



CITY OF SAN GABRIEL

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: **Planning Case No. PL-13-090**
2. Lead agency name and address: **City of San Gabriel, 425 S. Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776**
3. Contact person and phone number: **Larissa De La Cruz, Associate Planner: (626) 308-2806, ext. 4625**
4. Project location: **704-712 W. Las Tunas Dr., San Gabriel, CA 91776**
5. Project sponsor's name and address: **LSG Las Tunas, LP: 911 S. Garfield Ave., Alhambra, CA 91801**
6. General plan designation: **Commercial Specific Plan**
7. Zoning: **Mission District Village (MDV) Zone in the Mission District Specific Plan**
8. Description of project: *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

The proposed project includes a renovation to two existing commercial buildings along with the demolition of one commercial building, which will be replaced with a three story mixed-use development with approximately 61,026 square feet, including 4,814 square feet of commercial space and 37 residential condominium units. There is existing parking on site for the commercial uses and additional parking will be provided for the residential uses with one level of subterranean parking plus another level of at-grade parking. The property is designated as Commercial Specific Plan in the General Plan, and zoned Mission District Village in the Mission District Specific Plan area. The proposed project would require a Conditional Use Permit to allow mixed-use on the property, a Tentative Tract Map to consolidate the parcels and subdivide the airspace for the residential condominium units, and a Precise Plan of Design review by the Design Review Commission.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

North: Commercial Shopping Center (C-1 Retail Commercial zone)
 South: Multi Family Residential (R-2 Grapevine Residential zone)
 West: Commercial Shopping Center (Mission District Village zone)
 East: Commercial Shopping Center (C-1 The Marketplace zone) and
 Multi Family Residential (R-3 Arroyo Residential zone)

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology / Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation / Traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Utilities / Service Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature:

Date: July 1, 2014

Printed Name: Larissa De La Cruz,
Associate Planner

For: City of San Gabriel

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant.

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

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

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

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, including a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

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

QUESTION:

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: There is no scenic vista around the subject property. The project site and surrounding area are in an urbanized area, and no scenic vistas have been identified in the general plan on or near the project site.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: No officially designated State scenic routes or highways occur near the project site.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: The area surrounding the project site contains a mix of single family and multi-family residential uses. The Planning and Design Review Commissions will serve as the approving bodies for the project, which will ensure that the building will be compatible and complementary to with its neighboring uses. As such, the proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings and will in fact substantially improve them.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: The area surrounding the project site and its surroundings are currently urbanized and contain various forms of on- and off-site lighting. As part of the proposed project, lighting would be included for activity areas involving nighttime uses, parking, security lighting around the building and interiors of the building.

Recommended Mitigation Measure: MM 1.1: To reduce the impact on adjacent properties, any new exterior lighting or security illumination will be directed away or shielded from adjacent properties as a condition of approval and as part of the plan check review and construction process. With mitigation measures in place, any significant impact of light and glare will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. *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 of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is urbanized and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project implementation would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract because the project site and surrounding area are developed and urbanized, and no agricultural land exists within the site vicinity. Therefore no impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
--	--	--	--	---

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion c-d: The project site is urbanized and there are no farmland uses that are occurring on-site or in the immediate vicinity. Thus, the proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land. The site has been historically developed and is located within a highly urbanized area. As the proposed project site is within the Mission District Specific Plan boundaries, there will not be any impacts related to this environmental topic.

e) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: Refer to impact discussion for a-d, which concluded no impacts.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. *Would the project:*

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		X		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		

Impact Discussion for a-d: The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), monitored by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The U.S. EPA has classified the SCAB as a non-attainment area for Federal and State air quality standards.

The change from a commercial building to a mixed-use building will introduce a new component to the neighborhood by offering residential units above commercial space in the same building. This will allow residents in this project and the surrounding neighborhood opportunities for pedestrian trips, thereby reducing the number of vehicle trips and potential greenhouse gas emissions from the project as compared to if the site was redeveloped entirely with commercial uses. Nevertheless, the issues identified in III a-d below were studied within the scope of the environmental impact report prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan and adequately addressed by the following mitigation measures, which the project will be conditioned to include, and which the developer will be required to include in contract specifications.

