 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?

**No Impact.** The Project is located within an urban area, and would not impact the existing visual character or quality of public views in a non-urbanized area. The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes MU-T, C-CT, and R-NC. Policies within the Specific Plan governing the scenic quality of Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue include the following:

- **Policy 1.13** Redevelop the subarea as a cohesive and integrated project, with the possible inclusion of the Alhambra Wash and integration with commercial properties to the west (San Gabriel Square).
- **Policy 1.14** Promote and provide incentives for the aggregation of individual parcels and consolidation as a single development site, whose type, scale, and intensity of use and architectural character can serve as a primary activity center and visual landmark for the Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods.
- **Policy 1.15** Permit and provide incentives for the development of structures that provide parking for transit users that exceeds the number of spaces required by code for the primary permitted on-site uses.
- **Policy 1.16** Develop the site in a unified and cohesive manner, with integrated massing of individual buildings located on common plazas and open spaces, and uniform architecture and site landscape.

None of these policies would be applicable to the Project. The Project would not include the construction of any buildings. The Project would result in minor changes to the existing transportation facility. The Project would include addition of auxiliary lanes, lane reconfiguration, pavement rehabilitation, installation of new traffic signal poles and cabinets, a new curb return, and new driveways. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on regulations governing scenic quality.

# d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**No Impact.** The Project area contains sources of light and glare from streetlamps, cars passing through the area, and surrounding commercial and mixed-uses (commercial and residential uses). The Project would include the relocation of two traffic signals, but the relocation would not create additional light sources. Additionally, the Project would not include a change in the materials or capacity of the intersection in a way that would result in increased glare at surrounding land uses. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in no impact on Aesthetics. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization (AVM), and/or Mitigation Measures (MM) for Aesthetics.

### 5.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to 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 complied 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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resource Board. Would the project:					
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 (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?				

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?

**No Impact.** The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency designates the Project area as Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder, 2016). The Project area is not located on or adjacent to any parcels identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of State Importance (collectively "Important
Farmland"). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

#### b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

**No Impact.** The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes MU-T, C-CT, and R-NC. In addition, the Project area is not within or adjacent to land contracted under the Williamson Act (California Department of Conservation, State of California Williamson Act Contract Land, 2017). The Project would require a partial acquisition and TCE from APN 5360-020-010 and 5360-020-028 that are zoned MU-T. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

### c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?

**No Impact.** The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes MU-T, C-CT, and R-NC. The Project area is not zoned for timberland production. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on existing zoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned timberland production.

#### d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes MU-T, C-CT, and R-NC; therefore, the Project area is not zoned for, nor does it contain forest land. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to conversion of forest land.

# e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** The Project would include intersection improvements within City ROW and adjacent parcels (APN 5360-020-010 and 5360-020-028). According to the Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder Map, the Project area is not identified as Important Farmland (California Department of Conservation, 2016). In addition, the Project area does not contain forest land. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in no impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

### 5.3 Air Quality

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wh the con det	en available, the significance criteria established by applicable air quality management or air pollution trol district may be relied upon to make the following erminations. 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?			$\boxtimes$	
d.	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study that was prepared for this Project (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

#### a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project area is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) oversees the local air quality of the Project area. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) are responsible for determining state and federal air quality standards, California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), respectively.

SCAQMD maintains monitoring stations within district boundaries that monitor air quality and compliance with associated ambient standards. The Project area is within Source Receptor Area (SRA) 8 West Gabriel Valley in Los Angeles County. The closest air monitoring stations are the Pasadena and Azusa Monitoring stations. The monitoring station that collects ambient air quality data in SRA 8 is the Pasadena air monitoring site located approximately seven miles northwest of the Project area. The Pasadena site records ambient concentrations of ozone ( $O_3$ ), nitrogen dioxide ( $NO_2$ ), Carbon monoxide (CO), and fine particulate matter ( $PM_{2.5}$ ). In lieu of Pasadena site data, respirable particulate matter ( $PM_{10}$ ) monitoring data is supplemented from the Azusa monitoring station approximately 15 miles east of the Project area. Concentrations for the monitoring stations for the most recent three years (2018 – 2020) are shown in **Table 2**.

Pollutant	Monitoring	Monitoring Data by Year			
Foliutant	Station	Standard	2018	2019	2020
Ozone				-	•
Highest 1 Hour Average-					
State parts per million			0.112	0.120	0.163
(ppm)		0.09 ppm			
Days over State			8	11	<i>A</i> 1
Standard			0		71
Highest 8 Hour Average-			0.090	0.098	0 115
Federal (ppm)	Pasadena	0.070	0.050	0.050	0.115
Days over Federal		ppm	19	24	60
Standard			10		
Highest 8 Hour Average-	0.0 ppr		0.091	0.098	0 116
State (ppm)		0.070	0.031	0.050	0.110
Days over State		ppm	20	29	61
Standard				20	01
Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )		1		I	
Highest 24-Hour			78.3	82	152.3
Average-Federal (µg/m³)		150 μg/m <sup>3</sup>			
Days over Federal			0	0	-
Standard (measured)			•	•	
Highest 24-Hour			78.3	80.3	149.1
Average-State (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Azusa				_
Days over State		1 0,	59.2	24	-
Standard (measured)					
Highest Annual Average-			32	27.9	-
State (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		20 µg/m³			
Days over State			-	-	-
Standard (measured)					
Particulate Matter (PMI2.5)				1	
Hignest 24-Hour			32.5	41.8	67.7
Average (µg/m³)²		35 μg/m³			
Days over Federal			0	3.1	6.1
Standard (measured)					
Fighest Annual Average-			10.2	9.1	11.9
	Pasadena	12 μg/m³			
Standard			0	0	0
Highest Annual Average	1				
(ug/m <sup>3</sup> )			10.2	9.1	11.9
	•	12 μg/m³			
Standard			0	0	0
Stanuaru		1			

#### Table 2 Air Quality Data Summary (2018-2020)

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

Notes:  $ppm = parts per million; \mu g/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter.$ 

a. Generally, state standards and national standards are not to be exceeded more than once per year.

b. Values shown are from the Azusa air quality monitoring station.

The SCAB is in non-attainment with NAAQS for O<sub>3</sub> (8-hour) and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and is in non-attainment with CAAQS for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and is partial non-attainment for lead (see **Table 3**). In response to exceeding state and federal ambient air quality standards, the SCAQMD, in partnership with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), CARB, and the USEPA, prepared the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). On March 3, 2017, the SCAQMD adopted the 2016 AQMP, which includes strategies and measures needed to meet the NAAQS. The AQMP demonstrates attainment of the O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS and the latest PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. The SCAQMD also adopts rules and regulations to implement portions of the AQMP. On October 1, 2015, the USEPA strengthened the NAAQS for ground-level O<sub>3</sub>, lowering the primary and secondary O<sub>3</sub> standard levels to 70 parts per billion (ppb). The SCAB is classified as an "extreme" nonattainment area, and the Coachella Valley is classified as a "severe 15" nonattainment area for the 2015 O<sub>3</sub> NAAQS. The upcoming 2022 AQMP will be developed to address the requirements for meeting this standard.

Pollutant	Attainment Status			
Pollutant	Federal Standards	State Standards		
O₃ (1-Hour)	No Standard	Non Attainment		
O₃ (8-Hour)	Non-Attainment	Non-Attainment		
PM <sub>10</sub>	Attainment	Non-Attainment		
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Non-Attainment	Non-Attainment		
СО	Attainment	Attainment		
NO <sub>2</sub>	Attainment	Attainment		
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment		
Lead	Attainment	Attainment/Non-Attainment		

#### Table 3 Federal and State Attainment Status for South Coast Air Basin

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

The City has not developed specific air quality thresholds for air quality impacts. However, as stated in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the above determinations. As such, the significance thresholds and analysis methodologies in SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook have been used in evaluating Project impacts. SCAQMD has established daily mass thresholds for regional pollutant emissions, as shown in **Table 4** (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

#### Table 4 SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Dellutent	Mass Daily Thresholds (lbs/ day)			
Pollutant	Construction	Operation		
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> )	100	55		
Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG)	75	55		
PM <sub>10</sub>	150	150		
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	155	55		
Oxides of Sulfur (SO <sub>x</sub> )	150	150		
СО	550	550		
Lead*	3	3		

*Source:* (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

Notes: \*As the proposed Project would not involve the development of any major lead emissions sources, lead emissions are not analyzed further.

SCAQMD has developed Local Significance Thresholds (LST) that represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to exceeding the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Therefore, LSTs determine whether a project would cause or contribute to localized air quality impacts. LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each of the 38 SRAs in the SCAB. The localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in SCAQMD's Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology document, were developed for use on projects that are less than or equal to one acre in size or have a disturbance of less than or equal to one acre daily. The LST threshold for a 1-acre site was used based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily soil disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment. LSTs are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The construction and operational LSTs for a 1-acre site in SRA 11 (South San Gabriel Valley) at a distance of approximately 164 feet from a sensitive receiver (see **Table 5**) were used to evaluate the Project's localized air quality impacts (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

#### Table 5 SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds for a 1-Acre Site

Pollutant Monitored Within SRA 11 – South San Gabriel Valley	Allowable Emissions
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	69
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	783
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	11
Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	4

*Source:* (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

Short-term construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors associated with the Project were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2020.4.0, as recommended by SCAQMD. Construction equipment horsepower and load factors are based on the CalEEMod model defaults. The model results were used to determine whether short-term construction related emissions of criteria air pollutants associated with the Project would exceed SCAQMD's applicable regional thresholds and whether mitigation would be required. In addition, to determine whether or not construction activities associated with the proposed development Project would create significant adverse localized air quality impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, the worst case daily emissions contribution from the proposed development Project were compared to SCAQMD's LSTs (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in generation of CO, volatile organic compound (VOC),  $NO_x$ ,  $SO_x$ ,  $PM_{10}$ , and  $PM_{2.5}$ . Construction is expected to commence in January 2024 and last for 18 months through June 2025. SCAQMD Rules require standard best management practices to be incorporated during construction and are not considered mitigation as they are standard regulatory requirements. The Project would be subject to the general SCAQMD Regulation IV – Prohibitions (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a):

- Rule 401 Visible Emissions
- Rule 402 Nuisance
- Rule 403 Fugitive Dust
- Rule 481 Spray Coating
- Rule 1108 Volatile Organic Compounds
- Rule 1143 Paint Thinner and Solvents
- Rule 1186 Fugitive Dust

- Rule 1303 Major Emission Sources
- Rule 1401 New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants

As shown in **Table 6**, construction emissions resulting from the Project would not exceed the applicable SCQAMD regional emission thresholds of significance for any criteria pollutant. Implementation of Rule 403 would further reduce emissions.

	СО	NOx	ROG	SOx	PM10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Summer	13.77	17.77	1.84	0.036	1.22	0.76
Winter	13.73	17.77	1.85	0.036	1.22	0.76
SCAQMD Thresholds	550	100	75	150	150	55
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 6 Regional	Construction	Emissions	of Maximum	Daily I	Emissions	(lbs/dav)
			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

Based on information obtained from CalEEMod, the Project is anticipated to disturb up to 21 acres during the grading phase. The grading phase would take approximately 30 days in total to complete. As such, the Project would actively disturb approximately 0.7 acre per day (21 acres divided by 30 days). Therefore, the LST thresholds for one acre were conservatively utilized for the construction LST analysis. As the nearest sensitive uses are within approximately 200 feet from the Project area, the LST value of 50 meters was used. Localized emissions include only on-site emissions (i.e., from construction equipment and fugitive dust) and do not include off-site emissions (i.e., from hauling activities). As seen in **Table 7**, on-site emissions with SCAQMD rules applied would not exceed the LSTs for SRA 8 (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

Table 7 Localized Construction Emissions of Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)

	СО	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Summer	42.49	37.97	1.97	1.58
Winter	42.49	37.97	1.97	158
SCAQMD	702	60	11	4
Thresholds	765	09	11	4
Exceeds	No	No	No	No
Thresholds	NO	NU	NO	NU

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a)

Project operation is not expected to generate any mobile trips and is intended to improve the LOS conditions of the Project roadway segment. Therefore, no operational-source emissions were modeled. The Project would not result in changes to existing land use, increased capacity, or growth in the region. The Project would not result in an increase of operational emissions beyond existing baseline conditions. In addition, the Project would comply with SCAQMD rules (measure **AVM-AQ-1**) applicable to the Project, reducing overall emissions. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to implementation of an applicable air quality plan.

# b. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project area is designated as an extreme non-attainment area for Ozone and a nonattainment area for PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and Lead. According to the SCAQMD published report *White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution*, AQMD uses the same significant thresholds for project-specific and cumulative impacts. Therefore, this analysis assumes the individual projects that do not generate construction emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerate increase in emissions for these pollutants for which the SCAB is in nonattainment. Alternatively, individual project related construction emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction activities and cumulative impacts would be less than considerable (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to the increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

#### c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The potential impact of Project-generated air pollutant emissions at sensitive receptors has also been considered. Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that house or attract members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illness. Sensitive receptors can include uses such as long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, and retirement homes. Residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities can also be considered as sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors are residential homes located approximately 200 feet from the Project area.