Recommended Mitigation Measures for a-d:

AQ-MM 3.1: During clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures, as specified in the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Rules and Regulations:

- On-site vehicle speed will be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- All on-site construction roads with vehicle traffic will be watered periodically.
- Streets adjacent to the Project reach will be swept as needed to remove silt that may have accumulated from construction activities so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- All material excavated or graded will be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering will occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferable in the late morning and after work is done for the day.

- All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities will cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 35 miles per hour averaged over one hour) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- All material transported on-site or off-site will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations will be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- These control techniques will be indicated on Project grading plans. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic site inspections by the City.
- Visible dust beyond the property line emanating from the Project will be prevented to the maximum extent feasible.

AQ-MM 3.2: Project grading plans shall show the duration of construction. Ozone precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Compliance with this measure will be subject to periodic inspections of construction equipment vehicles by the City.

AQ-MM 3.3: All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114, with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(2) and (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets and roads.

AQ-MM 3.4: During overall site grading and public infrastructure construction phases, construction equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet from the nearest residence to the extent practical. During structure/building construction, equipment and supply staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet or as far as practical from the nearest residence.

AQ-MM 3.5: Should a potential end-user be identified whose land use would cause a particulate diesel index of 0.0003 F/m³ or increase the volume-to-capacity ratio (also called the Intersection Capacity Utilization) by 0.02 (2 percent) for any intersection with a LOS of D or worse, a preliminary screening shall be conducted per SCAQMD Rules 1401 and 212 to determine whether a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) shall be prepared.

AQ-MM 3.6: Prior to the issuance of building permits for any future development, the applicant shall submit, and the Director of Community Development shall have approved, an operation-emissions mitigation plan. The plan shall identify implementation procedures for each of the following emissions reduction measures and all feasible mitigation measures shall be implemented. If certain measures are determined infeasible, an explanation thereof shall be provided.

- Utilize built-in energy-efficient appliances to reduce energy consumption and emissions.
- Utilize energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners and lighting to reduce electricity consumption and associated emissions.
- Utilize light-colored roofing materials as opposed to dark roofing materials to conserve electrical energy for air-conditioning.
- Provide shade trees in residential subdivisions as well as public areas, including parks, to reduce building heating and cooling needs, whenever feasible.
- Ensure that whenever feasible, commercial truck traffic is diverted from local roadways to off-peak periods.
- Centralize space heating and cooling for multiple family dwelling units and commercial space.
- Orient buildings north/south for reducing energy related combustion emissions.
- Use solar energy, when feasible.
- Use high-rating insulation in walls and ceilings.

AQ-MM 3.7: Information on available housing and employment opportunities within the Plan Area shall be provided to employees and residents to encourage employees to live within the residential developments within the Plan Area and future residents to find employment within or adjacent to the Plan Area.

An Air Quality/GHG report was also prepared for the project on January 28, 2014 and identified the following additional mitigation measures to mitigate impacts:

AQ-MM 3.8: Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans, and specifications stipulate that, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust prevention measures, as specified in the SCAQMD.'s Rules and Regulations. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off--site.

Implementation of the following measures would reduce short term fugitive dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:

- All active portions of the construction site shall be watered every three hours during daily construction activities and when dust is observed migrating from the project site to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
- Pave or apply water every three hours during daily construction activities or apply non--toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas. More frequent watering shall occur if dust is observed migrating from the site during site disturbance.
- Any on--site stockpiles of debris or on--site haul roads, dirt, or other dusty material shall be enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily, or non--toxic soil binders shall be applied.
- All grading and excavation operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour.
- Disturbed areas shall be replaced with ground cover or paved immediately after construction is completed in the affected area.
- Track--out devices such as gravel bed track--out aprons (3 inches deep, 25 feet long, 12 feet wide per lane and edged by rock berm or row of stakes) shall be installed to reduce mud/dirt track out from unpaved truck exit routes. Alternatively a wheel washer shall be used at truck exit routes.
- All material transported off--site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust prior to departing the job site.
- Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.

AQ-MM 3.9: All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on--site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114 (*Spilling Loads on Highways*), with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets and roads. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall demonstrate to the City Engineer how the project operations subject to that specification during hauling activities shall comply with the provisions set forth in Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(4).

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is not expected to generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, this impact would be short-term in nature and cease upon project completion. In addition, with mitigation measures in place, any significant impact will be reduced to a level of insignificance. According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Any impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short term and are less than significant.

f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment ?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

g) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion f-g: The City has adopted an *Energy Action Plan* (EAP) (November 20, 2012), as part of a regional partnership between the City, Southern California Edison (SCE), and the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG). Past and current collaborative efforts between these partners have focused on improving energy efficiency by providing local governments with funding, technical support, and a forum for sharing information through the San Gabriel Valley Energy Wise Partnership (SGVEWP). This EAP meets the requirements of the Energy Leader Partnership Model

and is part of a larger regional effort to develop GHG emissions inventories and energy efficiency climate action plans (EECAP) for 27 participating cities in the SGVCOG.

The purpose of this EAP is to identify the City of San Gabriel's long-term vision and commitment to achieve energy efficiency in the City. The EAP notes that it could serve as the foundation for future climate action planning projects.

The EAP identifies key energy efficiency targets and separate associated goals, policies, and actions for community and municipal activities. The project proposes to incorporate several energy efficiency design features that are consistent with the EAP efficiency measures. Table 11, *Energy Action Plan Consistency* from the Air Quality/GHG report discusses the project's consistency with the applicable EAP policies.

**Table 11
Energy Action Plan Consistency**

EAP Measure	Project Consistency
Policy 2.2: Support the use of energy-efficient appliances and equipment in the nonresidential building stock.	Consistent. The proposed residential and restaurant uses would incorporate energy-efficient appliances and lighting.
Policy 3.1: The City will maximize the energy efficiency of new buildings.	Consistent. The project would be compliant with CalGreen energy efficiency requirements. Additionally, the proposed project is designed and oriented to take advantage of natural ventilation and sunlight.
Policy 3.2: Encourage the use of smart grid and energy star appliances in new development.	Consistent. The project would install energy-efficient appliances and lighting throughout the project site.
Policy 5.1: Maximize the cooling of buildings through tree planting and shading to reduce building electricity demands.	Consistent. The project would include multiple trees and awnings along the exterior of the project site to reduce electricity demands to the extent feasible.
Policy 6.2: Encourage the use of energy- and water-efficient water fixtures for indoor water use to reduce electricity use for water pumping.	Consistent. Energy- and water-efficient fixtures would be installed throughout the project site, per CalGreen energy efficiency requirements.
Policy 6.3: Support water-efficient landscaping to reduce the electricity demand for water transport and treatment.	Consistent. Water-efficient landscapes (i.e., efficient irrigation systems and devices) would be implemented in landscape areas.

Source: PMC, City of San Gabriel Energy Action Plan, November 20, 2012.

As noted above, the proposed project would adhere to CalGreen standards, and would implement several project design features consistent with the EAP and *2009 Sustainability Action Plan*. Therefore, the proposed project would help implement the EAP and *2009 Sustainability Action Plan*, and would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHGs. Also, as previously discussed, the proposed project would result not in substantial construction--related or operational GHG emissions. The proposed project would not hinder the State's GHG reduction goals established by AB 32. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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

Impact Discussion: The project site is predominantly urbanized and built out. Landscaping within the area consists of both native and non-native vegetation and no species that are candidate, sensitive or special status species are known to exist in the local vicinity due to the urbanized conditions. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to Federal or State listed or other designated species.

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

Impact Discussion: As previously stated, the project site is predominately urbanized and built out. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on-site. According to Figure 8-1 of the Environmental Resources Element of the *General Plan*, the project site is not identified as having environmental resources.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: No federally protected wetlands occur on-site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: No migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nurseries exist in the project area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is comprised of native and non-native vegetation and does not include protected habitat. The proposed project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

Impact Discussion: The project site is located in the San Gabriel Mission District which represents one of the most historic locations in Southern California. The Mission District encompasses the Mission San Gabriel Archangel (the second oldest building south of Monterey), the Mission Playhouse, the Historic Museum and Hayes House, the Ramona Museum of California History and many other historic and cultural sites.

These historic sites contribute to an understanding of local and regional history. The proposed project may have a significant adverse impact if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5. of the CEQA Guidelines. This section of the CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as one listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places (per state law), included in a local register of historical resources (as defined by state law) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey (meeting the requirements of state law) or determined by the lead agency (the City of San Gabriel) to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Places.

In this case, the existing commercial building is not listed in nor eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places, not listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey, nor has it been determined to be historically significant by the City because it does not meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Places. Therefore, it does not meet the definition of a historical resource contained in Section 15064.5. of the CEQA Guidelines and its demolition would be a less than significant impact. The project site is urbanized with land area and has been previously disturbed.