An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot," would occur if an exceedance of the state 1-hour standard of 20 ppm or the 8-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur. CO hotspots are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at congested intersections. Currently, California's allowable CO emissions standard is a maximum of 3.4 grams/mile for passenger cars (there are requirements for certain vehicles that are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, the introduction of cleaner fuels, and the implementation of increasingly sophisticated and efficient emissions control technologies, CO concentration in the SCAB is designated as in attainment (see **Table 3**) (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

Other Air Districts employ similar considerations when evaluating potential CO concentration impacts. More specifically, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) concludes that under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a given Project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour, or 24,000 vehicles per hour, where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix, in order to generate a significant CO impact. The Project would not produce this volume of traffic required to generate a CO "hot spot." For the Project buildout under cumulative conditions, the highest daily volume would be 31,030, which is lower than the BAAQMD representative thresholds. Therefore, the Project would not result in a CO hotspot (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

As discussed in responses (a) and (b), emissions are expected from construction activities. However, emissions would be temporary during the construction period and not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. In addition, measure **AVM-AQ-1** would be implemented to reduce emissions of pollutants during

construction (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

## d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook identifies the following uses as having potential odor issues: wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, agricultural uses, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass moldings. The Project would not include the types of uses that would emit these types of objectionable odors. The Project area is heavily trafficked by motorists, patrons, pedestrians, and nearby residents and construction activities resulting in heavyduty equipment exhaust may generate detectable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Construction activities associated with the Project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. Construction-related odors would be short-term in nature and would cease upon Project completion. In addition, the Project would be constructed in accordance with CCR, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, which requires minimizing the idling time of construction equipment either by shutting it off when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes (see measure **AVM-AQ-2**). This would reduce the detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. In addition, the City would conduct construction in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent odor nuisances on sensitive land uses (see measure AVM-AQ-1) (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b). With compliance with regulatory requirements, construction odors would be minimized, and the Project would not affect a substantial amount of people. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to other emissions (such as odors) affecting a large number of people.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid and minimize potential impacts on air quality, the following standard measures would be implemented:

- AVM-AQ-1 SCAQMD Regulation rules, including Rule 401 Visible Emissions, Rule 402 Nuisance, Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, Rule 481 – Spray Coating, Rule 1108 – Volatile Organic Compounds, Rule 1143 Paint Thinner and Solvents, Rule 1186 - Fugitive Dust, Rule 1303 – Major Emission Sources, and Rule 1401 – New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants would be applied during Project construction to minimize air quality pollutants as a result of construction activity.
- AVM-AQ-2 Pursuant to CCR, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, during construction of the Project, idling time of construction equipment would be minimized by shutting off equipment when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes.

### 5.4 Biological Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact		
Wo	Nould the Project:						
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 CDFW or USFWS?						
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 CDFW or USFWS?						
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?						
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?						
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?						
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP); Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or state HCP?				$\boxtimes$		

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Biological Resources Memorandum that was prepared for this Project (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project 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 CDFW or USFWS?

**No Impact.** The biological study area (BSA) is located within an urbanized area along Valley Boulevard in San Gabriel, California. The BSA includes areas that could be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project, either temporarily or permanently. The limits of the BSA were determined by reviewing Project plans and aerial photography. The BSA includes three intersections: Valley Boulevard and New Avenue, Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard, and Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue, and an approximately 50-foot buffer beyond the direct impact area of each intersection. Based on the aerial imagery, the BSA is within an urbanized community consisting of industrial, residential, and commercial businesses along

Valley Boulevard. The majority of the BSA is developed or landscaped, including ornamental street trees along Valley Boulevard (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

A literature search was conducted to determine the potential special-status species within the BSA. In addition, a desktop survey was conducted to determine potential habitat of special-status species. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which is managed and updated monthly by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), was queried for a list of special-status species that have been recorded within or near the BSA. A CNDDB RareFind 5 database query was run on December 3, 2021, for the El Monte 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey Quadrangle (quad) and surrounding eight quads (CDFW, 2021). An official United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) list of species designated as threated or endangered and designated critical habitat under the FESA was obtained from the USFWS Carlsbad Office on December 3, 2021, (USFWS, 2021). The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory database query was run on December 3, 2021, for the El Monte quad and surrounding nine quads (CNPS, 2021). The CDFW Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) Habitat Connectivity Viewer was reviewed on December 3, 2021, to determine habitat connectivity in the BSA (CDFW, 2021). A desktop survey of the BSA was conducted by Zach Neider via Google Earth and Google street view on December 3, 2021 (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

According to the results of the CNDDB, USFWS, and CNPS searches, 38 special-status plant species have the potential to be in the BSA based on recorded geographical distribution. The species include the federally endangered Braunton's milk-vetch (*Astragalus brauntonii*), the federally and state endangered Nevin's barberry (*Berberis nevinii*), the federally and state endangered slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecahema leptoceras*), and the federally and state endangered California Orcutt grass (*Orcuttia californica*). However, the BSA is within a highly developed area with only pockets of landscaping and does not provide suitable habitat for special-status plant species. Therefore, no special-status plant species are expected in the BSA (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

According to the results of the CNDDB and USFWS searches, 45 special-status wildlife species have the potential to be in the BSA based on recorded geographical distribution. The species include the federally endangered arroyo toad (*Anaxyrus californicus*), the state threatened Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), the federally threatened Santa Ana sucker (*Catostomus santaanae*), the federally threatened and state endangered western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Cuccyzus americanus occidentalis*), the federal candidate monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), the federally and state endangered southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimusI*), the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica* californica), the state endangered foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylii*), the federally and state endangered southern mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*), the state threatened bank swallow (*Riparia riparia*), and the federally and state endangered least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*). However, the BSA is within a highly developed area with only pockets of landscaping zones and does not appear to have suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species. Therefore, no special-status wildlife species are expected in the BSA (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

Since no special status wildlife or plant species are expected to be present in the BSA, the Project would result in no impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

## b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS?

**No Impact.** The BSA is located in a developed, urbanized area consisting of mostly industrial, residential, and commercial land uses. According to the CNDDB search, eight special-status natural communities have the potential to be in the BSA based on recorded geographical distribution, including California Walnut Woodland, Canyon Live Oak Ravine Forest, Open Engelmann Oak Woodland, Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, Southern California Arroyo Chub/Santa Ana Sucker Stream, Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest, Southern Sycamore Alder Riparian Woodland, and Walnut Forest. However, no special-status communities were observed during the desktop survey and no special-status communities are expected to be in the BSA due to the highly urbanized conditions of the area (GPA Consulting, 2022b). The Project area is developed, with minimal landscaped area, with a lack of natural communities present. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

# c. Would the project 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.** There are no waterways or other features under the jurisdiction of United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or CDFW in the BSA. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on wetlands or other jurisdictional features.

# d. Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. A functional wildlife corridor allows for ease of movement between habitat patches. Corridors are important in preventing habitat fragmentation. Habitat fragmentation is typically caused by human development and can isolate wildlife populations, which leads to a decrease in genetic diversity and increases the risk of extirpations. Natural features such as canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover provide corridors for wildlife movement. Wildlife movement corridors are important because they provide access to mates, food, and water; allow the dispersal of individuals away from high population density areas; and facilitate the exchange of genetic traits between populations.

According to the CDFW BIOS Habitat Connectivity Viewer, the BSA is not within an essential connectivity area. The Alhambra Wash is located just west of the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue. However, the Alhambra Wash does not flow through the BSA at any point. It is highly unlikely that wildlife would access the BSA via Alhambra Wash due to the urbanized conditions of the site. Additionally, there is a lack of migratory habitat within the Project area due to the urbanized conditions of the Project area. Therefore, habitat connectivity is expected to be low within the BSA (GPA Consulting, 2022b).

Construction activities, including vegetation removal, could result in direct impacts on migratory birds and raptors if they were to be nesting in and/or adjacent to the BSA. Indirect impacts such as noise, vibration, dust, and human activity could result in indirect impacts on this species by disrupting nesting or foraging (GPA Consulting, 2022b). However, with implementation of measures **AVM-BIO-1** through **AVM-BIO-4**, impacts on migratory birds would be avoided and/or minimized.

Tree removal could result in direct impacts on bats if they were roosting in the trees to be removed. Noise and disturbance from adjacent construction activities could result in indirect impacts on bats, causing roost abandonment (GPA Consulting, 2022b). However, tree removal would be limited to 10 small trees directly adjacent to the southwest corner of the intersection. These trees are all small and have minimal habitat; therefore, the potential for bats to roost in these trees is minimal. With implementation of measures **AVM-BIO-5** and **AVM-BIO-6**, impacts on bats would be avoided and/or minimized.

Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant impact on movement within wildlife corridors and the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

## e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

**No Impact.** Based on desktop aerial photos, the BSA contains crepe myrtle (*Lagerstroemia* sp.), London plane (*Platanus* x *acerifolia*), Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), Chinese pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), queen palm (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*), and other common ornamental street trees. No protected trees were observed via desktop surveys (GPA Consulting, 2022b). Construction of the Project would require the removal and/or relocation of 10 trees and eight plants at the southwest corner of the intersection.

According to the San Gabriel Municipal Code, Chapter 95: Trees and Shrubs, the following policies are in place to protect trees and shrubs (City of San Gabriel, 2021):

- Policy 95.03: Permit required to plant or remove trees
  - It shall be unlawful, and it is hereby prohibited, for any person to plant, move, remove or replace any tree or shrub in the streets, avenues, highways, parks, parkways and public places of the city, or to cause the same to be done, unless and until a permit in writing so to do shall have been first obtained from the Community Development Director.
  - It is hereby prohibited, for any person maintaining any overhead wires or any pipes or underground conduits along or across any street, avenue, highway, park, parkway or public place in the city, or owning any property abutting upon any street, avenue, highway, park, parkway or public place in the city, to have any tree, shrub or plant located therein cut, trimmed, pruned or removed unless and until a permit in writing so to do shall have been first obtained from the Community Development Director.
- Policy 95.23: Exemptions
  - No permit is required for the removal, trimming or pruning of a tree damaged by storm, fire or other natural disaster or otherwise determined to be dangerous by the City Manager, Community Development Director, police officer, firefighter or Code Enforcement Officer. The exemption applies only to the extent necessary to remove the danger and reshape the tree.
  - Class I trees located in the front yards which do not exceed 19 inches in circumference (6-inch diameter) and Class I trees located inside yards and rear yards which do not exceed 30 inches in circumference (9.5-inch diameter) measured four feet above natural grade may be removed, cut, trimmed or transplanted without a permit. These trees are considered "immature."
  - Trees that must be removed or trimmed by order of any public agency or public utility having jurisdiction are exempted from the permit requirement.
  - Normal and routine trimming or pruning which does not result in damage or death to a

tree or does not result in the loss of more than one-third (33%) of the live foliage and limbs of any mature tree is allowed without a permit. Removal of deadwood is allowed without a permit.

- Any palm tree or fruit tree may be trimmed or removed without a permit.
- All trees in excess of five protected trees on properties of less than 8,000 square feet may be trimmed more than one-third or removed without a permit. The maximum number of protected trees on these properties is five. On lots in excess of 8,000 square feet, the maximum number of protected trees is seven.
- **Policy 95.37:** Permit required for trimming certain trees
  - No person shall cut, trim, prune, transplant, destroy or remove more than one-third of the live foliage of any mature tree located anywhere on private property in any of the multiple-family, commercial or industrial zones of the city without first obtaining a permit from the city.
  - No person shall reduce the height of any mature tree more than a total of one-fourth over two years without first obtaining a permit from the city.

Tree removal, relocation, and replacement for the Project would comply with tree removal permit requirements. Per tree removal permit requirements, the number of replacement trees required is calculated based on the trunk size of the trees removed (see **Table 8**). The number of replacement trees would be determined during the tree removal permitting process.

#### **Table 8 Tree Replacement Requirements**

Size of Trunk 4 Feet	4 to 10 Inches in	10 to 25 Inches in	25 Inches in
Above the Ground	Diameter	Diameter	Diameter
Number of	2	3	4
Replacement Trees			
Required			

The Project would not be anticipated to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

#### f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP); Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or state HCP?

**No Impact.** The Project area is not included in an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other similar plans. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on adopted HCPs or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

To avoid potential impacts on migratory birds and raptors, the following measures would be implemented:

- **AVM-BIO-1** Construction in areas with trees and vegetation that may provide nesting habitat for birds would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible.
- **AVM-BIO-2** Trimming and removal of trees and vegetation would be minimized and performed outside of the bird nesting season (typically February 1 to August 31), to the extent feasible.
- **AVM-BIO-3** In the event trimming or removal of trees and vegetation must be conducted during the bird nesting season, nesting bird surveys would be completed within 300 feet (for birds) and 500 feet (for raptors) of the construction area by a qualified biologist no more than 48 hours prior to trimming or clearing activities to determine if nesting birds are within the affected vegetation. Nesting bird surveys would be repeated if trimming or removal activities are suspended for five days or more.
- **AVM-BIO-4** In the event nesting birds/raptors are found within 500 feet of the construction area, appropriate buffers (typically 300 feet for song birds and 500 feet for raptors) would be implemented, as determined by a qualified biologist, to ensure that nesting birds and active nests are not harmed. Buffers would include fencing or other barriers around the nests to prevent any access to these areas and would remain in place until birds have fledged and/or the nest is no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist.

To avoid and/or minimize impacts on bats, the following avoidance and minimization the following measures would be implemented:

- **AVM-BIO-5** Where feasible, tree removal would be conducted in October, which is outside of the maternal and non-active seasons for bats.
- **AVM-BIO-6** A qualified biologist would be onsite during tree removal. If the biologist determines that bats are being disturbed during this work, work would be suspended until bats have left the vicinity on their own or can be safely excluded under direction of the biologist. Work would resume only once all bats have left the site and/or approval to resume work is given by a qualified biologist.

### 5.5 Cultural Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporate d	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	uld the Project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			$\boxtimes$	
c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			$\boxtimes$	

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Historical Resources Technical Memorandum and Cultural Resources Assessment that was prepared for the Project (GPA Consulting, 2022c; VCS Environmental, 2022).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

### a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

**No Impact.** A Historic Resources Technical Memorandum was prepared to evaluate potential resources within or adjacent to the Project area. The work area is primarily limited to the public ROW with very limited areas of TCE or permanent ROW acquisition. The proposed improvements would be limited to lane reconfigurations, curbs, and traffic signals; therefore, impacts on historic resources are not anticipated beyond the proposed area of work, TCE, and ROW acquisition (see **Figure 5**, Project Study Area and **Table 9**) (GPA Consulting, 2022c).

#### Table 9 Parcels in the Project Study Area

Intersection	APN	Address	Use	Year Built	TCE/ROW
Valley/Del Mar Avenue	5360-020- 010; 5360- 020-028	100 W Valley Boulevard	Gas Station	1972	TCE, ROW

*Source:* (GPA Consulting, 2022c)

For the Historical Resources Technical Memorandum, the Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) was consulted. The BERD is maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation, and includes resources reviewed for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Historical Landmarks programs through federal and state environmental compliance laws, and resources nominated under federal and state registration programs. No properties within the Project area or immediately adjacent to the proposed work area are included in the BERD (GPA Consulting, 2022c).

A request to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for a records search of the California Historical Resources Inventory System was completed on April 9, 2021. The results indicated that no resources have been previously identified within the Project area, one has been previously identified immediately adjacent to the proposed work area, and three have been previously identified within one mile of the Project area (see **Table 10**). The Hawaii Supermarket building, immediately adjacent to the proposed work area, is a single-story market/retail center in the Modern style. The building has been extensively remodeled and retains no integrity. None of the previously identified resources were listed or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

Primary #	Resource Description	Status Code	Proximity to Project
19- 186684	Hawaii Supermarket (120 East Valley Boulevard, San Gabriel; APN 5370-014-001)	6Z (Found ineligible for NRHP, CRHR or local designation through survey evaluation.)	Immediately adjacent work area at Valley/Del Mar
19- 187280	Single Family Residence (3658 Chariette Avenue Rosemead; APN 5371- 014-043)	7R (Identified in reconnaissance level survey: not evaluated.)	Within 1-mile radius
19- 187970	Earl Thompson Commercial Property (1710 South Del Mar Avenue, San Gabriel; APN 5370-014-003)	6Y (Determined ineligible for NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CRHR or local designation.)	Within 1-mile radius
19- 190503	Southern California Edison Company (SCE) Mesa-Revendale-Rush 66kV Transmission Line	6Z (Found ineligible for NRHP, CRHR or local designation through survey evaluation.)	Within 1-mile radius

#### Table 10 Previously Recorded Resources

Source: (GPA Consulting, 2022c)

Additionally, the *City of San Gabriel Historic Context Statement* was reviewed to determine if any properties in the Project area or immediately adjacent to the proposed work area had been previously identified in these documents. A historic context statement is a narrative report that is intended as an aid to identifying potential historical resources. The San Gabriel Historic Context Statement identified one property approximately one mile from the Project area. The building, known as the J.D. Mclead Building, is described in the "Commercial Development, 1913-1930" theme as a typical example of the occasional store building that was constructed outside of the main business district to serve those living in the far periphery of town during this time period. The building is not listed on or formally eligible for the NRHP or CRHR, or local listing (GPA Consulting, 2022c). As a result of the literature review, additional research methods, and visual observations, the buildings within the Project area do not appear to be potential historical resources as defined by CEQA (that is, listed in or eligible for the CRHR). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on historical resources.

### b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. A Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared to evaluate impacts on cultural resources in the Project area. The Cultural Resources Assessment included an archaeological survey of the Project area; the archaeological survey was conducted by VCS Archaeologist Patrick Maxon, RPA on March 15, 2021. The Project area was inspected visually by walking and inspecting the corners of the intersection. The APE was completely developed, and no open, undeveloped ground surface was present within the Project area (VCS Environmental, 2022). A literature review of documents on file at the SCCIC was also completed. The records search provided data on known archaeological and built environment resources as well as previous studies within one mile of the Project area (see Table 11). Data sources consulted at the Eastern Information Center located at the University of California, Riverside, included archaeological records, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility , and the Historic Property Data File maintained by the California Office of Historic Preservation. No cultural resources were identified within the Project area. Because the Project area is completely developed under streets and sidewalks, and the proposed impacts would be minor, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on archeological resources. However, if any archeological resources are found during construction, measure **AVM-CUL-1** would be implemented.

## c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project area is in a developed area that is not within or adjacent to a formal cemetery. The land within and surrounding the Project area has already been disturbed and developed. However, construction of the Project would include ground-disturbing activities that could unearth previously undiscovered human remains interred outside of a formal cemetery. Should they be present in the Project area, measure **AVM-CUL-2** would be implemented. Therefore, the Project would result in in a less than significant impact on human remains.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **AVM-CUL-1** In the event unknown cultural resources are encountered during construction activities, all construction activities near the discovery would cease, until a qualified archeologist can determine the significance of the discovery and the course of action for its recovery in consultation with the City and consulting Tribes.
- AVM-CUL-2 If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work would halt and the County Coroner would be notified (California Health and Safety Code, §7050.5). The Coroner would determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, he/she would contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC is responsible for immediately designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who would be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed, if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials. If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that would not be subject to further subsurface disturbance.

### 5.6 Energy

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould 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?				

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project 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.** During the 18-month construction period, operation of construction vehicles, worker vehicles, and equipment would require the use of fuel (gasoline and diesel) and electricity. Energy consumption during construction would be temporary and would not require an ongoing or permanent commitment of energy resources.

Equipment used during construction and construction would be compliant with CARB Standards. Compliance with CARB emission standards and state anti-idling regulations would minimize wasteful or inefficient energy consumption during construction. The Project would be constructed in compliance with applicable CARB regulations regarding retrofitting, repowering, or replacing diesel off-road construction equipment. In addition, Project construction would comply with state regulations (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(3)) that limit the construction vehicle idling times to no more than five minutes.

The energy required for operation of the signals and lighting would not be greater than the existing amounts. The Project would not require long-term energy input beyond what is currently required. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on energy resources.

## b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

**No Impact.** The California Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan provides a roadmap for achieving maximum energy savings across all major sectors in California and identifies strategies for achieving goals for energy. Implementation of the Project would not result in increased traffic, growth, or new uses of energy resources. As a result, long-term changes in energy use (i.e., fuel consumption) are anticipated to be negligible. Fuel used for construction vehicles and equipment would be temporary and would result in a negligible increase in regional energy consumption. Once operational, the energy requirements for the Project would be similar to existing energy usage. The proposed Project would also include measures that

would help minimize fuel use associated with Project construction (refer to **AVM-AQ-1**). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on regional and local plans for use of renewable energy or energy efficiency.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Energy. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Energy.

### 5.7 Geology and Soils

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	ould the F	Project:				
a.	Directly including	or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, g the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i.	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
	ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$	
	iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
	iv.	Landslides?				$\boxtimes$
b.	Result ir	substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
c.	Be locat become in an on liquefact	ed on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result -site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, tion, or collapse?				
d.	Be locat Uniform indirect	ed on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or risks to life or property?				
e.	Have soi tanks or sewers a	ils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where are not available for the disposal of waste water?				$\boxtimes$
f.	Directly site or u	or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or nique geologic feature?			$\boxtimes$	

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Geotechnical Evaluation Report that was prepared for the Project (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

- a. Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** An earthquake is caused when strain energy in rocks is suddenly released by movement along a plane of weakness. Surface rupture usually occurs along traces of known or potentially active faults, although many historic events have occurred on faults not previously known to be active. There are seven active or potentially active faults within the region. These faults include the East Montebello, Elsinore (Whittier Section), Puente Hills blind thrust (Los Angeles Section), Puente Hills blind thrust (Santa Fe Section), Puente Hills blind thrust (Coyote Hills), Elysian Park blind thrust (Upper), and Elysian Park blind thrust (lower) (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021).

The California Geologic Survey (CGS) establishes criteria for faults as active, potentially active, or inactive. Active faults are those that show evidence of surface displacement within the last 11,000 years (Holocene age). Potentially active faults are those that demonstrate displacement within the past 1.6 million years (Quaternary age). Faults showing no evidence of displacement within the last 1.6 million years may be considered inactive. In 1972 the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act was passed into law which requires studies within 500 feet of active or potentially active faults. The Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act designs "active" and "potentially active" faults utilizing the same age criteria as that used by the CGS (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). Out of the seven faults, none are located within 500 feet of the Project area.

In addition to the seven regional faults, other large regional faults in the Southern California area have the potential to impact the Project area, the Eagle Rock Fault, the Raymond Fault, and the Sierra Madre Fault. The Project alignment does not cross any mapped active faults, though the Elysian Park blind thrust does lie beneath the Project area and the East Montebello fault segment does cross near the western boundary of the Project area. The Elysian Park blind thrust fault and the Puente Hills blind thrust fault are buried deep beneath the surface and do not present a surface fault rupture hazard; Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture within the Project alignment would be considered low (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). Since the Project area is near a fault zone, measure **AVM-GEO-1** would be implemented to further analyze the soil conditions and hazards in the Project area prior to construction. The Project would not increase risk of hazards because the intersection is existing, and the Project would not change the use or add new facilities. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to a known earthquake fault.

#### ii. Strong Seismic Ground shaking?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The energy released during an earthquake propagates from its rupture surface in the form of seismic waves. The resulting strong ground motion from the seismic wave propagation can cause significant damage to structures. At any location, the intensity of the ground motion is a function of the distance to the fault rupture, soil conditions, and the earthquake magnitude.

Intensity is usually greater in areas underlain by loose earth material than in areas underlain by more competent rock (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021).

Due to the proximity of the Project area to numerous seismic sources discussed above in response (a.i.), strong to moderate ground shaking would be anticipated within the Project alignment in the event of a major earthquake from a nearby seismic source. Since all structures would be designed in accordance with the latest Caltrans acceleration response spectrum design parameters and load and resistance factor design specifications, the risk due to seismic shaking from known seismic sources is considered low. In addition, measure **AVM-GEO-1** would be implemented to further analyze the soil conditions and hazards in the Project area prior to construction (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). Recommendations and mitigation measures from the geotechnical and materials reports would be incorporated into the Project plans and specifications. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to strong seismic ground shaking.

#### iii. Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Soil liquefaction occurs when a saturated or partially saturated soil substantially loses strength and stiffness in response to an applied stress, usually earthquake shaking or other sudden change in stress condition, causing it to behave like a liquid. Primary factors influencing liquefaction potential include groundwater elevation, soil type and grain-size characteristics, relative density of the soil, initial confining pressure, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. Soils that are mostly susceptible to liquefaction are saturated low-density sands and silty sands within 50 feet of the ground surface. With increasing overburden, soil density, and increasing clay content, the likelihood of liquefaction decreases (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021).

According to the Department of Conservation's Earthquake Zones of Required Investigations Map, the Project area is not located in a liquefaction zone (California Department of Conservation, 2019). However, a review of the nearby as-built log of test borings data show loose to medium dense granular soils within the upper 15 to 25 feet of the area tested (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). Although these borings are located over half a mile away from the Project area within the liquefaction zone and may not be representative of soil in the Project area, measure **AVM-GEO-1** would be implemented to further analyze the soil conditions and hazards in the Project area. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to seismic related ground failure.

#### iv. Landslides, Including Seismically Induced Landslides?

**No Impact.** Landslides are downslope movements of conglomerations of soils or bedrock or combinations of both. Landslides occur when the internal strength of earth material is lost, and the material settles into a form where the mass is centralized on the downhill side of motion. The chances of a landslide occurring are increased with steeper slope gradients, decreased shear strength of earth materials, unfavorable bedding configuration, clay content, human disturbance of the earth mass or its boundaries, increased water content, earthquake shaking, and disturbance of the toe of a slope. The Project area is relatively flat along the basin floor of the San Gabriel basin. Based on the existing topography and the soil characteristics in the Project area, the landslide potential in the Project area is anticipated to be negligible (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). In addition, the Department of Conservation's Earthquake Zones of Required Investigations Map shows the Project is not located in a landslide zone (California Department of Conservation, 2019). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to landslides.

#### b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soils Survey conducted for the Project, there is one type of soil mapped in the Project area: Urban Land – Palmview Tujunga complex, 0 to 5 Percent Slopes (National Resources Conservation Service, 2021). Based on its texture, this soil has a low to high potential for erosion (Michigan State University, 2002). Standard BMPs such as fiber rolls and silt fences would be implemented to minimize the potential for soil erosion during construction (see **AVM-GEO-2**).

The Project area is paved and impervious. In addition, the Project would include addition of auxiliary lanes and widening of curbs that would increase impervious surface. An increase of impervious surfaces could focus runoff to one area, resulting in the increased velocity of runoff and erosion within that area. However, the permanent increase of impervious surface would be approximately 705 square feet, which would be considered negligible. The Project would improve existing drainage by adding a catch basin to accommodate the expected increase of runoff. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

c. Would the project 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?