The issues identified in a-c above were studied within the scope of the environmental impact report prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan and adequately addressed by the following mitigation measures:

CR-MM 5.1: An archaeologist and/or a Native American Monitor appointed by the City of San Gabriel shall be present during earth removal or disturbance activities related to rough grading and other excavation for foundations and utilities. If any earth removal or disturbance activities result in the discovery of cultural resources, the project proponent’s contractors shall cease all earth removal or disturbance activities in the vicinity and immediately notify the City selected archaeologist and/or Native American Monitor, who shall immediately notify the City. The City selected archaeologist will have the power to temporarily halt or divert the excavation equipment in order to evaluate any potential cultural material. The City selected archaeologist shall evaluate all potential cultural findings in accordance with standard practice, the requirements of the City of San Gabriel Cultural Resources Element, and other applicable regulations. Consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and data/artifact recovery, if deemed appropriate, shall be conducted.

CR-MM 5.2: Require monitoring of future grading operations by a qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist when the site is reasonably suspected of containing such resources. If, as a result, evidence of resources is found, require the property to be made available for a reasonable period of time for salvage of known archaeological and/or paleontological resources by qualified experts, organizations or educational institutions

CR-MM 5.3: If evidence of subsurface paleontological resources is found during construction, excavation and other construction activity in that area shall cease and the contractor shall contact the City. With direction from the City, a Los Angeles County Certified Paleontologist shall prepare and complete a standard Paleontologic Resource Mitigation Program.

CR-MM 5.4: Should any human bone be encountered during any earth removal or disturbance activities, all activity shall cease immediately and the city selected archaeologist and Native American monitor shall be immediately contacted, who shall then immediately notify the City. The City shall contact the Coroner pursuant to Section 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: No known human remains occur on-site and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project site. However, see discussion above in the event that human are remains are found.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse affects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X

Impact Discussion: No active faults are known to traverse the project site and the project site is not located within, or immediately adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur within the project area.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: Southern California has numerous active and potentially active faults that could produce strong ground shaking that could impact the project site. The City of San Gabriel is in proximity to the San Andreas and Sierra Madre Fault zone. The Raymond Fault is the closest active fault, and is located north of the City of San Gabriel. The California Building Code requires structural design and construction methods that minimize the effects of strong seismic ground shaking. The California Building Code requirements would be applied to the proposed project as standard conditions of project approval.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project area is located within a portion of the City that is identified in the *General Plan* Public and Environmental Safety Element as not being subject to liquefaction. Therefore, project implementation is not anticipated to result in the exposure of people or structures to potential impacts related to seismic ground failure or liquefaction.

iv) Landslides?				X
-----------------	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography. Project implementation would not expose people or structures to landslides, therefore no impact would occur in this regard.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: Grading and trenching for construction may expose soils to short-term wind and water erosion. Implementation of erosion control measures as stated in Chapter 98.02 of the *Municipal Code* and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities would reduce potential impacts.

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

Impact Discussion: As indicated above, the project site is not identified as a geologic unit that is unstable, and would not become unstable as a result of project implementation.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: According to the Mission District Specific Plan EIR, expansive soils have a significant amount of clay particles, which can give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell). The change in volume exerts stress on buildings and other loads placed on these soils. The occurrence of these soils is often associated with geologic units having marginal stability. The distribution of expansive soils can be widely dispersed, and they can occur in hillside areas as well as low-lying alluvial basins. The project site is not located in neither a hillside or within a low lying alluvial basin and therefore, will not create a substantial risk to life or property. In addition, a soils report will be required for this project to confirm such condition.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. *Would the project:*

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?"				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would adhere to CalGreen standards, and would implement several project design features consistent with the City’s Energy Action Plan (EAP) and *2009 Sustainability Action Plan*. Therefore, the proposed project would help implement the EAP and *2009 Sustainability Action Plan*, and would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHGs. Also, the proposed project would result not in substantial construction-related or operational GHG emissions, as it is below the City's adopted screening level size for condominium developments. The proposed project would not hinder the State’s GHG reduction goals established by AB 32.

Additionally, an Air Quality/GHG report was prepared for the project on January 28, 2014 that indicated the GHG impacts caused by this project will be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Small amounts of hazardous materials may be found in solvents and chemicals used for cleaning, building maintenance, and landscaping. The materials would be similar to those found in common household products, such as cleaning products or pesticides. Hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: Proposed uses are not anticipated to result in the creation of health hazards following compliance with health and safety regulations.

The proposed uses would not use, generate or dispose of hazardous materials in large quantities. As stated above, hazardous materials used in construction and operation of the proposed project would be subject to City, State, and Federal regulations, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: There are no schools located within a one quarter mile of the project. Additionally, the proposed project would not involve the transport, use, handling, or disposal of notable quantities of hazardous materials, aside from normal household chemicals and landscaping applications. Therefore, no significant impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project area is not on a list of hazardous sites compiled, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is El Monte Airport, approximately five miles southeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is El Monte Airport, approximately five miles southeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: Emergency vehicles would continue to have access to project related and surrounding roadways upon completion of the proposed project. The proposed project would not impact access to emergency response. In addition, the proposed project will be required to modify the median on Mission Drive between Padilla Street and Las Tunas Drive to provide additional left turn lane capacity at Padilla and at Las Tunas Drive. This improvement will assist in alleviating the through lanes being blocked by queuing vehicles waiting to make left turns at those locations. This will improve traffic conditions along Mission Drive and will not place temporary or permanent barriers on existing roadways or reconfigure existing roadways. Therefore, no impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site and surrounding areas are predominately built out and no wildlands occur within or adjacent to the project site. Future development as a result of project implementation would introduce additional ornamental landscaping, which is not anticipated to create hazardous fire conditions.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	

Impact Discussion: The project will not be allowed to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Compliance with the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES Permit issued by the State of California, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board is required.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The level of the proposed excavation will not reach the aquifer, thus the proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: There are no streams or rivers nearby. The Engineering Division is requiring that, prior to approval of a grading plan, the applicant shall prepare and submit a drainage study, including supporting hydraulic and hydrological data to the City for review and acceptance. The study shall confirm or recommend changes to the City's existing drainage system by identifying off-site and on-site storm water runoff impacts resulting from the project. In addition, the study identifies the project's contribution and shall provide locations and sizes of catchments and system connection points and all downstream drainage mitigation measures. The proposed development will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

The applicant would also be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and meet all National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB) and the City of San Gabriel.

Impact Discussion: There are no streams or rivers nearby. The Engineering Division is requiring that, prior to approval of a grading plan, the applicant shall prepare and submit a final drainage study, including supporting hydraulic and hydrological data to the City for review and acceptance. The study shall confirm or recommend changes to the City's existing drainage system by identifying off-site and on-site storm water runoff impacts resulting from the project.

In addition, the study identifies the project's contribution and shall provide locations and sizes of catchments and system connection points and all downstream drainage mitigation measures. A conceptual drainage study was submitted that indicated the proposed development will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The applicant would also be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, and meet all National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB) and the City of San Gabriel.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: See Response a through d above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: See Response a and c above.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X

Impact Discussion: According to the Public and Environmental Safety Element of the *General Plan*, the project site is not located within a flood zone. Additionally, the City of San Gabriel is not subject to any major flood hazards, or potential inundation due to nearby dam failures. Furthermore, the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map designates the entire City as within a Flood Zone “C.” Flood Zone “C” is identified as an area of minimal flooding. The proposed project would not involve the placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project site is 25 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and there are no large bodies of water within the vicinity of the project site that would cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore no impacts would result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:*

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The subject site is surrounded by commercial and residential uses. The proposed development is replacing an existing commercial building and will provide additional residential units and will not physically divide an established community. The project site is located within the Mission District Specific Plan. A commercial retail and residential mixed-use project would require a Conditional Use Permit. However, according to Figure 1-1 of the *General Plan* Land Use Element, the project site is located within an area identified for mixed-use and revitalization. As a result, the proposed project would provide higher density residential uses in proximity to general commercial uses, and would not divide an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but to limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is in compliance with the City’s General Plan and the Mission District Specific Plan.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project site is not included in any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site is currently developed and not identified as a site with known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project will not 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, because the site contains no known mineral resources.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XII. NOISE. *Would the project result in:*

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		

Impact Discussion: There will be a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the project, but it will not be substantial and must remain within noise limits established by the City. Adherence to regulations about the hours of construction should minimize noise impacts on adjacent uses.

Impact Discussion: The issues identified in a-d above were studies within the scope of the environmental impact report prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan and adequately addressed by the following mitigation measures, which the project will be conditioned to include, and which the developer will be required to include in contract specifications. There will be a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the project, but it will not be substantial and must remain within noise limits established by the City.