No Impact. See discussion in responses (a-iii) and (a-iv).

d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

**Less Than Significant Impact**. Expansive soil is a soil that is prone to large volume changes (swelling and shrinking) that are directly related to changes in water content; with higher moisture levels, the soils swell, and with lower moisture levels, the soils shrink. According to the NRCS Web Soils Survey conducted for the Project, the soil in the Project area has low potential to shrink and swell (National Resources Conservation Service, 2021). Measure **AVM-GEO-1** would be implemented to further analyze the soil conditions and confirm the expansiveness of soil in the Project area (Earth Mechanics Inc., 2021). Recommendations and mitigation measures from the geotechnical and materials reports would be incorporated into the Project plans and specifications. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to expansive soil.

# e. Would the project 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 would include intersection improvements and would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to septic tanks.

### f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no unique geologic features in the Project area. Paleontological resources include fossils, which are the preserved remains or traces of animals, plants, and other organisms from prehistoric time (i.e., the period before written records). Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units (formed by the deposition of material at the Earth's surface); and are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance or natural causes, such as erosion by wind or water. The Project area is located on Young Alluvial Fan Deposits. Holocene and late Pleistocene aged Alluvial Fan Deposits are geologically too young to contain fossils and have a low paleontological sensitivity (California Department of Conservation, 2016). In addition, a paleontological resources records search was conducted for the Project. It was determined that there are no recorded fossil sites within the Project area (see Figure 5, Project Study Area). However, there are fossil sites located near the Project area and the fossil sites contain the same sedimentary deposits that occur in the Project area. The Project area is in a developed area where soils have been previously disturbed; therefore, it was determined that unknown fossils are unlikely to be encountered during construction (VCS Environmental, 2022). In addition, if paleontological resources are discovered during construction of the Project, measure AVM-GEO-3 would be implemented. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **AVM-GEO-1** Prior to completing final design, a geotechnical design report , and a materials report would be prepared for the proposed improvements. The reports would document and analyze the soil conditions and hazards such as surface fault rupture, liquefaction, and expansive and collapsible soil conditions. Reports would also include:
  - Subsurface investigations using exploratory boreholes and discrete sampling to evaluate site-specific soil and groundwater conditions and to collect in-situ soil samples for laboratory testing.
  - Laboratory testing to determine soil strengths, plasticity, grain size distribution, compressibility, and expansion potential.
  - Liquefaction analysis to determine potential liquefiable soil layers to determine suitable mitigation.
  - Pavement recommendations based on soil data and engineering analysis. Recommendations from the geotechnical and materials reports would be incorporated into the Project plans and specifications. The construction contractor would be required to implement mitigation measures from the geotechnical report and Project specifications.
- **AVM-GEO-2** BMPs, including silt fencing and fiber rolls, would be implemented to minimize erosion resulting from construction activities.
- **AVM-GEO-3** In the event unknown paleontological resources are encountered during construction activities, all construction activities near the discovery would cease, until a qualified paleontologist can identify and determine the significance of the discovery and the course of action for its recovery in consultation with the City of San Gabriel.

### 5.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	uld the Project:				
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			$\boxtimes$	
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				$\boxtimes$

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study that was prepared for this Project (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

### a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] No. 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32), which requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. As a central requirement of AB 32, the ARB was assigned the task of developing a Scoping Plan that outlines the state's strategy to achieve the 2020 GHG emissions limit. The Scoping Plan, which was developed by the ARB in coordination with the Climate Action Team, was published in October 2008. The Scoping Plan proposed a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California, improve the environment, reduce the state's dependence on oil, diversify the State's energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health. An important component of the plan is a cap-and-trade program covering 85 percent of the state's emissions. The Scoping Plan was approved by the ARB on December 11, 2008. According to the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, California has made progress toward achieving the 2020 statewide target while also reducing criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants and supporting economic growth (California Air Resources Board, 2017). The ARB published a second update to the Scoping Plan to reflect the 2030 target set by Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by AB 32 (California Air Resources Board, 2017).

According to the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the major source of GHGs in California is transportation, contributing approximately 37 percent of the state's total GHG emissions. Industrial sources are the second largest generator, contributing approximately 24 percent of the state's GHG emissions. Residential and commercial sources contribute only about six and five percent of the state's GHG emissions, respectively. These are less than the eight percent generated by agriculture (California Air Resources Board, 2017).

51

GHG emissions refer to a group of emissions that are believed to affect global climate change conditions. The principal GHGs are CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, nitrous oxide, sulfur hexafluoride, perfluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, and water vapor. CO<sub>2</sub> is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant GHG emitted. To account for the varying warming potential to different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2e</sub>). GHG impacts are considered on a global scale, as single projects are not substantial enough to result in a measurable increase in global concentrations of GHG emissions. GHG impacts of a project are considered on a cumulative basis (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a).

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment was conducted for the Project to evaluate the Project's air quality and GHG impacts. Construction activities would be temporary and occur over 18 months. The construction activities would result in the emission of GHGs from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction activities' emissions would vary depending on the number and type of equipment, duration of use, operation schedules, and the number of construction workers. The Project's total estimated GHG emissions during construction would equal approximately 121.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>) per year, equal to approximately 4.05 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year after amortization over 30 years per SCAQMD methodology. Construction emissions for the Project would be below the SCAQMD GHG emissions threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. In addition, the Project would reduce vehicle emissions through traffic flow improvements consistent with the Regional Transportation Reduction Targets (T-3) of the CARB Scoping Plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted and is consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

The Project would not include any buildings and therefore would not result in any permanent source or stationary source emissions. In addition, the intersection improvements would not directly generate vehicle trips, a predominant source of GHG emissions. Vehicle trips are caused by land use changes that indirectly influence transportation improvements, whereas the proposed traffic facility improvements provide improved circulation through an area with existing and anticipated future traffic congestion. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the Project would generate GHG emissions in excess of the baseline conditions, and the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions.

## b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

**No Impact.** As discussed in response (a) above, the total estimated construction related GHG emissions for the Project would equal approximately 121.6 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year, equal to approximately 4.05 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year after amortization over 30 years per SCAQMD methodology. Construction emissions for the Project would be below the SCAQMD GHG emissions threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year (Entech Consulting Group, 2022a). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted and is consistent with the CARB Scoping Plan for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

### 5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact			
W	Would the Project:							
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?							
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?							
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$			
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?							
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project Area?							
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?				$\boxtimes$			

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Initial Site Assessment Report (ISA) that was prepared for this Project (Geocon West Inc., 2022).

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**. A hazardous material is any substance that may be explosive, flammable, poisonous, corrosive, radioactive, reactive, or any combination thereof, because of its quality, concentration, or characteristics. Hazardous materials may require special care in handling due to the hazards they pose to public health, safety, and the environment. Potential hazards

associated with hazardous materials include fires, explosions, and leaks. Releases of hazardous materials can be damaging when they occur in highly populated areas or along transportation routes.

An ISA was prepared to evaluate potential hazards and hazardous materials within or adjacent to the Project area. The ISA included a site reconnaissance and review of historical topographic maps, aerial photographs, regulatory databases, and other site-related sources for indications of potential environmental concerns as well as Recognized Environmental Conditions that might be encountered during construction (Geocon West Inc., 2022). The limits of the ISA study area include the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection and an approximately 500-foot buffer from the center of the intersection.

Historical records indicate that the intersection has been a thoroughfare in the region since at least the late 1890s, which includes use during periods when lead was an ingredient in gasoline. Therefore, aerially deposited lead (ADL) may be present in exposed soil within the Project area. Because the roadways within the Project area are paved and elements included in the Project would not disturb soil in unpaved areas, the risk of encountering ADL is considered low (Geocon West Inc., 2022). However, the Project would generate excess soil that would require off-site disposal; measure **MM-HAZ-1** would be implemented to test the soil and develop a waste profile prior to export.

There are a number of former or current facilities adjacent to the Project area with reported releases of petroleum hydrocarbons. All released have been addressed to the satisfaction of the regulatory oversight agencies and no further action is required. However, residual concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons may still be present in soil and groundwater; therefore, these facilities are considered to be HREC. Based on the location and depth of the contamination at these facilities, the risk of encountering these facilities during construction of the Project is considered low (Geocon West Inc., 2022). Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would be implemented to test the soil and develop a waste profile prior to export.

Historical records indicate crops were present on adjoining and adjacent properties from sometime prior to 1928 until sometime between 1928 and 1938. Pesticides may have been applied to the crops, and if so, then pesticides and associated metals such as arsenic and lead may be present in shallow soil on these properties. The Project includes shallow earthwork to facilitate new paving sections in areas that have been previously disturbed; therefore, the risk of encountering pesticides and associated metals is considered low (Geocon West Inc., 2022). Measure **MM-HAZ-1** would be implemented to test the soil and develop a waste profile prior to export.

Treated wood waste potentially contains arsenic, chromium, copper, pentachlorophenol, and creosote. If not disposed of properly, treated wood waste containing these constituents could contaminate soil, surface water, and groundwater (Department of Toxic Substances Control, n.d.). The relocation or replacement of power poles may generate treated wood waste if the wooden posts are unable to be reused. Therefore, **AVM-HAZ-2** would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts related to treated wood waste.

Pole-mounted transformers observed within the Project limits have the potential to contain fluids that contain polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB). As the owner, Southern California Edison maintains responsibility for the transformers. Evidence of a release of PCBs was not observed in the vicinity of the electrical equipment during the site reconnaissance. However, if leaking transformers are identified during construction, the utility owner would be contacted to test for PCBs or other hazardous substances, and service, replace, and/or relocate the equipment (Geocon West Inc., 2022).

Yellow and white thermoplastic striping paint observed within the Project limits generally has the potential to contain lead or chromium. During construction, the removal of yellow and white thermoplastic striping paint could release lead or chromium into the environment. Therefore, measures **AVM-HAZ-3** would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts related to yellow and white thermoplastic striping paint.

All hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with standard practices and applicable regulations. No potentially hazardous materials would be used during Project operation. Implementation of measures **MM-HAZ-1** through **AVM-HAZ-3** would avoid and minimize impacts related to the release of hazardous materials. Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant related to the routine transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials create.

# b. Would the project 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 With Mitigation Incorporated. See discussion in response (a) above.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**No Impact**. Transporting small quantities of fuels, oils, and lubricants would be required for Project construction and maintenance. The closest school is McKinley Elementary is located approximately 0.3-mile northwest of the Project area. McKinley Elementary is located along Frisk Avenue and Manley Drive, and neither road would be used to transport materials to the Project area. In addition, the transport of hazardous materials required during construction or maintenance would be conducted in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and City regulations. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to emissions of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.

d. Would the project 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?

**Less Than Significant Impact**. According to California State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker online database for groundwater information, the nearest leaking underground storage tank is the former Unocal Corp SS 6177 at 1935 South Del Mar Avenue, approximately 0.5-mile southeast of the Project area (Geocon West Inc., 2022). In addition, a search of federal, state, and local databases for the Project area and surrounding areas was conducted on Environmental Data Resource, Inc. (EDR). Approximately 16 properties within 0.125-mile of the Project area are listed on one or more non-release-related databases. Four properties within 0.125-mile of the Project area are listed on one or more release-related databases. Three of these four properties are closed cases. The one open case is located 600 feet south of the intersection and has been inactive since January 2001. The distance of this case and its downgradient location suggest that it is unlikely to have caused a REC in the Project area. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to a hazardous waste site.

# 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 closest airport to the Project area is the San Gabriel Valley Airport, located approximately five miles east of the Project area. There are no airports within two miles of the Project area; therefore, the Project would result in no impact on safety or noise within an airport land use planning area.

## f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Disaster routes are used during times of crisis to save lives, protect property, and minimize impact to the environment. During a disaster, pre-identified disaster routes have priority for clearing, repairing, and restoration over all over roads. According to the General Plan, Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue are considered public safety access routes (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Construction would take approximately 18 months, and it is anticipated that Valley Boulevard and New Avenue would be partially closed during working hours during both phase 1 and phase 2 of the Project. Partial lane closure could cause slower emergency response times. However, the roadway would remain open to through-traffic during non-working hours to maintain continuous access. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

## g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

**No Impact.** According to the City of San Gabriel General Plan, there are no fire wildfire hazard areas in the Project area (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to wildland fires.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **MM-HAZ-1** The Project would generate excess soil that would require off-site disposal. The soil would be tested and a waste profile developed prior to export.
- **AVM-HAZ-2** Treated wood waste generated for this Project would be managed during construction under Project standard special provisions.
- **AVM-HAZ-3** Traffic striping waste generated for this Project would be managed during construction under Project standard special provisions.

### 5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	ould the P	roject:				
a.	Violate a requirem groundw	ny water quality standards or waste discharge tents or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ater quality?				$\boxtimes$
b.	Substant substanti may imp basin?	ially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere ially with groundwater recharge, such that the project ede sustainable groundwater management of the				
c.	Substant area, incl or river o manner t	ially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or luding through the alteration of the course of a stream or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a chat 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 offsite;			$\boxtimes$	
	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; or				
	iv.	Impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
d.	In flood h pollutant	nazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, rise release of s due to project inundation?				$\boxtimes$
e.	Conflict v control p	with or obstruct implementation of a water quality lan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				$\boxtimes$

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Hydrology and Hydraulic Report that was prepared for this Project (PacRim Engineering, 2021).