Recommended Mitigation Measures for a-d:

NOI-MM 12.1: In compliance with the City's noise standards, future construction activities shall be limited between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activity is prohibited on Sundays and holidays.

NOI-MM 12.2: Prior to approval of a grading permit for future development projects, the applicant shall inspect all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, to determine that they are equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and to retrofit all equipment which is not so equipped, and certify that all equipment operating on the site is properly equipped, subject to review and approval by the City Building Inspector.

NOI-MM 12.3: Stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers, subject to review and approval by the City Building Inspector.

NOI-MM 12.4: Stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located at least 400 feet from noise-sensitive receptors during construction activities, subject to review and approval by the City Building Inspector.

NOI-MM 12.5: Future project proponents in the Plan Area shall pay fair share project costs for noise attenuation measures (i.e., double glazed glass) to existing sensitive receptors that would ensure compliance with interior noise level criteria established by the City of San Gabriel along the following three roadway segments:

- Santa Anita Street: north of Las Tunas Drive;
- Broadway: east of Junipero Serra Drive; and
- Junipero Serra Drive: San Marino Avenue to Broadway.

Future noise studies shall be conducted at each existing sensitive receptor along these three roadway segments prior to the installation of noise attenuation measures to determine compliance with noise standards established by the City of San Gabriel.

NOI-MM 12.6: Future sensitive receptors constructed within the Plan Area along the three roadway segments identified below shall comply with adopted noise standards of the City of San Gabriel:

- Santa Anita Street: north of Las Tunas Drive;
- Broadway: east of Junipero Serra Drive; and
- Junipero Serra Drive: San Marino Avenue to Broadway.

NOI-MM 12.7: Prior to building permit issuance, subsequent noise assessments shall be prepared, to the satisfaction of the City Building Inspector, which demonstrates the site placement of stationary noise sources would not exceed criteria established in the General Plan Update. The analysis shall verify that loading dock facilities, rooftop equipment, trash compactors and other stationary noise sources are adequately shielded and/or located at an adequate distance from residential areas in order to comply with the City's noise standards.

In addition, an acoustical assessment was conducted on January 28, 2013 that identified further mitigation measures for the project.

NOI-MM 12.8: Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the Project Applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the San Gabriel Planning Division that the project complies with the following:

- Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.
- Property owners and occupants located within 250 feet of the project boundary shall be sent a notice, at least 15 days prior to commencement of construction of each phase, regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the project construction site. All notices and signs shall be reviewed and approved by the City of San Gabriel Community Development Director (or designee), prior to mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. The Contractor shall provide evidence that a construction staff member will be designated as a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and will be present on-site during construction activities.

The Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the City within 24--hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the Community Development Director (or designee). All notices that are sent to residential units immediately surrounding the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the Noise Disturbance Coordinator.

- Prior to issuance of any Grading or Building Permit, the Project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director (or designee) that construction noise reduction methods shall be used where feasible. These reduction methods include shutting off idling equipment, installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and electric air compressors and similar power tools.
- Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.
- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.

With mitigation measures in place, any significant noise related impact will be reduced to a level of less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan. There is no public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip located within two miles of the project site. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The construction of the proposed project would have no impact with regards to private airstrips. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*

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

Impact Discussion: The anticipated population growth is within that foreseen by the Mission District Specific Plan and thus not considered substantial in this area. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2025 Regional Growth Forecasts estimated that the population of San Gabriel would reach 42,287 persons by 2010, and 42,951 persons

by 2020. The 2010 Census indicated that San Gabriel has a population of 39,718, below the anticipated growth. The increase in population that the proposed project will bring is approximately 120 persons, per the median household size in the 2010 Census. The increase in people not significant in the context of the City as a whole or substantial for the area.. The City is continuously increasing the housing stock through infill development, which is consistent with the City’s General Plan Housing Element. The proposed project meets the allowable density for this site.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

Impact Discussion: The proposed project will provide 37 new residential units and therefore, will not necessitate the construction of additional housing elsewhere.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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?		X		
ii) Police protection?		X		
iii) Schools?		X		
iv) Parks?		X		
v) Other public facilities?		X		

Impact Discussion: The marginal increase in housing units from this project are well within those anticipated in the City’s General Plan and would not require the provision of new or altered governmental facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services. The proposed project would have expected some level of impact on these services, and to mitigate these impacts, the project is subject to the City’s development impact fees which include police, fire, open space, sewer, and traffic. The purpose of these fees is designed to offset the impacts created by new development on City facilities and infrastructure. While the proposed project by itself will not necessitate the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, it would have impacts contributing to the need for these facilities proportional to its share of the anticipated growth permitted by the City’s General Plan. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will be required to pay impact fees for police facilities (\$29,759.94), fire facilities (\$13,557.14), open space (\$82,991.00), traffic (\$115.462) and sewer impacts (\$68,846). Additionally, prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will be required to pay school impact fees to the San Gabriel Unified School District. With mitigation measures in place, any public service related impact will be reduced to a level of less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
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?			X	

Impact Discussion: Because of the increase of dwelling units on-site, some increase in use of neighborhood or regional parks is expected along with a corresponding increase in the physical deterioration of the facilities. While the project by itself would not trigger the new construction or expansion of recreational facilities, the applicant will be required to pay open space facility impact fees of \$82,991.00, which will be used for future upgrades and expansions of recreational facilities. Additionally, the proposed project provides approximately 7,782 sq. ft. of common open space on-site for the recreational use of project residents.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: The mixed use building is replacing a commercial building. A traffic study was prepared for this project and indicated that the project is not creating a significant traffic impact. In addition, the project will be conditioned to modify the median on Mission Drive between Padilla Street and Las Tunas Drive to provide additional left turn lane capacity at Padilla and at Las Tunas Drive. This improvement will assist in alleviating the through lanes being blocked by queuing vehicles waiting to make left turns at those locations. This will improve traffic conditions along Mission Drive. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

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

Impact Discussion: The Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County is intended to reduce traffic congestion and provide a mechanism for coordinating land use and development decisions throughout Los Angeles County. The Congestion Management Program requires the analysis of the traffic impacts of individual projects with potential regional significance. In conformance with Congestion Management Program *Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines*, a traffic impact analysis is conducted at:

- Congestion Management Program arterial monitoring intersections, including freeway on-ramps or off-ramps, where a project would add 50 or more vehicle trips during either morning or afternoon weekday peak hours; or at
- Congestion Management Program mainline freeway-monitoring locations, where a project would add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the morning or afternoon weekday peak hours.

There are no Congestion Management Program arterial monitoring intersections located within proximity to the project site that would receive project-generated trips. Thus, no additional analysis is required.

According to the traffic study for the project, the proposed Project would generate a net total of 307 daily vehicle trips, with 11 trips (-4 inbound and 15 outbound) occurring during the a.m. peak hour, and 27 trips (22 inbound and 5 outbound) occurring during the p.m. peak hour. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant in this regard.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X

Impact Discussion: The proposed project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks because there is no airport nearby.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not create any hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Access to the project site would be required to comply with all City design standards, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. There will be a required median modification that will assist in alleviating the blocking of the through lanes on Mission Drive and will help increase the level of safety along that segment of Mission Drive.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not significantly impact the adequacy of existing and future emergency services. Constructed roadways and driveways are required to meet access standards of the San Gabriel Police and Fire Departments. Therefore, significant impacts would not result from the construction and operation of the proposed project.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: According to the traffic study, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities, nor create any significant traffic impacts within both the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods. Project mitigation measures, therefore, are not recommended.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Impact Discussion: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts, would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board and would have a less than significant impact on the need to construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

As proposed, the project will comply with the densities anticipated under the General Plan; therefore its impacts on wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board and on the need to construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities are less than significant.

Additionally, a sewer capacity study was prepared on February 19, 2014. The study shows that the sewer in Padilla Street between Alanmay and Santa Anita does not have adequate capacity for the additional wastewater flow from the proposed project. The applicant is required to pay a fair share amount of \$134,316 toward the upgrade of the sewer in Padilla as mitigation for this impact. In addition, the applicant is required to pay sewer impact fees of \$68,846 which will be used for future upgrades and expansion of the sewer facilities farther downstream from the project.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: This issue was studied within the scope of the environmental impact report prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan. The EIR indicated that future development projects in the Plan Area must be compliant with the requirements of the statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity which would prevent storm water pollution from impacting waters of the U.S. in the vicinity of the Plan Area.