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

**No Impact.** The Project area is within the Los Angeles River Watershed (HUC 18070105). The Los Angeles River Watershed encompasses approximately 830 square miles in Los Angeles County and is surrounded by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, the Santa Monica Mountains to the west, the Pacific Ocean to

the south, and the Santa Ana Mountains to the east (USGS, 2021). The Alhambra Wash is located just west of the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue. However, the Alhambra Wash does not flow through the Project area at any point. There are no waterways or jurisdictional features within the Project area (GPA Consulting, 2022b). Excavation required for the Project would be a maximum of 13 feet and would not be expected to encounter groundwater at this depth. The Project would include draining inlets, flowing through the on-site piping system and discharges into sand/ oil interceptors. A flow pipe would be installed at the bottom of the onsite basin, and a curb opening catch basin would be located on the northeast corner of Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Boulevard. All storm runoff from the site would be released into a storm drain system on Del Mar Avenue (PacRim Engineering, 2021). Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or degrade surface or ground water quality. The Project would result in no impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

# b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

**No Impact.** The Project area is located within the Main San Gabriel Basin. The Project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 13 feet. Groundwater is not expected to be encountered at this depth. Therefore, the Project would not affect groundwater quality. The Project would not be anticipated to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Therefore, the Project would recharge.

- c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surface, in a manner that would:
  - i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the NRCS Web Soils Survey conducted for the Project, there is one type of soil mapped in the Project area: Urban Land – Palmview Tujunga Complex, 0 to 5 percent Slopes (National Resources Conservation Service, 2021). Based on its texture, this soil has a low to high potential for erosion (Michigan State University, 2002). Standard BMPs such as fiber rolls and silt fences would be implemented to minimize the potential for soil erosion during construction (see measure **AVM-GEO-2**).

The Project area is paved and impervious and the Project would include addition of auxiliary lanes and widening of curbs that would increase the impervious surface. An increase of impervious surfaces could focus runoff to one area, resulting in the increased velocity of runoff and erosion to that area. However, the permanent increase of impervious surface would be approximately 705 square feet, which would be considered negligible. The Project would improve existing drainage by adding a catch basin to accommodate the expected increase of runoff. In addition, no waterways would be altered by the Project. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to soil erosion.

## ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are two existing curb inlets with 7-foot wide openings at the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection of Del Mar Avenue and Valley Boulevard that. A curb opening catch basin would be added at the southwest corner of the Del Mar Avenue and Valley Boulevard intersection along Valley Boulevard to accommodate the widening. Drainage would be designed to direct flows to these three curb inlets. The sizing and design of the proposed curb inlets and connector pipes have adequate capacities to handle the 50-year storm peak flow rates (PacRim Engineering, 2021). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to surface runoff.

# 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. See discussion in response (c-i) and (c-ii) above.

#### iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion in response (c-i) and (c-ii) above.

## d. Is the project in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, or risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?

**No Impact.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Insurance Rate Maps (Panel 06037C1675F), the Project area is outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain (Zone X) (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2015). A tsunami is a series of traveling ocean waves of extremely long length generated primarily by vertical movement on a fault (earthquake) occurring along the ocean floor. The Project area is not within a tsunami hazard area (California Department of Conservation, n.d.). In addition, the Project area is not located near a large inland body of water that could generate a seiche during seismic ground shaking. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.

## e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

**No Impact.** The San Gabriel Valley Water Associated developed a San Gabriel Valley Groundwater Basin Salt and Nutrient Management Plan (SNMP) in May 2016 to set forth basin management goals and objectives. The SNMP's goals are to assist stakeholders to comply with the SNMP regarding the use of the recycled water from municipal wastewater treatment facilities as a safe source of water supply, while maintaining the water quality objectives for salt and nutrients in the Basin Plan established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Groundwater and surface water would not be encountered during Project implementation. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on water quality control or sustainable groundwater management plans.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Hydrology and Water Quality.

### 5.11 Land Use and Planning

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould 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?				

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

#### a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

**No Impact.** The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a physical feature (such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (such as a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within the existing community or between a community and outlying areas. The Project would require partial parcel acquisition and TCEs from the ARCO Gas Station (APN 5360-020-010 and 5360-020-028); however, the partial acquisition would not divide the community. The Project would include improvements to an existing intersection; therefore, operation of the Project would not divide the existing community. Construction would take approximately 18 months. It is anticipated that Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue would be partially closed during working hours during both phases of the Project; however, the roadway would remain open to through-traffic during non-working hours to maintain continuous access. Following construction, access would be restored. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to the division of an established community.

### b. Would the project 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?

**Less than Significant Impact**. The land use designation for the Project area is identified in the General Plan as Commercial Specific Plan. The Project would be consistent with the sustainable transportation goals adopted by the General Plan, including the Mobility Chapter to improve circulation, including:

- Goal 3.1 We will provide a safe, efficient, and environmentally sensitive transportation system for the movement of people and goods.
  - Target 3.1.2 Attain level of service "D" as the performance threshold at designated intersections.
  - Target 3.1.3 Improve the City's interregional transportation capabilities.
  - Target 3.1.4 Improve traffic signal coordination / synchronization on Valley Boulevard, San Gabriel Boulevard, Mission Road and Las Tunas Dr. to increase traffic flow.

The Project would meet performance LOS thresholds set by the City. The Project would also be consistent with the sustainable transportation policy recommendations and goals listed in the Specific Plan that describe the need for traffic control synchronization to improve mobility on Valley Boulevard. The Project would improve traffic flow and overall travel speed along Valley Boulevard through traffic signal synchronization, installation of new traffic signal poles and cabinets, a new curb return, new driveways, and addition of auxiliary lanes. The new traffic signals and signal control equipment would improve signal timing, coordination, and pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

The Specific Plan includes standards intended to support the implementation of the sustainable transportation policy recommendations. The roadway, on-street parking, and sidewalk improvements included in the Transportation and Circulation chapter of the Specific Plan related to transportation improvements are as follows:

- 1. **Cross Section.** Valley Boulevard will be a five-lane street with curb parking and sidewalks.
- 2. **Median/Turn Lane.** The center turn lane will be retained, particularly at major intersections and along segments where driveways are present. In conjunction with the driveway consolidation aspects of this Plan, as segments of the roadway are developed that do not have driveways, the center turn lane will be converted to landscaped pocket medians.
- 3. **Parking**. Parallel parking will be provided in the curb lane as it is necessary buffer between the traffic volumes on the street and the pedestrian realm. At intersections where additional through or turn lanes are necessary, particularly on a peak-period basis, the parking lane will be converted to a travel or turn lane for an appropriate length, but will be managed for peak-period, peak-direction use. In areas where additional width is needed for sidewalk amenities, the parking lane may be converted to sidewalk (creating parking bays). This conversion of parking to sidewalk will occur in mid-block locations and at lower volume intersections where additional travel lanes will not be needed.
- 4. Sidewalks. Sidewalk width will be maintained and expanded where possible, through conversion of the parking lane (as above), by narrowing the travel way where feasible through the use of narrower travel and parking lanes (11 feet and 7 feet, respectively), or during redevelopment of the abutting land use.
- **5. Improvements.** Valley Boulevard mobility improvements shall be in the form of efficient traffic signal timing and coordination and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities rather than emphasizing widening Valley Boulevard (except for dedications or corner cut-offs necessary to construct turn lanes).

The Project does not meet all the standards intended to support the implementation of the sustainable transportation policy recommendations made in the Specific Plan due to safety and operational issues. The cross section of Valley Boulevard would have a minimum of five lanes with curb parking and sidewalks except at the approaches of the intersection, where there would be no parking in order to accommodate a minimal length of additional turn lanes. Center turn lanes would be preserved at this intersection. The Project would not be able to accommodate wider sidewalks at this intersection through the conversion of parking lanes or creating narrower travel lanes, due to safety and operational issues. Additionally, a well-defined off-peak hour could not be established to allow for off-peak hour parking usage along Valley Boulevard within the limits of the proposed improvements at the intersection.
The Project would improve traffic safety, alleviate congestion, improve traffic flow and operational conditions, and improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility along Valley Boulevard at the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection and meet the goals outlined in the General Plan and Specific Plan. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on a land use plan, policy, or regulation.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Land Use and Planning. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Land Use and Planning.

### 5.12 Mineral Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould 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?				$\bowtie$
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?				$\boxtimes$

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project 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.** According to the Los Angeles County General Plan, the Project area is not within a mineral resource zone (Los Angeles County, 2014). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on mineral resources.

b. Would the project 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.** See discussion in response (a) above.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in no impact on Mineral Resources. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Mineral Resources.

# 5.13 Noise

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould the Project result in:				
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?				
b.	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
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?				

The following discussion incorporates the results of the Noise Study that was prepared for this Project (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b).

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

a. Would the project result in the 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 Impact.** A Noise Study was prepared to evaluate whether an increase in the future noise levels would result in a significant effect using thresholds defined in CEQA Guidelines and the Municipal code (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b).

The zoning within and adjacent to the Project area includes MU-T, C-CT, and R-NC. According to the Specific Plan, the land use designation for the Project area and surrounding area is classified as Transit Oriented Development (City of San Gabriel, 2013). The nearest sensitive receptors are residential homes located approximately 200 feet from the Project area. The closest school is McKinley Elementary is located approximately 0.3 mile northwest of the Project area.

The existing noise environment was characterized by collecting field noise measurements at residential properties near the Project area. The noise measurements were performed on October 28 and November 10, 2021. Eighteen residential properties were selected within the Project area. Concurrent traffic counts were taken at acoustically unobstructed locations exposed to the roadways immediately adjacent to the property. The selected locations are representative of the worst-case traffic noise exposure for the surrounding residential properties and were also used for calibrating the traffic noise prediction model (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b) (see **Table 11**).

Field Survey Position	Location	Time	L <sub>eq</sub> * (dBA)
ST-1	Valley Boulevard/New Avenue	10:00 to 10:15 AM	71.5
ST-2	New Avenue/SB	10:45 to 11:00 AM	71.6
ST-3	West Bencamp Street/EB	11:02 to 11:17 AM	57
ST-4	West Bencamp Street/WB	11:20 to 11:35 AM	53
ST-5	West Bencamp Street/EB	11:40 to 11:55 AM	58.3
ST-6	Del Mar Avenue/SB	12:10 to 12:25 PM	75.4
ST-7	Del Mar Avenue/NB	12:30 to 12:45 PM	66.7
ST-8	Valley Boulevard/Del Mar Avenue	12:50 to 1:05 PM	69.7
ST-9	West Bencamp Street/WB	1:15 to 1:30 PM	56.6
ST-10	West Bencamp Street/WB	1:35 to 1:50 PM	54.9
ST-11	East Newby Avenue	10:00 to 10:15 AM	44.6
ST-12	Lafayette Street	10:25 to 10:45 AM	53
ST-13	Allegro Square	10:45 to 11:00 AM	51.7
ST-14	Kenmore Drive	11:10 to 11:25 AM	51
ST-15	San Gabriel Boulevard	11:30 to 11:45 AM	67.7
ST-16	San Gabriel Boulevard/ Valley Boulevard	12:00 to 12:15 PM	70.1
ST-17	South Gladys Avenue	12:25 to 12:40 PM	58.7
ST-18	South Gladys Avenue	12:45 to 1:00 PM	55.5

#### Table 11 Existing (Ambient) Short-Term Noise Level Measurements

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b)

\*Equivalent continuous sound level (time-average sound level) in A-weighted decibels

The City of San Gabriel Municipal codes include several references to noise control that apply depending on the zoning of the site. The following sections of the Municipal code applicable to the Project:

- Section 98.02 (T): It shall be unlawful and hereby declared a public nuisance for any person or persons either owning, leasing, occupying or having charge or possession of any real property within the city to cause, permit or allow the of the following condition to exist thereon: To maintain or operate, between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM, any device, instrument, vehicle or machinery in such a manner as to create noise or cause vibrations which cause discomfort or annoyance to reasonable persons of normal sensitivity, or which endangers the comfort, repose, health or peace of the public or of any person using or occupying other property in the vicinity.
- Section 130.09: It shall be unlawful for any person to run or operate, or permit to be run or operated, any mechanical, electrical, electronic, hydraulic, or wind-driven equipment, fan, pump, compressor, blower, motor, engine, machine, or other similar apparatus, whether as owner, agent, employee, lessee, or other person having the charge thereof, which causes, or is likely to cause, any loud, excessive, unnecessary, or unusual continued or intermittent noise, or any noise which annoys, disturbs, injures, or endangers the comfort, repose, health, peace, or safety of others within the city unless such noise is muffled effectually and the apparatus is either equipped with a muffler device in constant operation and properly maintained to deaden such noise, or the apparatus is enclosed in a room, building, or other enclosure sufficiently insulated to deaden such noise.

- Section 150.003: No construction shall take place within the city except between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturday. Construction shall be prohibited on Sundays and on such holidays as may be designated by Council resolution. The Community Development Director may extend the hours of operation for special circumstances by providing written notice to surrounding residents in advance. The restriction on construction hours shall not apply to emergency repairs required to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, whether performed by a public agency, utility, company, or private owner. Said restrictions also shall not apply to a residential property owner and or members of his immediate family, performing work on his personal property.
- 153.152 (2):The following performance standards shall apply to all commercial and industrial uses located in the C-1, C-3, and M-1 zone districts: no use may violate the city's noise standards; no use may generate any ground-transmitted vibration that is perceptible to the human sense of touch measured at the outside boundary of the immediate space occupied by the enterprise generating the vibration if the enterprise is one of several located on a lot or at the lot line if the enterprise generating the vibration is the only enterprise located on a lot.

Construction hours of operation would be limited to weekdays from 7 AM to 7 PM. Project construction would require two phases of construction: demolition and site preparation, and grading and paving. The operation of heavy-duty equipment would produce noise. Construction noise levels were estimated using Federal Transmit Association (FTA) guidance, which provides a method for calculating noise levels for the two noisiest pieces of equipment operating in each construction phase using reference noise levels for individual pieces of equipment. Full power operation for one hour was assumed because most construction period. No ground effects were considered. The noise levels associated with equipment that may be used during the various construction phases are shown in **Table 12**.