A hydrology report was also prepared for this project and found that the project would not result in significant impact on the need to construct storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Additionally, the project will install new drainage facilities on site, and an infiltration system will be installed to accommodate the first flush storm water on site. This is an improved condition over the existing, and it will help reduce runoff from the project site.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Impact Discussion: As proposed, the project will comply with the densities anticipated under the Mission District Specific Plan and therefore sufficient water supplies will be available to serve the proposed development. Neither a Water Supply Assessment nor Water Supply Verification, as required by Senate Bills 610 (Costa) and 221 (Keuhl), are required for the proposed project, since the proposed number of residential units is well below the 500,000 square feet for retail, and 500 dwelling unit thresholds. Because the proposed project would only entail the development of 37 dwelling units, a formal Water Supply Assessment or written Water Supply Verification are not warranted.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	

Impact Discussion: This issue was studied within the scope of the environmental impact report prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan. The EIR indicated that in order to ensure adequate service to future development projects in the Plan Area, plans for the wastewater system shall be approved by the City Engineer and/or the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County as part of the environmental review procedure.

A recent sewer capacity analysis prepared for this project provided flow metering data which indicated that the proposed project would have minimal impact on the existing sewer main line. While the project by itself would not trigger the new construction or expansion of existing facilities, the applicant will be required to pay sewer impact fees of \$68,846, which will be used for future upgrades and expansions of sewer facilities.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: The City of San Gabriel is served by Athens Disposal Company. The company hauls nonrecyclable solid waste to a designated Landfill in San Bernardino County, of which they have a 10-year operations contract.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: These issues were studied within the scope of the environmental impact report (EIR) prepared in 2004 for the Mission District Specific Plan. The EIR found that implementation of the Specific Plan would have a potentially significant impact on permitted landfill capacity and compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste but addressed by the following mitigation measures below.

USS-17 MM 16.2: The applicant shall submit advance notice of the proposed project to Athens Disposal Service one week prior to the occupancy date of the building.

USS-17 MM 16.3: A number of conservation measures shall be considered in building and site design to reduce the demands of the individual development projects. Such measures include:

- Businesses should investigate local recycling/resource recovery programs. A handbook for development of such programs is available through the California Waste Management Board.

USS-17 MM 16.4: The applicant shall adhere to all source reduction programs for use operation, as required by the City of San Gabriel.

USS-17 MM 16.5: The applicant shall adhere to all source reduction programs for the disposal of demolition and construction materials and solid waste, as required by the City of San Gabriel.

With mitigation measures in place, any solid waste related impact will be reduced to a level of less than significant.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of 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, 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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Impact Discussion: The project site does not contain the habitat of a fish or wildlife species and therefore construction of the proposed project would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Likewise, approval of the proposed project is not anticipated to eliminate examples of 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)?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Impact Discussion: The cumulative impacts of the project are not expected to be significant As conditioned and with mitigation measures in place and are in keeping with the long-range considerations of the *General Plan*.

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

Impact Discussion: Previous sections of this Initial Study reviewed the proposed project’s potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, noise, hazards and hazardous materials, traffic, and other issues. As concluded in these previous discussions, the proposed project would result in less than significant environmental impacts with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Larissa De La Cruz
Name

July 2, 2014
Date

Signature

Associate Planner, San Gabriel Planning Division
Title

SOURCES CITED IN THE EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Planning Case PL-13-090

704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive, San Gabriel, CA

Conditional Use Permit and Tentative Tract Map for New Mixed-Use Development

1. *Ingredients for Success*, the Comprehensive General Plan of the City of San Gabriel, 2004
2. The Comprehensive General Plan Background Report of the City of San Gabriel, 2004
3. Environmental Evaluation, City of San Gabriel General Plan, 2004
4. Zoning Ordinance, City of San Gabriel
5. *Mission District Specific Plan*, 2004
6. Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring Program for *Mission District Specific Plan*, 2004
7. Tentative Tract Map for 704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive dated September 10, 2013
8. Architectural Site Plan for 704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive dated September 16, 2013
9. Landscape Plan for 704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive dated September 16, 2013
10. Traffic Impact Study for 704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive prepared by KOA Corporation dated April 9, 2014
11. Sewer Study for 704-712 W. Las Tunas Drive prepared by EGL Associates dated February 19, 2014

All documents cited above are available for review at the City of San Gabriel Community Development Department, 425 South Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776. The office hours are Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except Tuesday until 6:30 p.m.