	Predicted Noise Levels (dBA) 1-hr Leq
Construction Phase	Valley Boulevard & Del Mar Avenue Nearest Receiver at 378 ft
Demolition	68
Site Preparation	64
Grading	66.8
Paving	64.1
Architectural Coating	56.1

Table 12 Construction Noise Level 1-hour  $L_{\mbox{\scriptsize eq}}$ 

*Source:* (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b)

During each construction stage, noise levels would have the potential to exceed existing background noise levels. BMPs would be implemented to reduce the temporary increase in noise levels. Using temporary noise mufflers, barriers and blankets would reduce noise levels for construction equipment by up to 15 A-weighted decibels (dBA) (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b).

The Traffic Noise Model 2.5 (TNM) and the Project's traffic report were utilized to predict existing, future 2025, and 2045 Project noise levels (see **Table 13**) (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021). Changes in noise levels between existing and 2025 would be negligible (less than 1-dBA increase) and would remain unnoticeable under 2045 future with Project conditions. Project improvements would not result in

additional traffic and no new exceedances of noise levels would occur (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b). Therefore, with the implementation of measures **AVM-NOI-1** and **AVM-NOI-2** the Project would result in a less than significant impact on noise levels.

Location	Existing Noise Levels L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	2025 Project Noise Levels Leq (dBA)	2025 Project Increase over Existing	2045 Project Noise Levels L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	2045 Project Increase over Existing
ST-1	68.9	68.8	-0.1	69.2	0.3
ST-2	69.1	6	-0.1	69.3	0.2
ST-3	57.8	57.6	-0.2	57.7	-0.1
ST-4	54.9	54.8	-0.1	55.1	0.2
ST-5	53.1	53	-0.1	53.4	0.3
ST-6	64.3	64.4	0.1	64	-0.3
ST-7	65.3	65.2	-0.1	65.5	0.2
ST-8	68.3	68.7	0.4	69	0.7
ST-9	51.7	51.7	0	52.3	0.6
ST-10	50.6	50.6	0	51.3	0.7
ST-11	46.5	46.7	0.2	46.6	0.1
ST-12	49.6	50.2	0.6	49.9	0.3
ST-13	52.2	53.9	1.7	52.7	0.5
ST-14	55	55.2	0.2	55	0
ST-15	64.4	64.4	0	64.5	0.1
ST-16	68.1	68.3	0.2	68.4	0.3
ST-17	52.7	52.9	0.2	53	0.3
ST-18	55	55	0	55.5	0.5

#### Table 13 Future Traffic Noise Levels

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b)

# b. Would the project result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. Vibration can result from a source (e.g., train operations, motor vehicles, machinery equipment, etc.) causing the adjacent ground to move, thereby, creating vibration waves that propagate through the soil to the foundations of nearby buildings. This effect is referred to as ground-borne vibration. Ground-borne vibration is measured as peak particle velocity (PPV) in inches per second (in/sec).

During Project construction, ground-borne vibration may result from use of heavy equipment during demolition, grading, and paving. Based on the reference vibration levels provided by the FTA, a large bulldozer represents the peak source of vibration with a reference level of 0.089 in/sec at a distance of 25 feet. Vibration levels at the nearest receiver for each of the intersections would not exceed 0.005 in/sec or 62 vibration decibels (VdB). Based on the construction vibration assessment annoyance criteria provided by the FTA for infrequent events, the Project would not include nor require equipment, facilities, or activities that would result in levels of vibration causing building damage or perceptible human response (annoyance) (see **Table 14** and **Table 15**). Construction in the Project area would be restricted to daytime hours consistent with City requirements, eliminating potential vibration impact during the sensitive nighttime hours (7PM-7AM). The Project would not add capacity to existing roadways. Ground-

borne vibration from vehicular traffic rarely causes a disturbance within buildings located in urban environments unless the pavement surface is uneven or the receptor is highly sensitive (e.g., a scientific research establishment) to ground-borne vibration. Therefore, ground-borne vibration levels within the Project area are not expected to increase during operation.

Building Category	PPV (in/sec)
I. Reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster)	0.5
II. Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)	0.3
III. Non-engineered timber and masonry buildings	0.2
IV. Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage	0.12

#### Table 14 Construction Vibration Damage Criteria

Source: (Entech Consulting Group, 2022b)

#### Table 15 Ground-borne Vibration Impact Criteria for General Assessment

Land Use Category	Frequent Events (VdB) <sup>*</sup>	Occasional Events (VdB)**	Infrequent Events (VdB)***
Category 1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations.	65****	65****	65****
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep.	72	75	80
Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use.	75	78	63

*Source:* (California Department of Transportation, 2013)

Notes: \*Frequent Events is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

\*\* Occasional Events is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

\*\*\*Infrequent Events is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day.

\*\*\*\*This criterion is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes.

Project construction would be restricted during daytime hours per City requirements and would not result in significant vibration levels. Vibration would return to existing levels following Project completion. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to groundborne vibration.

# 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?

**No Impact.** The Project area is not within an airport land use plan area, and the closest airport to the Project area is the San Gabriel Valley Airport, located approximately five miles east of the Project area. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to noise levels within airport land use areas.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **AVM-NOI-1** Construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Project would be consistent with the requirements articulated in the City of San Gabriel noise control ordinances where feasible.
- **AVM-NOI-2** Adherence to local noise ordinances and implementation of construction Best Management Practices, including using temporary noise mufflers, barriers, and blankets to reduce noise levels during construction.

### 5.14 Population and Housing

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould the Project:				
a.	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

# a. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**No Impact.** The Project would include improvements to an existing intersection with no increase in roadway capacity and would not include the construction of new homes or businesses; therefore, it would result in no impact on unplanned population growth.

# b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact.** There are no existing residential structures in the Project area. The Project would include improvements to an existing intersection and would not result in the demolition of existing housing or displacement of any residential populations. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on housing.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in no impact on Population and Housing. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Population and Housing.

### 5.15 Public Services

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	uld the Project:				
a.	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:				
i.	Fire protection?			$\boxtimes$	
ii.	Police protection?			$\boxtimes$	
iii.	Schools?				$\boxtimes$
iv.	Parks?				$\boxtimes$
v.	Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

- a. 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
  - i. Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. Disaster routes are used during times of crisis to save lives, protect property, and minimize impact to the environment. During a disaster, pre-identified disaster routes have priority for clearing, repairing, and restoration over roads. According to the General Plan, Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue are considered public safety access routes (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Emergency services that serve the Project area include the San Gabriel Fire Department and the San Gabriel Police Department. Construction of the Project would not require full closure of the roadway. Construction would take approximately 18 months, during which it is anticipated that Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue would be partially closed during working hours during both stages of the Project. Partial closure of the roadway during construction would potentially cause a minor delay response time. However, the roadway would remain open to through-traffic during non-working hours to maintain continuous access. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on public service response times.

#### ii. Police protection?

**No Impact.** See discussion for (a-i) response above.

#### iii. Schools?

**No Impact.** The closest school is McKinley Elementary is located approximately 0.3 mile northwest of the Project area. McKinley Elementary is located along Frisk Avenue and Manley Drive. The Project would not include residential development, would not result in an increase in population and therefore, would not increase the potential number of students within the service area of the San Gabriel Unified School District. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on schools.

#### iv. Parks?

**No Impact.** The nearest recreational facility to the Project area is Vincent Lugo Park approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the Project area. The Project would not include residential development and would not increase the potential number of residents within the service area of the San Gabriel Community Services Department. In addition, the Project would not increase the need for recreational facilities. As discussed in response (a.i) partial access would be maintained during construction and the Project would not restrict access to recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on parks.

#### v. Other public facilities?

**No Impact.** The Project would not include residential development and would not increase the potential number of residents within the Project vicinity that could result in an increase demand for other public services such as public libraries. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on other public facilities.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Public Services. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Public Services.

## 5.16 Recreation

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould the Project:				
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?				$\boxtimes$
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				$\boxtimes$

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

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?

**No Impact.** The nearest recreational facility to the Project area is Vincent Lugo Park approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the Project area. The Project would not include the construction of housing and would not increase the number of visitors to existing parks or recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project area, such that substantial deterioration of an existing park or recreational facility would occur or be accelerated. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on regional and neighborhood parks.

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?

**No Impact.** The Project would include intersection improvements and would not include recreational facilities. The Project would not facilitate population growth in the area, and therefore would not create a need for new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to the expansion of recreational facilities.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in no impact on Recreation. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Recreation.

## 5.17 Transportation

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W	ould the Project:				
a.	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				
b.	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				
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 discussion incorporates the results of the Traffic Study that was prepared for this Project (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021).

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to the General Plan, the existing Valley Boulevard is a 4-Lane Street and is classified as a Secondary Arterial (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Del Mar Avenue is a 2-Lane Street north of the Project and 4-Lane Street south of the Project and is classified as a Secondary Arterial (City of San Gabriel, 2004). There are no medians on Valley Boulevard or Del Mar Avenue leading up to the intersection. The Project would be designed to comply with the standards for the road classifications shown in **Table 16**. In addition, the Project would be designed to comply with adopted policies, plans, or programs concerning public transit and pedestrian facilities (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021).

Street Classification							
Design	Functional	Attribute	s				
Classification	Classification	Lanes	Medians	Parking	ADT*		
	6-Lane Boulevard	Six	Raised Median	No Parking	54,000		
Major Arterial	6-Lane Arterial	Six	Striped Median	No curb parking unless adequate right-of-way (indents preferred)	50,000		
Secondary Arterial	4-Lane Boulevard	Four	Raised Median	No Parking	36,000		

#### **Table 16 Street Classifications**

	4-Lane Arterial	Four	Striped Median	If space available (indents preferred)	30,000
	4-Lane Street	Four	None	Parking	24,000
	Limited Secondary Arterial	Two	Striped Median**	Parking	16,000
	Limited Secondary Street	Two	Striped Median**	No Parking (Bike Lane)	16,000
Collector	Collector Street	Two	None	Parking	10.000

Source: (City of San Gabriel, 2004)

Notes: \*The ADT value is a guide to the general level of daily traffic that can be carried by a roadway of this classification. Since level of service is determined by intersection performance rather than roadway link performance, this ADT value will vary (up or down) depending on the performance of adjacent intersections.

\*\*Except where traffic calming applications provide for a raised landscaped median

A traffic study was conducted for the Project to analyze existing and future traffic conditions for the Project. The current and future LOS with Project implementation is shown in **Table 17.** 

Peak Hour Level of Service						
Interrection	Existing Year (2021)		Opening Year (2025)		Horizon Year (2045)	
Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue	D	D	D	D	D	E

Source: (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021)

The General Plan states that certain intersections must attain LOS "D" as the performance threshold. The Project would meet performance LOS thresholds set by the City. The Project would include installation of new traffic signals and signal control equipment to improve signal timing, coordination, and pedestrian and bicycle traffic. These signals would be interconnected via new fiber-optic cables for improved performance, monitoring, and synchronization.

The Project would also be consistent with the sustainable transportation policy recommendations and goals listed in the Specific Plan that describe the need for traffic control synchronization to improve mobility on Valley Boulevard. The Project would improve traffic flow and overall travel speed along Valley Boulevard through traffic signal synchronization, installation of new traffic signal poles and cabinets, a new curb return, new driveways, and addition of auxiliary lanes.

The Specific Plan includes standards intended to support the implementation of the sustainable transportation policy recommendations. The roadway, on-street parking, and sidewalk improvements included in the Transportation and Circulation chapter of the Specific Plan related to transportation improvements are as follows:

- 1. **Cross Section.** Valley Boulevard will be a five-lane street with curb parking and sidewalks.
- 2. **Median/Turn Lane.** The center turn lane will be retained, particularly at major intersections and along segments where driveways are present. In conjunction with the driveway consolidation aspects of this Plan, as segments of the roadway are developed that do not have driveways, the center turn lane will be converted to landscaped pocket medians.
- 3. **Parking**. Parallel parking will be provided in the curb lane as it is necessary buffer between the traffic volumes on the street and the pedestrian realm. At intersections where additional through or turn lanes are necessary, particularly on a peak-period basis, the parking lane will be converted to a travel or turn lane for an appropriate length, but will be managed for peak-period, peak-direction use. In areas where additional width is needed for sidewalk amenities, the parking lane may be converted to sidewalk (creating parking bays). This conversion of parking to sidewalk will occur in mid-block locations and at lower volume intersections where additional travel lanes will not be needed.
- 4. Sidewalks. Sidewalk width will be maintained and expanded where possible, through conversion of the parking lane (as above), by narrowing the travel way where feasible through the use of narrower travel and parking lanes (11 feet and 7 feet, respectively), or during redevelopment of the abutting land use.
- **5. Improvements.** Valley Boulevard mobility improvements shall be in the form of efficient traffic signal timing and coordination and enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities rather than emphasizing widening Valley Boulevard (except for dedications or corner cut-offs necessary to construct turn lanes).

The Project does not meet all the standards intended to support the implementation of the sustainable transportation policy recommendations made in the Specific Plan, due to safety and operational concerns. The cross section of Valley Boulevard would have a minimum of five lanes with curb parking and sidewalks except at the approaches of the intersection, where there would be no parking in order to accommodate a minimal length of additional turn lanes. Center turn lanes would be preserved at this intersection. The Project would not be able to accommodate wider sidewalks at this intersection through the conversion of parking lanes or creating narrower travel lanes, due to safety and operational issues. Additionally, a well-defined off-peak hour could not be established to allow for off-peak hour parking usage along Valley Boulevard within the limits of the proposed improvements at the intersection.

Approximately 50 on-street parking spaces would be removed to accommodate the proposed improvements (see **Figure 6**, Existing Conditions, Parking). Local parking requirements for residential, community, industrial, office, commercial, and recreational uses are provided in the City of San Gabriel municipal code Section 153.220. The project would not conflict with parking requirements included in the City's municipal code.

The existing commercial developments incorporate extensive on-site parking, with buildings located to the rear or side of lots, as well as subterranean structures. A Park-and-Ride facility, which would facilitate carpooling activities, is located 900 feet from the intersection, on the corner of Del Mar Avenue and Dewey Avenue. Additionally, the proposed developments in the Project area, including the hotel development on the northwest corner of the intersection and the mixed-use development on the northeast corner, would offer residential and commercial parking as required by the City's municipal code.

The Project would improve traffic safety, alleviate congestion, improve traffic flow and operational conditions, and improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility along Valley Boulevard at the Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue intersection and meet the goals outlined in the General Plan and Specific Plan. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant impact on program plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system.

#### b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA states that "Transit and active transportation projects generally reduce Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) and therefore are presumed to cause a less-than-significant impact on transportation" (Office of Planning and Research, 2018). Transportation projects include rehabilitation, maintenance, replacement, safety, and repair projects designed to improve the condition of existing transportation assets (e.g., highways, roadways, bridges, culverts) and do not add additional motor vehicle capacity (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021).

Valley Boulevard has a current VMT of 102,141,782 miles during AM peak period and 144,869,612 miles during PM peak period. After Project completion VMT during AM peak period would be 102,143,661 and 144,867,793 miles during PM peak period. The Project would not increase the capacity of the roadway (Advantec Consulting Engineers, 2021). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to CEQA section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

# c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses?

**No Impact.** The intersection improvements would meet current safety and geometric standards. The Project would reduce geometric hazards though adding a thick striped pedestrian crosswalk; therefore, the Project would result in no impact on geometric hazards.

#### d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Disaster routes are used during times of crisis to save lives, protect property, and minimize impact to the environment. During a disaster, pre-identified disaster routes have priority for clearing, repairing, and restoration over all over roads. According to the General Plan, Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue are considered public safety access routes (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Construction would take approximately 18 months, and it is anticipated that Valley Boulevard and New Avenue would be partially closed during working hours during both phases of the Project. Partial lane closure could cause slower response times. However, the roadway would remain open to through-traffic during non-working hours to maintain continuous access. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on an adopted emergency response access.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Transportation. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Transportation.



(a) Northwest corner in front of new hotel, along westbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 15 parking spots would be removed.



(c) Southwest corner in front of 132 W Valley Boulevard, along eastbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 6 parking spots would be removed.



(e) Northeast corner in front of The Salvation Army San Gabriel Center of Worship and Service, along westbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 6 parking spots would be removed.



(g) Northeast corner in front of 211-215 E Valley Boulevard, along westbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 3 parking spots would be removed.



(i) Southeast corner in front of Beijing Tasty House, along eastbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 4 parking spots would be removed.







(b) Southwest corner in front of Monterey Palace BBQ, along eastbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 3 parking spots would be removed.



(d) Northeast corner in front of Jazz Cat Restaurant, along westbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 3 parking spots would be removed.



(f) Northeast corner in front of 205 E Valley Boulevard, along westbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 3 parking spaces would be removed.



(h) Southeast corner in front of Hawaii Supermarket, along eastbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 6 parking spots would be removed.



(j) Southeast corner in front of Sai Fong Ginseng & Herb Inc, along eastbound Valley Boulevard. Approximately 1 parking spot would be removed.

FIGURE 6. EXISTING CONDITIONS, PARKING Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvements

### 5.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
W sig 21 ge lar Na	ould the project cause a substantial adverse change in the mificance of a tribal cultural resource (TCR), defined in PRC section 074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is ographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the ndscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California itive American tribe, and that is:				
a.	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or				
b.	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			$\boxtimes$	

#### **Discussion of Checklist Items**

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (TCR), defined in PRC 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 PRC section 5020.1(k), or

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In 2014, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) added the term "tribal cultural resources" to CEQA. Defined in PRC Section 21074(a), a tribal cultural resource is a CRHR or local register eligible site, feature, place, cultural landscape, or object which has a cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Tribal cultural resources must also meet the definition of a historical resource.

On October 12, 2021, Project letters were sent to the three tribes on the City's AB 52 contacts list including Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairwoman, Gabrielino Tongva Tribe; Anthony Morales, Chairperson, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians; and Andrew Salas, Chairperson, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. A response from Gabrielino Tongva was not received. On October 20, 2021, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation responded to the Project letter and requested formal consultation. A telephone consultation was held with Ms. Cheng of the City of San Gabriel on January 25, 2022. Following the meeting, Mr. Salas determined that Tribal monitoring and any other cultural resources investigations were not necessary for the Project. Mr. Salas stated in the event that any cultural resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the tribe would like to be informed of the discovery. On November 4, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians responded to

the Project letter stating that the Tribe did not wish to monitor but would like to be informed in the event that cultural resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities (VCS Environmental, 2022).

The consultation with Native American Tribes did not identify any cultural or historic properties within the Project area. Due to the nature of previous ground disturbances within the Project area, there remains a low potential to adversely affect unknown, potentially intact buried archaeological deposits that might be eligible for California Register of Historical Resources listing. With the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measure **AVM-CUL-2**, the Project would result in less than significant impacts on Tribal cultural resources.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource (TCR), defined in PRC 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 PRC Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion in response (a) above.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

- **AVM-CUL-1** In the event unknown cultural resources are encountered during construction activities, all construction activities near the discovery would cease, until a qualified archeologist can determine the significance of the discovery and the course of action for its recovery in consultation with the City and consulting Tribes.
- **AVM-CUL-2** If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work would halt and the County Coroner would be notified (California Health and Safety Code, §7050.5). The Coroner would determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, he/she would contact the NAHC within 24 hours. The NAHC is responsible for immediately designating the MLD, who would be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed, if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials. If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that would not be subject to further subsurface disturbance.

### 5.19 Utilities and Service Systems

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Wo	uld the Project:				
a.	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
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?				
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?			$\boxtimes$	

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The existing traffic signal cabinet, service cabinet, and traffic poles at the southwest intersection corner of the intersection would be removed and salvaged. On the northwest corner of the intersection. Signage at the southwest corner of the Project area would be located for proposed improvements. In addition, a catch basin would be installed at the southwest corner of the intersection. All other utilities would be protected in place. The relocated utilities would have similar energy usage to existing utilities. The addition of the catch basin would accommodate any addition storm water runoff (see **Attachment A**, Project Plans). The utility relocations and addition of a catch basin would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facility or the expansion of an existing facility, electric power, or natural gas facilities. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to utilities.

# b. Would the project 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.** Project construction would temporarily require the use of water resources for dust control, concrete truck washout, and the use of a sweeper truck. The Project would replace any landscaping removed where feasible. The use of water for landscaping would be consistent with the existing water usage in the area. Water usage would be negligible respective to long term water supply. In addition, the contractor would coordinate the water supply needs of Project construction with the City. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future.

# c. Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** The Project would not require wastewater treatment. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to wastewater treatment capacity.

# d. Would the project 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. Approximately 1,000 cubic yards of waste would be generated during construction activities, which include the removals of existing concrete, curb, gutter, and pavement materials. According to the County's Integrated Waste Management Program, 1000 cubic yards of solid waste would not exceed the capacity of nine out of 13 facilities located within the county (Los Angeles County Public Works, 2020). Project construction would require minimal, short-term solid waste disposal, which would be conducted in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Project operation would not generate substantial waste. A small amount of waste may be generated from routine maintenance of the transportation facility (e.g. cleanup and litter removal); however, this waste would be disposed in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and would not be in excess capacity for the local landfill. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to the generation of excessive solid waste.

# e. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion in response (d) above.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Utilities and Service Systems.

## 5.20 Wildfire

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
lf lo very	cated in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as / high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a.	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$	
b.	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				$\boxtimes$
c.	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
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?				$\boxtimes$

#### **Discussion of Checklist Responses**

a. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Disaster routes are used during times of crisis to save lives, protect property, and minimize impact to the environment. During a disaster, pre-identified disaster routes have priority for clearing, repairing, and restoration over all over roads. According to the General Plan, Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue are considered access routes (City of San Gabriel, 2004). Construction would take approximately 18 months, and it is anticipated that Valley Boulevard and New Avenue would be partially closed during working hours during both phases of the Project. Partial lane closure could cause slower response times. However, the roadway would remain open to through-traffic during non-working hours to maintain continuous access. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on emergency response.

b. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

**No Impact.** According to the General Plan, there are no fire wildfire hazard areas in the Project area (City of San Gabriel, 2004). According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Los Angeles County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA Map, the City is not located within or near a State

responsibility area nor is the City classified as a very high fire severity zone (CAL Fire, 2011). Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on wildfire pollutant exposure or uncontrolled spread of wildfire.

# c. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

**No Impact.** The existing traffic signal cabinet, service cabinet, and traffic poles at the southwest intersection corner of the intersection would be removed and salvaged. Two traffic signal poles located at the northwest corner would be removed and relocated to the southwest corner of the intersection. Signage on the southwest corner of the Project area would be relocated for proposed improvements. In addition, a catch basin would be installed at the southwest corner of the intersection. All other utilities would be protected in place. The addition of the catch basin would not exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact on exacerbated fire risk related to infrastructure.

# d. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

**No Impact.** See discussion in response (b) above.

#### Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The Project would result in a less than significant impact on Wildfire. Therefore, the Project would not require Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures for Wildfire.

## 5.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
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 drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
C.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		$\boxtimes$		

#### Discussion of Checklist Responses

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 drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

**Less Than Significant Impact**. As described in *Section 5.4 Biological Resources*, implementation of measures **AVM-BIO-1** through **AVM-BIO-6** would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize impacts on biological resources. *Section 5.5 Cultural Resources* describes measures **AVM-CUL-1** and **AVM-CUL-2** which would avoid and/or minimize impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Therefore, the Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife species habitat, fish or wildlife population, plant or animal communities, number or restricting the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

#### b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** According to 14 CCR § 15355, "Cumulative impacts" refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects

is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. **Table 18** provides a summary of related projects within two miles of the Project area, which is used in the cumulative impact analysis. The Project would not result in any significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-HAZ-1** mentioned in *Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. Therefore, with implementation of measure **MM-HAZ-1**, the Project would result in a less than significant impact and its contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Project Name	Project Description	Project Location in Relation to Project Area	Status
Valley Boulevard and New Avenue Intersection Improvements	This project is part of the SR-710 North MIP. This project would include lane and bus stop reconfiguration along Valley Boulevard and widening of a curb return. In addition, the intersection improvements would include various areas of pavement rehabilitation and within the limits of the pavement striping.	This project is approximately 0.3 mile west of the Project area.	Construction to begin January 2024
Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Intersection Improvements	This project is part of the SR-710 North MIP. This project would include a lane reconfiguration along San Gabriel Boulevard and a new curb ramp at the northwest corner of the intersection. The Project would lengthen the dedicated left and right- turn lanes along Valley Boulevard and San Gabriel Boulevard. The intersection improvements would include various areas of pavement rehabilitation within the limits of the pavement striping. A new traffic signal pole would be installed in the northwest corner of the intersection.	This project is approximately 0.4 mile east of the Project area.	Construction to begin January 2024
San Gabriel and Marshall Street Realignment Project (SG-11)	This project is part of the SR-710 North MIP. This project builds on the existing transportation system to reduce bottlenecks and smooth traffic flow on local streets with coordinated traffic signal timing, ramp metering, enhanced bus service, as well as street and intersection improvements.	This project is approximately 0.7 mile southeast of the Project area.	Approved for Funding
Intersection Safety Improvements HSIP7 Project (521702)	This project would include the modification of existing traffic signal intersections of Las Tunas Drive/Mission Drive and Las Tunas Drive/Del Mar Avenue. The proposed project will also install crosswalk enhancements, including flashing beacon system with pedestrian button actuated, at the uncontrolled intersections of Las Tunas Drive/Country Club and San Gabriel Boulevard/Live Oak Street.	This project is approximately 1.6 miles north of the Project area.	Construction Contract has been Awarded

#### **Table 18 Projects within Two Miles**

Broadway/Walnut Grove Intersection Improvement Project (CIP No. 1- 08-11)	This project includes intersection widening, traffic signal upgrades, sidewalk and parkway improvements, and pavement reconstruction in the intersection and approaches.	This project is approximately two miles northeast of the Project area.	Construction to begin Summer of 2022
New Traffic Signal Installation at SG Boulevard and Commercial Avenue (CIP No. 2-14-01)	This project includes the construction of a new traffic signal on San Gabriel Boulevard and Commercial Avenue.	This project is approximately 1.7 miles northeast of the Project area.	Construction is on Hold
2021 Pavement Rehabilitation Project	This project includes edge grinding of existing pavement, adjusting and installing manhole frames and covers at finished grade, restoration of all existing traffic striping, pavement marking and raised markers.	This project is approximately 0.1 mile east of the Project area.	Construction Contract has been Awarded
Hotel at 101-111 W. Valley Boulevard	This project includes the construction of a new hotel on Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue. Building would include hotel rooms, commercial space, and residential condominiums.	This project is located on the northwest corner of the Project area.	Under Construction. Anticipated Completion is Fall 2022
Mixed-Use Development at 101-109 E. Valley Boulevard	This project includes the construction of a mixed-use development. Development would include commercial space, residential units, and subterranean parking.	This project is located on the northwest corner of the Project area.	Under Construction. Anticipated Completion is 2023

*Source:* (City of San Gabriel Department of Public Works, n.d.; Metro, n.d.; San Gabriel Department of Public Works, 2021; City of San Gabriel, 2021; City of San Gabriel, 2021; GE Property, 2022)

# c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The IS analysis shows that the Project would not have environmental effects causing substantial adverse effects on human beings, directly or indirectly. Impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise would all be avoided, minimized, or mitigated with implementation of measures, AVM-AQ-1 and AVM-AQ-2, AVM-BIO-1 through AVM-BIO-6, AVM-CUL-1 and AVM-CUL-2, AVM-GEO-1 through AVM-GEO-3, MM-HAZ-1, AVM-HAZ-2 and AVM-HAZ-3, and AVM-NOI-1 and AVM-NOI-2. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant with mitigation incorporated impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## 6.0 List of Preparers

The following staff assisted in the preparation of this document:

#### **City of San Gabriel**

Greg de Vink, Public Works Director

Angela Cheung, P.E.

#### TranSystems

Joseph Sawtelle, Vice President

#### **Advantec Consulting Engineers**

Edward Miller, P.E.

#### **GPA Consulting**

Richard Galvin, Principal Environmental Planner

Catherine Saint, Senior Environmental Planner

Marieka Schrader, Senior Associate Biologist

Zachary Neider, Senior Biologist

Martin Rose, Senior GIS Analyst

Noeli Topete, Environmental Planner

Justin Nguyen, Environmental Planner

Mario Mayo, Biologist

This page has been intentionally left blank.

## 7.0 List of Technical Studies

The following studies were prepared for this environmental document:

- Advantec Consulting Engineers. *Traffic Study Valley Boulevard at New Avenue, Del Mar Avenue, and San Gabriel Boulevard Intersection Improvements*. 2021
- Earth Mechanics, Inc. Geotechnical Evaluation Report City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements. 2021
- Entech Consulting Group. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements. 2022
- Entech Consulting Group. Noise Study City of San Gabriel Boulevard Intersection Improvement Project. 2022
- Geocon West Inc. Initial Site Assessment Valley Boulevard and Del Mar Avenue Intersection Improvement Project. 2022
- GPA Consulting. Visual Impact Assessment Memorandum City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements. 2022
- GPA Consulting. *Biological Resources Memorandum City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements Project.* 2022
- GPA Consulting. *Historical Resources Technical Memorandum City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements Project.* 2022
- PacRim Engineering. Hydrology and Hydraulic Report City of San Gabriel Street Improvements Project. 2021
- VCS Environmental. Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment City of San Gabriel Intersection Improvements. 2022

This page has been intentionally left blank.

### 8.0 References

- Advantec Consulting Engineers. (2021). *Traffic Study Valley Boulevard at New Avenue, Del Mar Avenue and San Gabriel Boulevard Intersection Improvements.*
- CAL Fire. (2011, September). Los Angeles County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Retrieved from chrome-

extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Fosfm.fire. ca.gov%2Fmedia%2F7280%2Flosangelescounty.pdf&clen=6118362&chunk=true.

- California Air Resources Board. (2017, January 20). The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update. California, United States. Retrieved from https://policyintegrity.org/documents/Climate\_panel\_readings.pdf
- California Department of Conservation. (2016). California Important Farmland Finder. California, United States. Retrieved from https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/
- California Department of Conservation. (2016). Compilation of Quaternary Surficial Deposits. California, United States. Retrieved from https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/QSD/
- California Department of Conservation. (2017). State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. California, United States. Retrieved from https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/(E)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20St udy/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Will iamson%20Map%202016.pdf
- California Department of Conservation. (2019). Earthquake Zones of Required Investigations. California, United States. Retrieved from https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/eqzapp/app/
- California Department of Conservation. (n.d.). *Tsunami Hazard Map.* Retrieved from https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/ts\_evacuation/?extent=-13249590.3641%2C3986280.7635%2C-13132183.0887%2C4038410.8168%2C102100&utm\_source=cgs+active&utm\_content=losangel es
- California Department of Transportation. (2013, September). Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34120/Caltrans-2013-constructionvibration-PDF
- California Department of Transportation. (2018). California State Scenic HIghway System. California, United States. Retrieved from https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e805 7116f1aacaa
- CDFW. (2021, December). *Biogeographic Information and Observation System*. Retrieved June 20, 2019, from California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project: https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?bookmark=648

- CDFW. (2021, January 21). California Natural Diversity Database for the 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangles. Retrieved from California Department of Fish and Wildlife: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data
- City of San Gabriel. (2004). The Comprehensive General Plan of the City of San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/733/GENERAL-PLAN-FOR-WEB?bidId=
- City of San Gabriel. (2013, January 15). Valley Boulevard Neighborhoods Sustainability Plan. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/1645/VBSP-as-amended-01-15-2013?bidId=
- City of San Gabriel. (2019, June 4). Staff Report. San Gabriel, California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/11295/Item-4C---Award-of-Construction-Contract-for-Traffic-Signal-Installation-Contract-No-19-01
- City of San Gabriel. (2021, July 7). 2021 Pavemment Rehabilitation Project Contract No. 21-04 Notice to Contractors Notice to Bid. San Gabriel, California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/14910/3--2021-Pavement-Rehabilitation-Project--Notice-to-Contractors?bidId=
- City of San Gabriel. (2021, July 6). CHAPTER 95: TREES AND SHRUBS; WEEDS. Retrieved from San Gabriel Municipal Code: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sangabriel/latest/sangabriel\_ca/0-0-0-1
- City of San Gabriel. (2021, July 6). Staff Report. San Gabriel, California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/14940/Item-4D---Acquisition-of-Right-of-Way-for-the-Broadway-at-Walnut-Grove-Intersection-Improvement-Project?bidld=
- City of San Gabriel Department of Public Works. (n.d.). Public Works Map. San Gabriel, California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/1421/Public-Works-Map
- CNPS. (2021, February 11). *Inventory of Rare and Endnagered Plants*. Retrieved from California Native Plant Society: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/
- Department of Toxic Substances Control. (n.d.). Treated Wood Waste. California, United States. Retrieved from https://dtsc.ca.gov/toxics-in-products/treated-wood-waste/
- Earth Mechanics Inc. (2021). *Geotechnical Evaluation Report*.

Entech Consulting Group. (2022a). Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study. California, United States.

- Entech Consulting Group. (2022b). Noise Study. California, United States.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2015, January). *Federal Insurace Rate Maps*. Retrieved from https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=camarillo%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor
- GE Property. (2022, May). 101-109 E Valley Blvd. Retrieved from Apartments.com: https://www.apartments.com/101-109-e-valley-blvd-san-gabriel-ca/2w5v5gc/

Geocon West Inc. (2022). Initial Site Assessment.

GPA Consulting. (2022a). Visual Impact Assesment Memorandum.

GPA Consulting. (2022b). Biological Resources Memorandum.

- GPA Consulting. (2022c). *Historical Resources Technical Memorandum*.
- Los Angeles County. (2014, March). Mineral Resources Map. California, United States. Retrieved from https://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/gp\_2035\_2014-FIG\_9-6\_mineral\_resources.pdf
- Los Angeles County Public Works. (2020, September). Countywide Integrated Waste Managment plan. California, United States. Retrieved from https://dpw.lacounty.gov/epd/swims/ShowDoc.aspx?id=14372&hp=yes&type=PDF
- Metro. (n.d.). SR-710 Mobility Improvements. California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.metro.net/projects/sr-710-mobility-improvements/
- Michigan State University. (2002). *K Factor*. Retrieved from Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE), On Line Soil Erosion Assessment Tool: http://www.iwr.msu.edu/rusle/kfactor.htm
- National Resources Conservation Service. (2021). *Web Soil Survey*. Retrieved September 6, 2017, from https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm

Office of Planning and Research. (2018). Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.

PacRim Engineering. (2021). Hydrology and Hydraulic Report.

- San Gabriel Department of Public Works. (2021, February 8). Intersection Safety Improvements HSIP7 Projects. San Gabriel, California, United States. Retrieved from https://www.sangabrielcity.com/DocumentCenter/View/14283/a3-Intersection-Safety-Improvement-Proj--NTC--to-be-published-on-San-Gabriel-Sun-02-08-21?bidId=
- USFWS. (2021, February 11). *Information for Planning and Consultation*. Retrieved from United States Fish and Wildlife Service: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/
- USGS. (2021, February 19). *The National Map Viewer*. Retrieved from https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/advanced-viewer/

VCS Environmental. (2022, March). Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

# 9.0 Attachments

Attachment A Project Plans
## INDEX OF PLANS

1	NDEX OF FERIO
SHEET No.	DESCRIPTION
1	TITLE AND LOCATION MAP
2	X-1 TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS
3	L-1 LAYOUT PLAN
4	P-1 PROFILES
5	C-1 CONSTRUCTION DETAILS
6	U-1 UTILITY PLAN
7	D-1 DRAINAGE PLAN
8	TH-1 TRAFFIC HANDLING PLAN
9	TH-2 TRAFFIC HANDLING PLAN
10	PD-1 PAVEMENT DELINEATION & SIGNING PLAN
11	WPC-1 WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLAN & BMP DETAILS

12 E-1 TRAFFIC SIGNAL & LIGHTING PLAN

ABBREVIATIONS:

Left

Right

Right of Way

Sidewalk

L†

R†

R/W

SW

DIGALFR

UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

## PROJECT PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION ON VALLEY BOULEVARD AT DEL MAR AVENUE



NO.









VALLEY BLVD Sta 70+42.01 TO Sta 74+49.67

DIGALERT					21700 Copley Drive Suite 350
			REVISIONS		Diamond Bar, CA 91765 Tel: (909) 860-6222
1-800-227-2600		NO.	DESCRIPTION	APP. DATE	Fax: (909) 860-6722
AT LEAST TWO DAYS					Prepared under the Supervisio
BEFORE YOU DIG	PRELIMINARY -				
UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION			 _	l
					RONALD STONE RCE





RONALD STONE



TOP OF CURB PROFILE SOUTH-WEST VALLEY BLVD AT DEL MAR AVE

NO.





	PREL	IMINARY -
NOT	FOR	CONSTRUCTION

	CITY	CITY OF SAN GABRIEL							
	STF	REET IMPROVEMEN	T PLAN FC	R					
onsulting Engineers	VALLE	EY BLVD AT	DEL MA	R AVE					
vil + Traffic		PROFI	LE						
		SCALE: HORIZ	1 <i>"=</i> 20′						
S PROFESSIONAL		VERT.	1 "=2 '						
RONALD STONE	RECOMMENDED	APPROVED							
2 No. 71675	EM	GREG DE VINCK	#58442						
<b>★</b> Exp. <u>12-31-21</u> <b>★</b>	CHECKED	CITY ENGINEER	R.C.E.	DATE					
of:	DESIGNED	-		SHEET					
OF CALL	RS	P-1	8						
	DRAWN		8	4 OF 12					
71675 DATE	RS								







## PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

				21700 Copley Drive Suite 350
	REVISIONS			Diamond Bar, CA 91765 Tel: (909) 860-6222
NO.	DESCRIPTION	APP.	DATE	Fox: (909) 860-6722
				Prepared under the Supervision of
				]
				RONALD STONE RCE 7

	CITY OF SAN GABRIEL							
	STR	EET IMPROVEMEN	T PLAN FC	R				
Consulting Engineers	VALLEY BLVD AT DEL MAR AVE CONSTRUCTION DETAILS							
RONALD STONE		APPROVED	#58442					
of:	EM DESIGNED RS DRAWN	CITY ENGINEER	к.с.Е.	SHEET 5 OF 12				
71675 DATE	RS							



			Hout	Cons	struct	ion	1
	CONSULT	NG / EM	NGINEERING	G / TRA	A		
		2050 SW A Suite 150	cacia Stre	et			
REVISIONS			Newport Be Tel: (949)	och, CA 9 274-4501	2660		
DESCRIPTION	APP.	DATE	www.houtco	nstruction.	com		
			Prepared u	nder the	Supervision	of:	
	-		RONALD	ONE	RCF	71675	-
			NONALD 3		NOL.	/10/5	-

DIGALER

BEFORE YOU DIG



		-50	0 -25 0	25 50
ning INEERING SERVICES		OF SAN T IMPROVEMENT BLVD AT I DRAINAGE SCALE: 1" =	GABF PLAN FOI DEL MA PLAN 50' #58442	RIEL RAVE
of: <u>Civil</u> 18409 DATE	ENECKED FM DESIGNED RR DRAWN AA		R.C.E.	DATE SHEET 7 of 12





Г	REVISIONS			Suite 350 Diamond Bar, C/ Tel: (909) 860-
N	DESCRIPTION	APP.	DATE	Fax: (909) 860-
				Broograd under
				Frepored under
				1
$\vdash$		_	-	·
				RONALD STONE



				21700 Copley Drive Suite 350
DREL MUNIARY NOT FOR CONCERNATION		REVISIONS		Diamond Bar, CA 91765 Tel: (909) 860-6222
PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	NO.	DESCRIPTION APP	DAT	TE Fax: (909) 860-6722
THIS PLAN IS ACCURATE FOR				Prepared under the Supervision of:
TRAFFIC HANDLING ONLY	$\vdash$		_	_
TRAFFIC HANDEING ONET			+	









